

IMESS DISSERTATION



Note: Please email the completed mark sheet to Year 2 coordinator

(cc Julia Korosteleva j.korosteleva@ucl.ac.uk and Marta Kotwas m.kotwas@ucl.ac.uk)

Please note that IMESS students are not required to use a particular set of methods (e.g. qualitative, quantitative, or comparative) in their dissertation.

Student:	Miroslava Masarikova
Dissertation title:	

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Poor
Knowledge <i>Knowledge of problems involved, e.g. historical and social context, specialist literature on the topic. Evidence of capacity to gather information through a wide and appropriate range of reading, and to digest and process knowledge.</i>			x
Analysis & Interpretation <i>Demonstrates a clear grasp of concepts. Application of appropriate methodology and understanding; willingness to apply an independent approach or interpretation recognition of alternative interpretations; Use of precise terminology and avoidance of ambiguity; avoidance of excessive generalisations or gross oversimplifications.</i>	x		
Structure & Argument <i>Demonstrates ability to structure work with clarity, relevance and coherence. Ability to argue a case; clear evidence of analysis and logical thought; recognition of an arguments limitation or alternative views; Ability to use other evidence to support arguments and structure appropriately.</i>		x	
Presentation & Documentation <i>Accurate and consistently presented footnotes and bibliographic references; accuracy of grammar and spelling; correct and clear presentation of charts/graphs/tables or other data. Appropriate and correct referencing throughout. Correct and contextually correct handling of quotations.</i>		x	

ECTS Mark:	D	UCL Mark:	58	Marker:	Karel Svoboda
<i>Deducted for late submission:</i>				Signed:	
<i>Deducted for inadequate referencing:</i>				Date:	

MARKING GUIDELINES

A (UCL mark 70+): Note: marks of over 80 are given rarely and only for truly exceptional pieces of work.

Distinctively sophisticated and focused analysis, critical use of sources and insightful interpretation. Comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research.

B/C (UCL mark 60-69):

A high level of analysis, critical use of sources and insightful interpretation. Good understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research. 65 or over equates to a B grade.

D/E (UCL mark 50-59):

Demonstration of a critical use of sources and ability to engage in systematic inquiry. An ability to engage in sustained research work, demonstrating methodological awareness. 55 or over equates to a D grade.

F (UCL mark less than 50):

Demonstrates failure to use sources and an inadequate ability to engage in systematic inquiry. Inadequate evidence of ability to engage in sustained research work and poor understanding of appropriate research techniques.

CONTINUES OVERLEAF

Comments, explaining strengths and weaknesses (*at least 300 words*):

The author is not a historian, which is obvious from the first sight. The author speaks about the Soviet Union and the Soviet Bloc as about one entity, which it was not. Instead of "Soviet banks" in the case of the Czechoslovak, Polish or Hungarian, the author should have used the term "Soviet type banks" etc. Furthermore, states such as Hungary or Poland were by no means "newly formed" (p. 22) etc. Despite the fact that this confusion does not impact the analysis itself, it represents a serious mistake in the knowledge of the environment of the transformation. It also puts the whole initial part into chaos (analyzing what Mikhail Gorbachev did has only limited, if any value for analyzing a situation in the Eastern Central Europe). This is more than regretful, as it could have been avoided quite easily, by using more proper literature than Lieberman. Gros, Steinherr or Myant, Drahokoupil for instance deal more deeply with the Central Europe...

Due to this confusion, the first part that sets the environment is just of limited use for the thesis, as it in most parts speaks about the situation in the Soviet Union, which radically differed from the situation in Central Europe. CE countries did not retain ruble, as they had never had it etc.

Leaving aside the introduction, the author exhibits sound knowledge of methods. The conclusions are presented persuasively. Nevertheless, some of them may sound surprising. Namely, the statement, that prohibiting banks from pursuing none-core businesses represents a negative factor in their stability (58) goes against rationale of the banking regulation.

In the structure part, the whole thesis is divided into two parts. This would not be a problem if it did not touch even parts such as literature review or methodology. I would strongly suggest putting them together, as the structure used in the thesis lacks coherence. The literature review does not explain the place of the thesis in current research, but provides additional narration to the problem. I would also prefer structuring according to the banking sector developments. As author notes (p. 39), banks in the area underwent reforms around 2000. These reforms changed the environment, where the banks operated. However, author does not regard 2000 as a breakpoint and the whole period ranges from 1995-2004.

From the formal side, the author uses the work "Masarikova, 2016. Is there a need for tighter state regulations to improve the stability of the financial sector?" which is probably her previous work on the topic. However, she leaves no information about the place of publication etc. Also the reference to "White, W.R., 2006. Is price stability enough?." is not full.

It is hard for me to evaluate this thesis, I must say. The author obviously mixes the Soviet Union and the Soviet Bloc, which is impossible to accept. Without this mistake, which I find a serious one, the thesis itself would be very good.

Specific questions you would like addressing at the oral defence (*at least 2 questions*):

Did you consider any other periodization for your thesis? (not the 1995-2004 etc.)

The period of 1993-95 in the Czech Republic and Slovakia is somehow left aside. How would you compare development in these two countries?