



## Diploma Thesis Evaluation Form

Author: Mikhail Mkrtchyan

Title: The Russian Federation in front of the 21st century  
security challenges: cooperation or confrontation

Programme/year: MISS/202

Author of Evaluation (supervisor/external assessor):

Ing. Bc. Luděk Michálek, Ph.D.

| Criteria              | Definition                                     | Maximum    | Points |
|-----------------------|--|------------|--------|
| <b>Major Criteria</b> |  |            |        |
|                       | Research question,<br>definition of objectives | <b>10</b>  | 6      |
|                       | Theoretical/conceptua<br>l framework           | <b>30</b>  | 19     |
|                       | Methodology, analysis,<br>argument             | <b>40</b>  | 22     |
| <i>Total</i>          |  | <b>80</b>  |        |
| <b>Minor Criteria</b> |  |            |        |
|                       | Sources  | <b>10</b>  | 6      |
|                       | Style  | <b>5</b>   | 3      |
|                       | Formal requirements                            | <b>5</b>   | 3      |
| <i>Total</i>          |  | <b>20</b>  |        |
| <b>TOTAL</b>          |  | <b>100</b> | 59     |



## Evaluation

- Major criteria: Research question (just one) in not very precisely defined and immediately simply answered – author is setting up in advance his opinion on it, although at the end of the thesis is answered and analysed in more details.  
Theoretical / conceptual framework is developed on the more practical than theoretical level (Cold War 2.0 chapter). In addition, main issues further discussed should be structured and summarized more precisely at the end of this theoretical part.  
From the overall perspective the work looks more like relatively complex description of the partial topics in the form of compilation of the pieces of the ideas of other authors with only very little added value by the author of the thesis.  
From the perspective of originality, many parts of the paper suffers from deficiencies coming from referencing. Although these parts of text are sourced, they are not properly marked as direct quotations or paraphrases.
- Minor criteria: From the perspective of minor criteria, there are relatively many formal mistakes identified in this work – e.g. footnotes, form of bibliographic records, and form of list of references.
- Overall evaluation: On the first look the work looks relatively structured and complex but there are identified following problematic issues: not very well structured theoretical framework, work is more descriptive / compiled than analytical and mainly there is too high level of similarities with other texts (although more or less properly linked). Overall evaluation is that this work is fulfilling the minimum criteria for the Diploma Thesis.
- Suggested grade: E (59 points)

Signature: