

BACHELOR THESIS EVALUATION: THESIS OPPONENT

Thesis topic: The impact of Multinational Corporations on Human Rights Abuse in Developing Countries

Author: Michaela Marcinová

Advisor: Sylvia Tiryaki

Opponent: Dagmar Kusá

Study program: Political Science, Liberal Arts

Evaluation contains objective and critical analysis of a bachelor thesis proposal. Evaluation should be considered by the following criteria:

Criteria for the evaluation of the final thesis	Max. points	Points given by evaluator
1. Methodological aspect (Logical frame, process of inquiry, topic specification, how realistic are set goals and how adequate are proposed working methods)	10	7
2. Sources of domestic and foreign literature, familiarity with relevant literature	15	12
3. Formatting and style	15	14
4. Scope and proportionality of content	5	5
5. Systematic approach	15	10
6. Evaluation of achieved results	40	35
Total	100	83

Final evaluation: A (95-100 points), B (83-94 points), C (68-82 points), D (55-67 points), E (50-54 points), Fx (<50 points)

Evaluation, comments, recommendations:

Methodologically speaking, one interview is not sufficient to establish the expertise on the subject of MNCs, merely an opinion of one individual. It would have been useful, if Michaela used the additional months for research and writing of the thesis to conduct more interviews of the sort. One interview can serve for illustration, but not as the basis for a separate chapter. That simply is not enough verifiable data to enable that. Also, since the interview is on a case not mentioned before, it gets quite confusing as to what is going on and why.

Theoretical framework is confusing in parts, for example J. Nye's theory of the impact of MNCs on international order is divided into three points, but those are left unexplained. Same is done with the second presented source, J. Wouters. Then there is a chapter on theory, which focuses on the concept of sovereignty, although it is not clear to the reader why – as we are missing a hypothesis that would prepare the reader for the argument of the paper.

Nye's work is returned to later (ch. 5.1., 5.2.) and Wouters (6.1-6.3), where the reference to the text is part of the subtitle, and it is not clear whether what follows is a summary of that text, its application, or something else entirely, as that is not sufficiently explained.

The text has several typos and formatting and frequent referencing mistakes, which could have been really easily avoided with in the editing process. References do not include initials, year is stated first, page number after. There is a space between "p." and the page number. References in bibliography

should not be capitalized—neither the first words, nor, certainly, the entire titles. Most references are thus not correct, which is a truly unnecessary flaw. This is an official publication, these things matter.

The thesis is building on clear cases (though the addition of Cambodia was confusing) substantiated by sufficient evidence, which works in the thesis' favor. It is a pity that the structure and integration of sources is confusing at times, which makes the overall argument difficult to follow and the reader often has to guess as to how individual parts are coming together. With more work on the structure and clarity of the text, the argument could have come across much stronger. There is a wealth of resources used, but the reader has to do a lot of work to grasp the arguments and keep track of them.

Questions for the author (relevant to the content of the Thesis):

1. **The cases detail the conduct of MNCs and their impact on environment and human rights. The thesis does not tell us the “big story” behind these case studies and behind the problem of MNCs as such – what is that big story? What are we witnessing on the example of these cases? What kinds of changes or problems in global society?**
2. **What is the hypothesis of this work? Is it that MNCs are dominant in the low-income countries? Or that they violate human rights? Or that the problem is their legal standing? The lack of normative framework? Many things are mentioned, but the reader is kept guessing as to where the argument is headed, which makes it difficult to follow at times. Hypothesis should map the argument and essentially outline the thesis, so that each following chapter is a part of the clear line of argumentation stated in the hypothesis. Please formulate such hypothesis for this publication.**
3. **It is not clear how was the interviewee related to the MNC in Cambodia? From what position is he or she assessing the impact? Is the interviewee an expert in this area or a lay observer? Would the insiders have different perceptions? Is the case in Cambodia in any way related to the cases described before?**
4. **The conclusion states a different approach to protecting human rights from MNCs is needed. That is a rather vague conclusion after detailed case studies. What should be the main changes, or at least main priorities in changing the current laws?**

In Bratislava, on: 20.1.2022 (date)

Signature of evaluator: _____

