

REPORT ON THE MASTER THESIS

IEPS – International Economic and Political Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Title of the thesis:	Responsibility and responsiveness in state governance. Case of Ukraine
Author of the thesis:	Arianna Krasko
Referee (incl. titles):	Mgr. Martin Riegl, PhD.

Remark: It is a standard at the FSV UK that the Referee's Report is at least 400 words. In case you will assess the thesis as "non-defendable", please explain the concrete reasons for that in detail.

Comments of the referee on the thesis highlights and shortcomings (following the 5 numbered aspects of your assessment indicated below).

1) Theoretical background:

The author has based her research within the framework of Public administration theory (associated with the name of Max Weber and many others) which is aiming at explaining broad range of aspects related to functions, design, functions, policies of public services and Governance theory which bridges the sub-system of public administration and key actors within the external environment. This theoretical part provides the author a solid theoretical basis and point of departure for her analytical part comprising the case study of Ukraine. On the other side a clear conceptualization of some basic terms like centralization, decentralization would be desirable for the empirical part of the paper. Limiting factor is that both above mentioned theories mainly fit to liberal-democratic system and not so much to the hybrid/mixed system in Ukraine.

2) Contribution:

Ms. Krasko has chosen a truly relevant and important topic for her diploma thesis research. The authors is trying to analyze the link responsibility, responsiveness and governance in Ukraine. The research questions is clearly formulated: „*What is the role and place of responsiveness and responsibility in the state governance?*“ The hypotheses (given the qualitative nature of author's research these are rather research questions) are twofold: „*1. Governance became more effective when cooperation between political institutions, political institutions and society was presented in the state. 2. Responsibility and responsiveness are guarantee of good governance.*“ The author comes to the conclusion that the Ukraine, although being still half of the way...at the central (state level) results are good (p. 42), which seems to be more than a subjective judgment rather than a statement based on solid grounds or supported by research in the field.

3) Methods:

The method is clearly explained (using the institutional analysis of governance structure), relevant to the research goal and consistently applied throughout the thesis. The author applies qualitative research and the case study research method.

4) Literature:

The author has collected a sufficient amount of literature, but some imperfections are obvious. I would recommend to avoid definitions (definition of management) borrowed from dictionaries and rather rely on academic sources. Secondly the format of a bibliography seems to be a bit disunited as some standard information is missing in particular entries.

5) Manuscript form:

The layout of the thesis would deserve some improvements. Also typos and grammar errors appears relatively often throughout thesis. The paper gives an impression that additional proofreading is needed and the quality of language might be improved. Also citation style differs from standards as the author placed the periods both before and after brackets. To sum up my review, the thesis fulfills formal criteria required by the Faculty, given my previous comments I do recommend to mark it as very good.

Box for the thesis supervisor only. Please characterize the progress in the working out of thesis (e.g. steady and gradual versus discontinuous and abrupt) and the level(intensity) of communication/cooperation with the author:

...

Suggested questions for the defence are:

„... ..“

I recommend the thesis for final defence. I recommend the following grade: “2” (very good).

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

CATEGORY	POINTS
<i>Theoretical background (max. 20)</i>	18
<i>Contribution (max. 20)</i>	15
<i>Methods (max. 20)</i>	18
<i>Literature (max. 20)</i>	15
<i>Manuscript form (max. 20)</i>	10
TOTAL POINTS (max. 100)	76
The proposed grade (1-2-3-4)	2

You can use the decimal point (e.g. giving the grade of 2.4 for 61 points).

DATE OF EVALUATION: 2.6.2017

Referee Signature

The referee should give comments to the following requirements:

1) THEORETICAL BACKGROUND: Can you recognize that the thesis was guided by some **theoretical fundamentals** relevant for this thesis topic? Were some important theoretical concepts **omitted**? Was the theory used in the thesis consistently **incorporated with the topic** and hypotheses tested? Has the author demonstrated a genuine **understanding** of the theories addressed?

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0 points

2) CONTRIBUTION: Evaluate if the author presents **original ideas** on the topic and aims at demonstrating **critical thinking** and ability to draw **conclusions** based on the knowledge of relevant theory and relevant empirical material. Is there a distinct **value added** of the thesis (relative to knowledge of a university-educated person interested in given topic)? Did the author explain **why** the observed phenomena occurred? Were the **policy implications** well founded?

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0 points

3) METHODS: Are the **hypotheses** for this study clearly stated, allowing their further **verification and testing**? Are the theoretical explanations, empirical material and **analytical tools** used in the thesis relevant to the research question being investigated, and adequate to the aspiration level of the study? Is the thesis **topic comprehensively analyzed** and does the thesis not make trivial or **irrelevant detours** off the main body stated in the thesis proposal? More than 12 points signal an exceptional work, **which requires your explanation "why" it is so**).

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0 points

4) LITERATURE REVIEW: The thesis demonstrates author's full understanding and **command of recent literature**. The author **quotes** relevant literature in a **proper way** and disposes with a **representative bibliography**. (Remarks: references to Wikipedia, websites and newspaper articles are a sign of **poor research**. If they dominate you cannot give more than 8 points. References to books published by prestigious publishers and articles in renowned journals give much better impression. Any sort of **plagiarism** disqualifies the thesis from admission to defence.)

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0 points

5) MANUSCRIPT FORM: The thesis is **clear and well structured**. The author uses appropriate **language and style**, including the academic **format for quotations**, graphs and tables. The text effectively refers to graphs and tables, is easily readable and **stimulates thinking**. The text is free from typos and easy to comprehend.

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0 points

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:

TOTAL POINTS	GRADE	Czech grading	US grading
81 – 100	1	= excellent	= A
61 – 80	2	= good	= B
51 – 60	3	= satisfactory	= C
41 – 50	3	= satisfactory at a margin of failure	= D a marginal passing grade
0 – 40	4	= failing is recommended	= non-defendable