

# Report on Bachelor Thesis

Institute of Economic Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University in Prague

<b>Student:</b>	<b>Lucie Svitáková</b>
<b>Advisor:</b>	<b>Petr Janský, Ph.D.</b>
<b>Title of the thesis:</b>	<b>Measuring the Index of Constructive External Engagement: ICEE for the Czech Republic</b>

## **OVERALL ASSESSMENT** (provided in English, Czech, or Slovak):

The thesis deals particularly with the difference between the Commitment to Development Index (CDI) and Index of Constructive External Engagement (ICEE). Other similar indices are also considered. The ICEE index is assumed to better reflect the real-world situation since it assesses the impact of a particular country with respect to all other countries, whereas the CDI assesses the impact on one country (set) only. Having introduced the components of the ICEE and compared it to the components of the index to the CDI, the thesis points at drawbacks of the ICEE and suggests a potential for its improvement in further research. In the empirical work, the thesis calculates the ICEE for the Czech Republic finding out that the Czech Republic scores evenly in all components of the ICEE. Scores in individual components are compared to other countries and indices as well. The author concludes that based on the comparison particularly between the ICEE and the CDI, the Czech Republic focuses more on the global commitments than on a purposeful aid to developing countries.

The intention of the thesis and the contribution to the state-of-knowledge is obvious, I consider the primary contribution of the thesis to be found in chapter 6 where the author compares her results to similar indices (including also the CDI). However my main objections also relate to chapter 6.

1. The work misses an academic format where methodology would be properly explained also stating the specific model used.
2. The OLS model is used to estimate correlation of ranks between ICEE and other vectors of similar indices. However, if one compares two vectors of variables, isn't it rather just a correlation coefficient, than the OLS regression as such? Of course, the correlation coefficient is a specific form of an OLS regression, but the author presents it as if a proper OLS model was estimated.
3. No model assumptions are checked.
4. The Spearman's Rank correlation coefficient suits better the desired purposes of rank comparison. It also reports p-values, without the need to assign ranks manually. Why does the author not consider the Spearman's Rank correlation coefficient at all?

My other quite serious comments relate to the academic style of the whole thesis.

1. In an academic work, one expects proper separation of methodology, data, results, etc. In chapter 6.2. a number of indices are introduced to which the ICEE is compared (ideally a data section) and the results are immediately reported (results section) without any proper separation.
2. The academic style is lacking also in parts, where the author expresses her personal opinion in the review section. Own opinions of the author should be based on the empirical part of the thesis.
3. Sometimes language is quite informal which is again against the academic style, such as on p. 22 "...let the common politics settle a bit"
4. Format of citations is often incorrect. I started mentioning some of these below, but the format of citations is wrong in so many cases, that I ceased after a while.
5. Abstract is rather a description how the work proceeds, not really an abstract of an academic work

Besides, the thesis contains a large number of typos.

# Report on Bachelor Thesis

Institute of Economic Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University in Prague

<b>Student:</b>	<b>Lucie Svitáková</b>
<b>Advisor:</b>	<b>Petr Janský, Ph.D.</b>
<b>Title of the thesis:</b>	<b>Measuring the Index of Constructive External Engagement: ICEE for the Czech Republic</b>

Other minor comments are mentioned below and are divided according to chapters of the thesis:

## A. Introduction

p. 1: What institution invented the ICEE?

p.4.I do not understand the standardized averaging: „The standardiyed averages of all the components should match for one base year at least“. A reader would benefit from clarification.

## B. Chapter 3

p. 7 Wrong citation of Mankiw (2012).

p. 8 Trade component measured by the value of exporter's production. How is the size of the country accounted for? Should it not be weighted for instance by the number of inhabitants? Would that be feasible? Would it improve the measure?

p. 11 \citep instead of \cite with all the citations.

p. 11 „artical“ instead of „article“

The chapter introduces components of the ICEE and highlights how it differs from the CDI. However, no overview table is provided. A table would give the reader a clearer idea what each index includes and how the two indices differ.

## Chapter 4

p. 18 „0,99“, instead of „0.99“

p. 20 „...more and more important then before.“ But the author means „than“.

p. 20 not „wellfare“ but „welfare“

A.2.1. and p. 28 contain the same text. The appendix does not bring much additional information.

Even though the intention and goal of the thesis is appreciated, given the drawbacks stated above and also in comparison with other bachelor thesis, I suggest **grade 3 (satisfactory)**.

# Report on Bachelor Thesis

Institute of Economic Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University in Prague

<b>Student:</b>	<b>Lucie Svitáková</b>
<b>Advisor:</b>	<b>Petr Janský, Ph.D.</b>
<b>Title of the thesis:</b>	<b>Measuring the Index of Constructive External Engagement: ICEE for the Czech Republic</b>

**SUMMARY OF POINTS AWARDED** (for details, see below):

<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
<i>Literature</i> (max. 20 points)	12
<i>Methods</i> (max. 30 points)	10
<i>Contribution</i> (max. 30 points)	15
<i>Manuscript Form</i> (max. 20 points)	13
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b> (max. 100 points)	<b>50</b>
<b>GRADE</b> (1 – 2 – 3 – 4)	<b>3</b>

**NAME OF THE REFEREE:** *Jana Votápková*

**DATE OF EVALUATION:** *May 29, 2015*

*Jana Votápková*

---

**Referee Signature**

### **EXPLANATION OF CATEGORIES AND SCALE:**

**LITERATURE REVIEW:** *The thesis demonstrates author's full understanding and command of recent literature. The author quotes relevant literature in a proper way.*

Strong                  Average                  Weak  
20                          10                          0

**METHODS:** *The tools used are relevant to the research question being investigated, and adequate to the author's level of studies. The thesis topic is comprehensively analyzed.*

Strong                  Average                  Weak  
30                          15                          0

**CONTRIBUTION:** *The author presents original ideas on the topic demonstrating critical thinking and ability to draw conclusions based on the knowledge of relevant theory and empirics. There is a distinct value added of the thesis.*

Strong                  Average                  Weak  
30                          15                          0

**MANUSCRIPT FORM:** *The thesis is well structured. The student uses appropriate language and style, including academic format for graphs and tables. The text effectively refers to graphs and tables and disposes with a complete bibliography.*

Strong                  Average                  Weak  
20                          10                          0

### **Overall grading:**

TOTAL POINTS	GRADE		
81 – 100	<b>1</b>	= excellent	= výborně
61 – 80	<b>2</b>	= good	= velmi dobře
41 – 60	<b>3</b>	= satisfactory	= dobře
0 – 40	<b>4</b>	= fail	= nedoporučuji k obhajobě