

REPORT ON THE MASTER THESIS

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

Title of the thesis:	The Navajo Nation: The Consequences of Living Between Two Forms of Incomplete Governance
Author of the thesis:	Kristen Gressley
Referee (incl. titles):	Bohumil Doboš, Ph.D.

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

1) Theoretical background: The work is clearly rooted in Hirschman's theory that is well used throughout the thesis and applied to explain the studied issue. The theoretical background is well explained.

2) Contribution: Especially for our geographical space, the work presents a unique case of Navajo Nations and issues of US indigenous population. Drawn recommendations seem relevant and clearly based on the presented data and theoretical framework. They, nonetheless, might have been more extensive thus making the thesis less of a description.

3) Methods: The thesis is an in-depth single case study. The theory driven explanatory approach is well developed and utilized.

4) Literature: The literature used seems relevant and sufficient as it is mainly rooted in primary data sources.

5) Manuscript form: The thesis is well developed from language and formal point of view. There are minor issues with bibliography where "N/A" is handed to the sources that should have been marked by the institution that published them. A large issue is a completely missing conclusion which is a very big omission for the final thesis.

Box for the thesis supervisor only. The thesis was prepared continuously and consulted on several occasions. The student was able to reflect upon recommendations. Unfortunately, the final version was not consulted so the final proof-reading from the supervisor was not done.

Suggested questions for the defence are:

Do you see any policy changes towards Navajo administration that point towards improvement of the situation?

I recommend the thesis for final defence.

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

CATEGORY	POINTS
<i>Theoretical background (max. 20 points)</i>	20
<i>Contribution (max. 20 points)</i>	17
<i>Methods (max. 20 points)</i>	18
<i>Literature (max. 20 points)</i>	20
<i>Manuscript form (max. 20 points)</i>	10
TOTAL POINTS (max. 100 points)	85
The proposed grade (A-B-C-D-E-F)	B

DATE OF EVALUATION: 7.5.2021

Referee Signature

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:

TOTAL POINTS	GRADE	Quality standard
91 – 100	A	= outstanding (high honour)
81 – 90	B	= superior (honour)
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.