



## Master's Thesis Evaluation Form

Student's name: *Deniz Çelikoğlu*

Thesis title: *The Ambivalent Agency: Battered Women Who Kill in Turkey*

Name of the supervisor: *doc. Mgr. Martin Hájek, Ph.D.*

Name of the opponent: *Ema Hrešanová, Ph.D.*

What are the strengths and weaknesses of the thesis? Please give your reasons for the suggested grade in detail below.

1. *Does the author show understanding of one or more theories, and use theory to generate a hypothesis or to make the problem area more understandable.*

Comments: I find the theoretical part of the thesis very well written. The author seems to understand core theories and presents them accordingly with a substantial insight. Actually, I consider the theoretical chapter to be the best part of the whole thesis.

2. *Is the research question articulated clearly and properly? Is the research question sufficiently answered in the conclusion?*

Comments: The core research question is clearly defined. Moreover, there are seven particular research questions determined in the section 2.4. Most of the specific research questions are clearly related to the core research question and aim but I can't see such a clear association with the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> questions. This section on research questions concludes the theoretical chapter, which is confusing. It would make a much more sense in the methodological chapter.

3. *Is the thesis based on relevant research and literature and does it accurately summarize and integrate the information?*

Comments: The thesis has a clearly defined theoretical framework and builds on empirical qualitative research. Both parts are persuasively integrated, and the thesis presents a well formulated argument.

I see the only inconsistency in a missing relation between the intersectionality theory and the construction of a research sample.

4. *What is the quality of the data or the other sources? Are the sample method, data collection and data analysis appropriate?*

Comments: I found several methodological imperfections in the research design and the study.

First, the intersectionality theory does not translate into a research sample. There is missing information about participant class backgrounds (in the context of the Turkish society), and



there are no details about their place of residence (urban/rural) while all these categories emerge as crucial in previous chapters (1 and 2). I would also appreciate a more systematic information about the participants and their potential (if any) experience with gender-based violence and/or 'domestic violence', as this aspect turns to be important in the findings section.

I believe that the construction of a research sample could be designed more adequately to the research question and a research objective. With ten participants it is not really possible to "to capture the divergence in people's perception based on the socio-cultural position they occupy in society" and find out "how the position affects the perception" (p.19), especially if some crucial details about the socio-cultural position of participants are missing in the participant description. Moreover, the generalisations made about the participants' gender and class background is highly problematic with regard to the size of the research sample (p.55).

There is also a lot of confusion about the interview format in the thesis; the author mostly states that she conducted in depth interviews but on p. 36 she specifies that she "...used a structured questionnaire to ask each interviewee the same questions". I think the author shall clarify - with the use of proper sociological terminology - what research techniques she actually used, and assess the dis/advantages of both modes of interviewing (structured and in-depth interviews).

Regarding the methods of analysis, it is not entirely clear how the author arrived at the list of six dimensions she used for the interview analysis (p.38).

5. *Are the findings relevant to the research question? Are the conclusions of the thesis based on strong arguments?*

Comments: The thesis provides relevant answers to defined research questions, and presents a persuasive argument, which is supported by empirical evidence. The conclusions present clearly articulated arguments.

6. *Are the author's thoughts distinguished unambiguously from the borrowed ideas?*

Comments: The ideas are mostly paraphrased in an adequate way (an exception to be found on p. 12), and their sources and/or authors are clearly indicated.

7. *Is the thesis containing original/innovative research (in terms of topic, approach, and/or findings)?*

Comments: I find the work highly original in terms of the research subject and theoretical perspectives framing the overall research design. The work comes up with interesting findings and arguments. Unfortunately, methodological issues lower their overall relevance.

8. *What is the quality of style and other formal requirements?*

Comments: The thesis is well written. There are a usual number of typos (e.g. p. 12, 23, etc.). I came across several confusing and incorrect secondary quotations when the author cites a source and the quotation marks include the (original?) references while there is yet another



reference behind the quotation marks (e.g. p. 18, 36). An incorrect format of a reference on p. 17 is rather an exception.

9. *Are there any other strengths and weaknesses of the thesis, which are not included in the previous questions? Please list them if any.*

Comments: It is obvious that research participants were completely ignorant about the gender-based violence and domestic violence phenomenon (e.g. the vision of a 'strong woman' who w/could/ escape from an abusive relationship), and in what steps domestic violence actually evolves. I think this ignorance per se deserves to be highlighted even more in a conclusion section. The BWK serves as a point of departure to discuss broader social processes at play here, and the author does address these broader issues, which - I think - needs to be appreciated.

10. *What topic do you suggest for the discussion in the thesis defence?*

Comments: Please explicate key differences in the use and application of an interview guide for qualitative interviews and questionnaires in sociological research.

11. *Declaration that the supervisor has read the result of the originality check in the system: [ ] Theses [ ] Turnitin [ ] Original (Urkund)*

Supervisor's comment on the originality check result:

Overall assessment of the thesis:

*(Please, state clearly whether the thesis is or is not recommended for a defence and write the main reasons for the recommendation).*

Proposed grade: Given the methodological issues on one hand and the overall high quality of the text on the other (including its clear structure and line of reasoning), I suggest a grade **B**.

*(A- B: excellent, C-D: very good, E: good, F: fail)*

Date: 24/1/2022

Signature: