

KARLOVA UNIVERZITA V PRAZE
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut politologických studií

Master's Thesis Assessment

AUTHOR: *Kathryn Cozort*

TITLE OF THE THESIS: *Ancient blood,
modern vengeance:
the Impact of Traditional
Culture and Blood Feud on
Violence in Chechnya*

ASSESSED BY: *Mgr. Kamil Píkal*

ASSESSMENT TYPE: *opponent's assessment*

1. ASSESSMENT OF THE THESIS CONTENT

ASSESSMENT CATEGORIES	MARK
Relevancy of the topic in relation to the current scientific knowledge	1
Originality of the thesis, contribution to the science subject field	1
Integrity and scale of sources and literature relevant to the subject study	1
Ability for critical appraisal of the sources	1
Standards of working with sources	1
Methodology and its relevancy to the subject study and thesis goals	4
Logic of the thesis structure	2
Ability to argue, cohesion and coherence of the argument	2
Terminology in the relevant field	2
Adhesion to the citation norm	2
Language, stylistic and formal standard of the thesis	2

COMMENTARY: The author chose a very relevant topic that had not been researched enough. With quality and quantity of used sources and the appropriately critical approach the author chose towards them, there were optimal conditions for the author to create a paper that is not only original but also considerably contributing to many fields of study dealing with current Caucanus issues.

However, the author failed in taking opportunity of these advantages and created a text that actually is original, but might not receive the acceptance it should deserve due to serious insufficiencies in methodology, conceptualisation, argumentation and structure of the thesis.

The main problem of the thesis is a missing introduction. The chapter titled as introduction is rather an *avant-propos*. The introduction of a scholarly paper should (along with formulating a research question and research hypothesis) introduce a reader to the methodology, concepts and theories and sources the author chose, with an explanation of that choices. There should be also some outline of the text and explanation, why the text was structured in a chosen way. If such information is not included in the introduction, there should be a separate chapter immediately after the introduction explaining these choices.

There is similar (but lesser) problem with conclusion, where are no references to the theoretical and conceptual framework the author chose to operationalise. These references in both introduction and conclusion should be included, since the study is not fully empirical and do refer to various concepts (not so often to the theories) in the main body of the text.

Despite all these lacks and insufficiencies in the introduction and conclusion, the main body of the text is a carefully elaborated outcome of a good desk research that is in my opinion sufficiently thorough for the master level. Another positive aspect of the thesis is high stylistic standard the author adhered to.

Taking in consideration all the strong sides of the thesis, I strongly recommend that the thesis is accepted. However, since there were serious insufficiencies on formal and argumentative level, I cannot propose the highest mark.

2. QUESTIONS FOR THE DEFENSE

1. *What methodology did the author choose? Which concepts are operationalised in the thesis?*
2. *Are there some differences among the authors cited in the thesis in their approaches to the topic? Have some schools of writing about the topic developed? What are the matters of their disputes?*
3. *What knowledge and stereotypes did the Russian political and military elite have about the Chechen people? How this knowledge and stereotypes influenced their decisions during the Chechen Wars?*

3. SUGGESTED MARK: 2 (Very good)

Date: 25/05/2011

Signature: