

REVIEW OF THE BACHELOR'S THESIS SUPERVISOR

Student's name: Viktoria Vaneeva.....

Thesis title: An Analysis of Contribution of the USA to the Economic Collapse of the Soviet
Union.....

Name of the thesis supervisor: Ing. Zdenka Johnson, Ph.D.....

	1	2	3	4
Assessment of the topic itself (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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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: The significance of American influence on the USSR collapse is a very difficult and controversial topic and for its complexity hasn't been researched enough. Today's United States of American and Russia belong to the leading economies in the world with complicated and maybe partially unresolved political relations. From my perspective, research in the selected topic is valuable historically and nowadays as well.

Other (as appropriate):

Subsection 1.2: The author must understand and be able to evaluate many different factors that influenced economic and political development of the USSR in the 1980s, not only domestic, but especially foreign ones. Analysis within the topic thus is very challenging.

Subsection 1.3: Fieldwork (archival research) might be useful but it is not requested within the bachelor theses research.

Subsection 1.4: Reliable background materials especially of Soviet/Russian origin might be harder to obtain. On the other hand, the author is a native speaker of Russian language so she can make more use of Russian resources.

2. Evaluation of the thesis structure and logical cohesion:

2.1 To what extent is the thesis structure logical and transparent?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.2 To what extent does the author use current / suitable sources?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.3 How properly did the author select methods in respect of the topic?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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.

2.5 What is the compatibility level for the thesis basic line elements:

topic – thesis assignment – objective – structure - conclusions?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:

Subsection 2.1: Structure of the thesis is logical and transparent, the author decided to describe and analyze major internal (especially economic) factors affecting the USSR collapse, later she tried to find decisive external factors. The last chapter evaluates and compares both groups, striving to assess what the role of the US within the collapse was. I consider this research process as understandable and in the line with the topic and research questions.

Subsection 2.5: Individual elements of the thesis are compatible with each other.

Other (as appropriate):

Subsection 2.2: I do not have any objections against the resources used; I particularly appreciate the use of Soviet/Russian publications and statistical resources.

Subsection 2.3: The methods used are appropriate with the topic and research process. The author properly introduced them in the introduction section.

Subsection 2.4: The work is highly analytical, which the list of figures (29) and tables (12), not including appendices, confirms. The figures and tables, produced by the author, illustrate the text and provide support for analytical conclusions of the author throughout the thesis. They mostly present data taken from other resources.

3. Assessment of the thesis text quality:

3.1 How well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author analyze the topic?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

3.2 Did the author formulate the thesis objective clearly and with logical structure?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:

Subsection 3.2: The thesis objective – tested hypotheses and individual research questions – are introduced in the introduction; it is clear and logical.

Subsection 3.3: According to my opinion, the thesis goals as defined were achieved (within the borders provided by the bachelor thesis).

Subsection 3.4: The theoretical and analytical parts are interconnected and it is quite hard to distinguish between them. It is not a flaw of the thesis, it is standard for many historical-economic papers.

Subsection 3.5: As already mentioned, the work is highly analytical. I really appreciate that the author tried to assess such a complicated topic from broader point of view. So she analyzes and assesses the influence of economic development and economic experiments in the USSR per se, then she describes relations between the USSR and the US which determined the stand of

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.

the US. Author rightly paid a special attention not only to various impacts of famous Strategic Defense Initiative or War in Afghanistan, even more she focused on American effect on the price of oil or ban on high technology imports. I think she covered the decisive factors of the USSR collapse.

Subsection 3.6: In my opinion, the thesis confirms the most known conclusions about the selected topic. Even though, the work itself has its own value mirrored in the original analysis and synthesis of American and Russian resources.

Other (as appropriate):

Subsection 3.1: The topic was deeply researched and analyzed considering that it is a bachelor thesis and the topic is very wide. The author picked out the most important factors making a difference in the particularly economic development of the USSR thus causing the collapse of the Soviet economy. The analysis is selective and some can even say unobjective but I think it is fair and reasonable.

4. Assessment of the thesis form and style:

- | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 4.1 What is the formal layout of the thesis? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4.2 What is the quality of citations and references? Are sources identifiable? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:

Subsection 4.2: Formal layout of the thesis is very good. Author was very thorough.

Other (as appropriate):

Subsection 4.1: Citations and references are of a high quality; the resources are identifiable.

Subsection 4.3: Considering that the work is a bachelor thesis and author is not a native English language speaker, the stylistic and language level is excellent.

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.):*

This Bachelor Thesis complies with the content and formal requirements for this type of qualification works imposed by the Methodology for Writing Bachelor and Diploma Theses at the Faculty of Economics of the University of Economics in Prague.

I recommend the bachelor thesis for defense before the relevant examining board.

6. Questions and remarks to the defense:

1. How do current Russian authors evaluate the role of the United States in the USSR collapse? Is there any difference compared to the 1990s?
2. Is today's Russia as dependent on oil exports as she was in the 1980s?

Proposed grade: Excellent

Date: June 2nd, 2017

.....
Signature of the Thesis Supervisor

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.