

REPORT ON THE MASTER THESIS

IEPS – International Economic and Political Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Title of the thesis:	Assessment of Multinational Federalism in Bosnia and Herzegovina
Author of the thesis:	Ferhat Solar
Referee (incl. titles):	Doc. PhDr. Emil Souleimanov, Ph.D.

Remark: It is a standard at the FSV UK that the Referee's Report is at least 500 words long. In case you will assess the thesis as "non-defendable", please explain the concrete reasons for that in detail.

SUMMARY OF POINTS AWARDED (for details, see below):

CATEGORY	POINTS
<i>Theoretical background (max. 20)</i>	12
<i>Contribution (max. 20)</i>	6
<i>Methods (max. 20)</i>	0
<i>Literature (max. 20)</i>	13
<i>Manuscript form (max. 20)</i>	10
TOTAL POINTS (max. 100)	41
The proposed grade (1-2-3-4)	3 or 4

You can even use a decimal point (e.g. giving the grade of 2.5 for 60 points).

Comments of the referee on the thesis highlights and shortcomings (following the 5 numbered aspects of your assessment indicated below).

1) Theoretical background: The theoretical background is fairly developed, even though a considerably larger list of major authors and their work (*inter alia*, Alan Tarr, Robert Williams, John Loughlin, Michel Seymour, Rainer Bauböck, Alain Gagnon) could have been addressed in this section.

2) Contribution: One could hardly argue that the topic of (multi)federalism and related phenomena in post-war Bosnia and Herzegovina belong to under researched topics. In fact, the hypotheses raised by the author have been covered quite extensively by both local and Western authors; for instance Soeren Keil, Sumantra Bose, and others have published widely on these and related topics.

3) Methods: Notwithstanding my previous suggestions (and the fact that the lack of any methodological framework in the previous version of the thesis made me to give it a "A" [failed] mark last year), there still is no single mention of methods whatsoever used in the study.

4) Literature: See point 1)

5) Manuscript form: OK

All in all, I have to admit that only minor – and rather unimportant – changes have been made by the author following my critical feedback last year. Whilst the empirical and theoretical parts of the thesis deserve a satisfactory evaluation, ranging from C to D, the lack of any methodological part implies a worse grade (fail). If the author succeeds to give a clear explanation of the method(s) used by him throughout his thesis, I would suggest that a D is given to his thesis.

DATE OF EVALUATION: 20 June 2013

Referee Signature