

## REVIEW OF THE BACHELOR'S THESIS EXTERNAL REVIEWER

Student's name: ANDREAS STAMATIADIS .....

Thesis title: WHEN AUSTERITY DIDN'T WORK: A CASE STUDY OF GREECE

Name of the thesis external reviewer: Jaromír Prokop .....

	1	2	3	4
<b>Assessment of the topic itself</b> (irrespectively of the student):				
1.1 To what extent is the topic current and significant?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2 How challenging is the topic in respect of theoretical knowledge?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3 How challenging it in respect of practical experience or fieldwork?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4 How difficult is it to get background materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### **Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:**

*Subsection 1.1: I consider the chosen topic as current and significant; the importance of the proper evaluation of the austerity measures implemented by Greece during the Eurozone sovereign debt crisis is crucial for the further political decisions.*

*Other (as appropriate): 1.2, 1.3, 1.4: I think that for author was challenging to choose the proper information and data from the previously issued discussion papers, analyses and data sources and also the fact to provide analyses without the "political influence".*

### **2. Evaluation of the thesis structure and logical cohesion:**

2.1 To what extent is the thesis structure logical and transparent?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.2 To what extent does the author use current / suitable sources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.3 How properly did the author select methods in respect of the topic?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.4 How sufficiently and functionally did the author use in the thesis original charts, tables, data, annexes, etc.?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.5 What is the compatibility level for the thesis basic line elements: topic – thesis assignment – objective – structure - conclusions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### **Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:**

*Subsection 2.1: The thesis structure can be considered as fully logical and transparent. It was easy to follow the main structure of work during the reading the thesis, the author added very appropriately also the summary of each chapter. Subsection 2.5: According to subsection 2.1 the mutual compatibility of the all main parts is sufficient and the particular parts are perfectly linked in the logical order.*

*Other (as appropriate):*

*Instructions for the review: Author of the review must provide verbal assessment for the specified subsections, which are pivotal for the thesis assessment, particularly for the defense; therefore, the assessment must have reasonable explanatory power.*

*Note: Classification method: 1 = exceptional, 2 = very good, 3 = good, 4 = failed.*

2.3. Author should use also the proper analytical methods for his analyses.

2.4 The presented charts and tables helped to introduce and understand the presented findings, even that author should highlight what were his own analyses.

---

**3. Assessment of the thesis text quality:**

- |  |                          |                                     |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 3.1 How well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author analyze the topic?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3.2 Did the author formulate the thesis objective clearly and with logical structure?                                      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3.3 Did the author fulfill the defined thesis objective and approved assignment of the thesis that contains the objective? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3.4 How well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author cover the theoretical part of the thesis?                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3.5 How well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author cover the practical / analytical part of the thesis?         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3.6 To what extent are the thesis conclusions logically structured and show quality, and what is their added value?        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:**

*Subsection 3.2: The author formulated the main objectives clearly, with the logical structure towards the overall content of the bachelor's thesis. But the author did not formulate the proper hypotheses.*

*Subsection 3.3: The author fulfilled the defined objectives in its entirety and quality. Unfortunately there were not mentioned properly the limitation of analyses and presented findings and possible areas for further analyses.*

*Subsection 3.4: The theoretical part is described and analyzed in the broad extent, detail and proficiency, it fully follows the given requirements and logical structure of this thesis, also the critical analysis of used theory is sufficiently mentioned.*

*Subsection 3.5: The practical part (evaluation of researched indicators) from the proper analytical point of view is stated in sufficient and detailed level and extent and properly applied. But author should use also the proper analytical methods for indicators evaluation.*

*Subsection 3.6: The thesis conclusions are logically structured and correspond to the stated aims and objectives.*

*Other (as appropriate):*

---

**4. Assessment of the thesis form and style:**

- |  |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 4.1 What is the formal layout of the thesis?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4.2 What is the quality of citations and references? Are sources identifiable?                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4.3 What is the stylistic level of the thesis, particularly the use of correct economic terminology? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:**

*Subsection 4.2: The quality of citations and references is very good and appropriately used in the thesis content, the sources are identifiable.*

*Other (as appropriate):*

*Instructions for the review: Author of the review must provide verbal assessment for the specified subsections, which are pivotal for the thesis assessment, particularly for the defense; therefore, the assessment must have reasonable explanatory power.*

*Note: Classification method: 1 = exceptional, 2 = very good, 3 = good, 4 = failed.*

**5. Overall assessment** *(It is necessary to state, whether the thesis meets the requirements of the Methodology of the Faculty of Economics in terms of the quality of contents, scope and formal requirements, whether the thesis is/is not recommended for defense. It may also be nominated for a special award, etc.):*

*Mr. Andreas Stamatiadis completed his bachelor thesis according to the given requirements of Methodology of the Faculty of Economics in terms of the quality of contents, and formal requirements. The presented theoretical (literature research) and practical evaluation of the austerity measures implemented by the Greek government and their effects to the Greek economy were properly introduced and analyzed. The practical part is well organized and system of presented findings helped to understand the presented conclusions. I can recommend using also the primary research and proper analytical methods for further studies.*

*This thesis is recommended to defense.*

**6. Questions and remarks to the defense:**

- 1. Which measure form the implemented austerity packages was most effective and why?*
- 2. Do you think that the VAT increase was proper decision for supporting the Greek economy?*
- 3. Do you think the Greece government should be more effective in the support the foreign investments in Greece?*

**Proposed grade: 2 – very good**

Date: 4. 9. 2016

.....  
Signature of the Thesis External Reviewer

<p><i>Instructions for the review: Author of the review must provide verbal assessment for the specified subsections, which are pivotal for the thesis assessment, particularly for the defense; therefore, the assessment must have reasonable explanatory power.</i></p> <p><i>Note: Classification method: 1 = exceptional, 2 = very good, 3 = good, 4 = failed.</i></p>
---