

MASTER'S THESIS EXAMINER REPORT

IEPS – International Economic and Political Studies

Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Thesis title:	Kurdistan Regional Government: Internal Political Conflict as Factors of Failed Referendum of Independence
Student's name:	Nuha Hussein
Referee's name:	Martin Riegl

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Contribution and argument (quality of research and analysis, originality)	50	40
	Research question (definition of objectives, plausibility of hypotheses)	15	15
	Theoretical framework (methods relevant to the research question)	15	15
Total		80	70
Minor Criteria			
	Sources, literature	10	5
	Presentation (language, style, cohesion)	5	4
	Manuscript form (structure, logical coherence, layout, tables, figures)	5	4
Total		20	13
TOTAL		100	83

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):

Author's goal is to analyze internal political conflicts within KRG (mostly between two rival factions, one based on Erbil, and the second in Souleymaniah), and how these internal splits hindered the Region's quest for independence deserves to be appraised. The author provides a systemic attempt to achieve defined goals, her research design is based on rather solid theoretical and methodological grounds. Also, Nuha proves to know about the topic throughout the paper. She further clearly demonstrates her familiarity with some key theoretical works in the field of de facto studies, such as N.Caspersen among others.

The historical overview provides a solid point of departure, but to be true it clearly follows the structure of the chapter published in Springer 2017 (Dr. Doboš and me being co-authors), but the author is not trying to hide this from us. But it only points at rather limited Nuha's analytical input in

the paper, although technically it's very solid work, and the author declares this is the case of qualitative descriptive research. There are formal issues in the paper, that committee needs to discuss. First of all, the author often quotes N. Caspersen for example but cites me and Dr. Doboš (in fact it's Caspersen's chapter published in the monograph edited by Riegl, Doboš), p. 7. Another problem is direct quotations where Nuha refers to the source without citing a concrete page, see p. 9, 18, 22...(Esposti, Fumerton & van Wilgenburg, Gunter...)

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

Suggested questions for the defence are:

I (do not) 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.