

Supervisor's review for the thesis: Arianna Krasko: Responsibility and responsiveness in state governance. Case of Ukraine

In her thesis, Arianna Krasko addresses the question "What is the role and place of responsiveness and responsibility in the state governance?". The authoress concentrates on the role of institutions in decentralization of Ukraine. In her conclusion, she claims that closer cooperation between public and authorities may bring better results for governance. To a great extent, the categories as responsibility and responsiveness are hard to evaluate. This made the topic particularly hard to research.

In the first part, the thesis deals with the methodological and theoretical background. The authoress works with the theories of max Weber, Wilson etc. on the governance, which is appropriate for the selected topic. Their conclusions about the necessity of communication between different layers of administration and seem appropriate for testing. As the authoress nevertheless concludes, the case of Ukraine did not confirm claims about the role of responsiveness and responsibility.

The authoress presented a sound knowledge of literature concerning the theory of public administration and of responsibility and responsiveness. However, the theory could have been better built. The link between them is only outlined, but the connection does not seem strong. I would also appreciate clearer tie between the case of Ukrainian decentralization reform and the theoretical part. Furthermore, the author should avoid judging comments such as "The relations between central and regions were presented as the "good business", but against the well-being of the whole society." (p. 30) While I generally agree with this statement, it cannot serve as an analytical tool, because it decreases the strength of argumentation. Additionally, the list of references contains also page numbers, which is not typical for Harvard style of referencing.

The language side represents the biggest problem of this thesis. Despite my warnings that proofreading by the native speaker was absolutely essential, the thesis was not checked. As a result, numerous mistakes are present. Just to illustrate: The authoress claims that she will "testify" her hypotheses or she uses sentences like "Public administration theory does not focus on work activities of political elites no more" (p. 4) or "The use of an analysis is appropriate when we need to analyze the complex of reforms, which lead to changing or creation of government responsibility, or require the cooperation between different government actors." (p. 9) or "To implication of the methodology of institutional analysis to testify how it works in reality the case study has been chosen." (p. 25) This makes the whole thesis hard to read and sometimes even hard to understand and represents additional burden for the reader. This is regretful, because the authoress put a lot of effort into working on her thesis.

Generally, the authoress exhibited sound command of theories and methodologies, as well as good knowledge of literature about the topic. However, the presentation is brought down by the quality of language. As a result, mostly due to poor quality of the language of the thesis I propose the grade **good**.

Prague 15 June 2017

Karel Svoboda, Ph.D.