



Ústav světových dějin

## Master's Thesis Review

Student's name and surname: Stepanida Sashnikova

Title of the thesis: New Petrograd District in St. Petersburg: A Symbol of Modernity

Reviewer's name and surname: PhDr. Stanislav Tumis, M.A., Ph.D.

**1. Heuristic** (please, evaluate by grade 1, 2, 3, 4 – in case of grading 3 and 4 the reviewer is obliged formulate critical points)

1.1 Evaluation of the selection of literature and sources	1
1.2 Complexity of used sources from the perspective of the state of the art	1

Short evaluation:

The work is based on the representative sample of the secondary literature. I appreciate especially the wide sample of the theoretical literature developing the methodological framework of the discussion. The author properly uses also some primary sources (the then journals, archival materials etc.).

**2. Research problém and its solution** (please, evaluate by grade 1, 2, 3, 4 – in case of grading 3 and 4 the reviewer is obliged formulate critical points)

2.1 Choice of the formulation of the research issue respects the task given to the student	1
2.2 The relevance of the goal from the perspective of research area methodology	1

Short evaluation:

The author of the M.A. thesis discusses the wide spectrum of questions dealing with the theoretical and concrete problems concerning the phenomenon of the New Petrograd district in St. Petersburg.



Ústav světových dějin

**3. Thesis' structure evaluation** (please, evaluate by grade 1, 2, 3, 4 – in case of grading 3 and 4 the reviewer is obliged formulate critical points)

3.1 Is the structure of the thesis logical?	1
3.2 Does the thesis' structure work along the methodology and methods declared in the introduction	1

Short evaluation:

While the structure could be clearer (for example with the help of numeration of chapters) the author structures the work logically and her division of chapters and sub-chapters helps the reader to understand well the developing of her thoughts and methods.

**4. Text quality evaluation** (please, evaluate by grade 1, 2, 3, 4 – in case of grading 3 and 4 the reviewer is obliged formulate critical points)

4.1 Analysis of sources and literature	1
4.2 Interpretation of sources and literature in their interaction	1

Short evaluation:

The arguments of the author are well developed and the thoughts taken from secondary literature are convincingly discussed. Those theoretical works are well interconnected with using of primary sources. Possibly the author could divide the primary and secondary sources in the list of bibliography (in the end of thesis).

**5. Quality of the text** (please, evaluate by grade 1, 2, 3, 4 – in case of grading 3 and 4 the reviewer is obliged formulate critical points)

5.1 Style and grammar	1.5
5.2 Use of terminology	1

Short evaluation:

Despite some small inaccuracies in English (author is not native speaker) the thesis is written in good English with regard to grammar, stylistics, or terminology.



FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA  
UNIVERZITY KARLOVY  
V PRAZE



---

Ústav světových dějin

**6. Synthetic evaluation (500 signs):**

The author offers challenging comprehensive and interdisciplinary study of the urban development of *Petrogradskaya storona* dealing with urban processes of this district not only with emphasis on classification of particular types of buildings (architecture) but also on wide scale of another aspects of related problems such as geographical, social, political, anthropological, economic etc.). I appreciate highly her contribution to this complex problems and suggest excellent grade.

**7. Questions and comments which should the candidate answer and discuss during the defense:**

Will you continue the research of this topic in the future?

**Suggested grade: Excellent (1)**

**Date: 10/6/2016**

**Signature:**