

# Assessment of Master Thesis – Opponent



Study programme: **International Economic Relations**

Field of study: **International Business - Central European Business Realities**

Academic year: **2018/2019**

Master Thesis Topic: **UK's Economy after Brexit with Emphasis on Financial Industry**

Author's name: **Valentyn Pivnyk**

Ac. Consultant's Name: **doc. Ing. Josef Taušer, Ph.D.**

Opponent: **doc. Ing. Štěpán Müller, CSc., MBA**

	Criterion	Mark (1–4)
1.	Overall objective achievement	<b>3</b>
2.	Logical structure	<b>3</b>
3.	Using of literature, citations	<b>2</b>
4.	Adequacy of methods used	<b>3</b>
5.	Depth of analysis	<b>3</b>
6.	Self-reliance of author	<b>2</b>
7.	Formal requirements: text, graphs, tables	<b>3</b>
8.	Language and stylistics	<b>3</b>

## Comments and Questions:

There could hardly be in the International economic relations any current topic more interesting and important than the Brexit. The expectation has thus been very high. However, it needs to be said that the content of the thesis did not fully live up to the expectations.

The author presented his practical skills in the chapters, where he could lean on hard data, especially in Chapter 5. His expertise in analysing data presented in that chapter differ quite widely from the more theoretical chapters (Chapter 1 and 2). This part of the thesis is also very difficult to read due to very long and badly structured sentences. One example of that follows: „The indecisiveness of the prime minister has doubt her as Theresa Maybe by the economist online (The Economist, 2017) and the indecisiveness follows to this day, as a British expat with some of my income coming from the UK I am currently living and working in the Czech Republic, I have noticed a significant change in the lifestyle now, to what it was a few years, before the vote, when the pound was stronger and the economy was on the rise, this has changed, as the pound has fallen drastically, with noticeable change“ (page 16).

There are other signs of not enough attention being paid to the appearance of the thesis, especially in the Chapter 2, with inaccuracies such as “Robert Schouman”, not a correct use of abbreviations of ECSC, Euratom or establishment of EFTA. Quite irritating is also constant use of “Great British Pound”, instead of correct Great Britain Pound. Certain lack of attention to the correct appearance is demonstrated also by the fact that several times the author uses the expression “United Kingdom’s economy after Brexit, with „enthuses“ instead of corrent “emphasis” on the financial industries”, when mentioning the thesis’s title. Also Abstract looks more like another Introduction and the contents of the thesis is not very logically structured, as one would expect that Brexit negotiations (Chapter 3) would follow the analysis of the UK economy (Chapter 5). Literature Review (1.4) mainly explains the contents of chapters, does not present any literature and should not have been included in the thesis at all, it probably remained there as part of the diploma thesis project. Overall, while author demonstrates understanding of the financial sector and his ability to derive relevant conclusions, the work seems to be written in a haste, omitting some important issues, such as the Eurozone and the opt-out or promised explanation of Ukraine’s possible replacement of the UK in the EU.

This thesis is to a certain degree a missed opportunity to address some important arguments and/or questions of Brexit; however, generally it fulfils the requirements and therefore I propose that the thesis be defended before the appropriate state commission.

During the oral defence the author could answer the following questions: 1. How does he envisage the suggested replacement of the UK by Ukraine in the economy of the EU?  
2. What is his view on the Irish Backstop problem?

**Conclusion: The Master Thesis is recommended for the defence.**

Suggested Grade:     **3**

Date: 18/12/2018

**doc. Ing. Štěpán Müller, CSc., MBA**  
Opponent