BACHELOR'S THESIS EXAMINER REPORT
PPE – Bachelor's in Politics, Philosophy and Economics
Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Thesis title:	**Analysis of Bilateral Cooperation Between Greece and the Balkans: Defense, Trade and Cultural Perspectives**
Student's name:	**Iordanis Bourbos**
Referee's name:	**Mgr. Martin Riegl, PhD.**

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Contribution and argument (quality of research and analysis, originality)	**50**	38
	Research question (definition of objectives, plausibility of hypotheses)	**15**	10
	Theoretical framework (methods relevant to the research question)	**15**	12
Total		*80*	60
Minor Criteria			
	Sources, literature	**10**	10
	Presentation (language, style, cohesion)	**5**	4
	Manuscript form (structure, logical coherence, layout, tables, figures)	**5**	4
Total		*20*	18
TOTAL		*100*	78

Plagiarism-check (URKUND) match score:
[NB:] If the plagiarism-check (URKUND) match score is above 15%, the reviewer has to include his/her assessment of the originality of the reviewed thesis in his/her review.

Reviewer's commentary according to the above criteria (min. 1800 characters including spaces when recommending a passing grade, min. 2500 characters including spaces when recommending a failing grade):

The submitted thesis has a clear and logical structure. The author starts with a discussion of sources, the methodological part also offers a conceptualization, research question (If Greece became a regional power in the Balkans, would it stabilize the region?), and hypotheses, although they are a bit lost in the text and reader has to identify himself. Here I would recommend visually linking RQ and hypotheses, so the reader can understand which hypothesis is linked to the main RQ and sub-RQ. The problem with the research design is that wording of RQ does not correspond to the original title, and the developed methodology does not allow the author to achieve the ambitions defined via RQ.
The methodology of the papers is clearly described (the author claims to use quantitative, which is in fact qualitative, and comparative method, but the method is there) as well as a

selection of three case studies. On the other side, the methodology rather corresponds to the title (analysis of relations), than future prospects of Greece´s role in the region.

In the empirical part, the author describes and analyses mutual relations among selected Balkan countries, then he moves Greece´s policy towards the Balkans, history of relations, and change of policy (strategic importance of the Balkans for Greece) under recent governments in Athens is explained. Then he offers an analysis of the bilateral relations between Greece and Albania, Kosovo and North Macedonia, and relations between Greece and external actors in the region, namely Russia, China, and Turkey.

I do appreciate the author´s selection of a topic, which given the latest geopolitical development, is crucial from the EU´s and NATO´s perspectives, and Greece, due to its geographic location, can play a decisive role.

From the formal point of view, the paper meets all criteria required by the Faculty of Social Sciences. There are no major problems, but some minor issues, e.g. misspellings, or graphic layout (e.g. Introduction starts on the last line of the page) occur in the paper.

To sum up, the paper offers a solid analysis (overview of relations), based on extensive primary and secondary resources, of Greece (and others) as a geopolitical player in the Balkan. The conclusion offers a clear answer to RQ, however, one does not find a concise answer to hypotheses presented in the introductory part, which is a drawback of the presented research. But most importantly, the conclusions presented rather reflect the author´s views than the research findings presented in the paper.

Proposed grade (C):

Suggested questions for the defence are:

I recommend the thesis for final defence.

_____
Referee Signature

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:

TOTAL POINTS	GRADE	Quality standard
91 – 100	A	= outstanding (high honor)
81 – 90	B	= superior (honor)
71 – 80	C	= good
61 – 70	D	= satisfactory
51 – 60	E	= low pass at a margin of failure
0 – 50	F	= failing. The thesis is not recommended for defence.