

University of Economics, Prague

Faculty of Finance and Accounting

Study programme "Finance and Accounting"

Master Thesis Evaluation

Reviewer form

Student name: Bc. Denisa Vlčková

Title of the thesis: *Eurozone debt crisis*

Year of the defence: 2019

Supervisor name doc. Ing. Karel Brůna, Ph.D. (Department of Monetary Theory and

and affiliation: Policy; Department Chair - Associate Professor)

Reviewer name Ing. Ondřej Šíma (Department of Monetary Theory and Policy;

and affiliation: Assistant Instructor)

THESIS CONTENT SUMMARY:

The author divided the thesis into seven chapters. The first chapter is the introductory part of the whole text. The second, theoretically focused chapter, is devoted to the definition and the various "types" of financial crises, including their models, causes and expansion. At the end of the second chapter, Denisa Vlčková presents examples of crises from Mexico, Russia and Japan.

The third chapter describes the causes of the euro area debt crisis, specifically in the PIIGS countries (Portugal, Ireland, Italy, Greece and Spain). The fourth chapter focuses on the course of the crisis in these countries. The fifth chapter briefly comments the impact of the crisis on the euro area economy. The sixth chapter contains a brief summary of the whole thesis and in the seventh chapter the author presents the references.

The aim of the thesis "The main objective of this work is to identify the causes of the crisis in individual PIIGS countries." (p. 8) was fulfilled.

OBJECTIONS AND REMARKS:

On the one hand, the author offers a well-prepared diploma thesis, which has an excellent chapter structure. Moreover, the eurozone crisis is very topical and popular even nowadays, although we have been informed about it almost continuously for the last ten years. From the point of view of the Czech Republic, this topic will be even more current with the approaching integration into the euro area.

On the other hand, the author should have added a subchapter on the specifics of the crisis (or macroeconomic imbalances in general) within the monetary union, i.e. the theory of optimal currency areas and ways of establishing an external balance for the members of the area in the second chapter. The question is how the PIIGS countries have substituted for the absence of monetary policy (let us compare the monetary policy steps of Mexico and Russia during the crisis, pages 23 and 24). The third and fourth chapters should have offered fewer descriptive parts and more insight into the issue. The author should have used more her own tables and graphs and not just print-screens (at least in some cases).

Despite the above-mentioned shortcomings, I consider this thesis to be suitable for defense. At the end of my review I propose an evaluation of this thesis.

QUESTIONS FOR THE DEFENCE:

- 1) On page 15, you mention the so-called "debt treshold". Do you think its value is stable over time and is the same for all the world's economies?
- 2) On page 20, you state that one of the causes of the crisis may also be the so-called "market failure". Are there also so-called "state (government) failures"? If so, describe them briefly.
- 3) Explain in short what is the so-called "theory of optimal currency areas".
- 4) On the front page of the Financial Times of June 7, 2019, there is the headline "Draghi lines up fresh stimulus as a parting shot at boosting eurozone". It is another of the (non)conventional measures that the ECB and its chief, M. Draghi, try supporting the euro area economy. Why, despite such a degree of monetary policy easing, is there no more robust growth in the economy of this monetary union? There is no need to find out the details of each step of monetary policy or to deal with technical details. Rather, focus on the effectiveness of monetary policy in terms of short-run and long-run and the (im)possibility of influencing the supply side of the economy.

ASSESSMENT:				
Criterion	Excellent	Very good	Good	Insufficient
Aim formulation and fulfilment			Х	
Work with literature		х		
Methods and data used			Х	
Results and their discussion		Х		
Formal aspects		Х		
Suggested overall grading: 2 - Very good / 3 - Good				

	Signature		
Prague, 7 th June 2019	Ing. Ondřej Šíma		