

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

Thesis title:	Analysis of the Effects of Sri Lankan 1977 External Economic Liberalization Policy on Foreign Direct Investment
Student's name:	Senya Tennakoon
Referee's name:	Doc. Ing. Vladimír Benáček, CSc.

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Contribution and argument (quality of research and analysis, originality)	50	29
	Research question (definition of objectives, plausibility of hypotheses)	15	10
	Theoretical framework (methods relevant to the research question)	15	4
Total		80	43
Minor Criteria			
	Sources, literature	10	5
	Presentation (language, style, cohesion)	5	2
	Manuscript form (structure, logical coherence, layout, tables, figures)	5	2
Total		20	9
TOTAL		100	52

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):

I am sorry to start with the general impression of the thesis. There are weak theoretical foundations. The thesis bears symptoms of a makeshift research where the literature and data are stale and much of the academic work looks like it would be taken from the searches in Google Scholar (i.e. an ad hoc selection). I must appreciate, however, the endeavour to quantify the analysis by some technique – in this case, the mastering of the SCM model, whatever controversial was its implementation. This model added 10 points to the above criterion "Contribution" and made me make this thesis defensible.

Some further comments:

The thesis deals with the effects of economic liberalization policies launched in Sri Lanka in 1977 where the incoming FDI was tested for its role in economic growth. Unfortunately until only 1990.

Chapter 2 on the history of Sri Lankan liberalisation policies is an extensive standard description with little own contribution.

Chapter 3 "Literature review" continues, surprisingly, in the same narrative style mentioning policies but not mentioning any literature resource on its first six pages! I cannot consider this a good research.

The whole section 3.1 (pp. 8-18) with an encyclopedic summary of the history of economic policies could have been shorter and with added own theoretical assessments of the author.

Surprisingly, the literature references are generally stale. E.g. referring to Froot, 1993, as to the representative author on FDI - you somehow omit the contributions of authors in the more recent years. Searching through the References, the dominant titles are more than 10 or even 20 years old.

The main references, which are related to the specification of the model, i.e. UNCTAD (2002) and UNCTAD (2018), are not even included in the literature. By referring to the table from UNCTAD, the author thus simplified her role in specifying the model.

On p. 25 there is a reference to "the below graph" which has no number and is not to be found there. Most probably it is the figure stranded on p. 27.

In specifying the model, references to the theories of trade and FDI are rather rare. The author prefers picking up the variables from various papers where they proved to be statistically significant.

Data in Figure 1 and 2 end in 1990. Was there no data on FDI for the next 30 years?

Table 2 on p. 29 (enlisting three allegedly crucial explanatory variables) comes there out of blue, missing any serious explanation.

It is an academic standard to add to each table or graph some legend indicating what the content is about. Why was it not also your standard? The "reading" of your tables 5-7 and figures 3-5 was very reader-unfriendly.

The section on the "Soviet blocks" (p. 49) confuses the impact of the fall of communism on Sri Lanka with the effect of globalisation.

Mentioning the Flying Geese on p. 49 had hardly any importance to your quantitative testing or conclusions.

Proposed grade (A-B-C-D-E-F): E

Suggested questions for the defence are:

Please specify the technique for selecting countries in Table 3. Why was there included Thailand and e.g. not Malaysia or Laos? Why did you select Niger (as an absolute trade outsider) and not e.g. Namibia? This selection is of crucial importance. Why Cameroon and Nigeria behave differently from others in Figure 6? And Burkina Faso and Gambia in Table 7?

Why did you select the time period 1970-90 for your testing, while disregarding the period 1991-2020 (see p. 40) when FDI functioned at its full strength?

I recommend the thesis for final defence (though at a margin).



Referee Signature