

## REPORT ON THE MASTER THESIS

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

<b>Title of the thesis:</b>	<b>Participation and role of the EU in resolving the conflict in Nagorno-Karabakh</b>
<b>Author of the thesis:</b>	<b>Ahmad Hasanov</b>
<b>Referee (incl. titles):</b>	<b>PhDr. Kateřina Bocianová, Ph.D.</b>

**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):

<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
<i>Theoretical background (max. 20)</i>	8
<i>Contribution (max. 20)</i>	10
<i>Methods (max. 20)</i>	10
<i>Literature (max. 20)</i>	18
<i>Manuscript form (max. 20)</i>	13
<b>TOTAL POINTS (max. 100)</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>The proposed grade (1-2-3-4)</b>	<b>3</b>

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 author tries to work with the theoretical background (he mentions in his Master's Thesis Proposal Institutional realism), but he does not explain why he has decided to apply this approach nor he explains sufficiently this theoretical approach. Instead he concentrates mostly on description (see Contents).

**2) Contribution:** The author explains in detail complexity of conflict in Nagorno- Karabakh from the historical background until current political and security situation. He describes positions of various actors involved in the conflict. He defines hypotheses with the aim to confirm or disprove them. However, the author does not present any original idea or facts that are not known. Moreover, the title of the thesis is "participation and role of the European Union", but in the thesis this part is very brief and not sufficiently explained (only 3 pages in one chapter). On the other hand positive fact is deep and detailed knowledge about the problem.

**3) Methods:** Methodology is clearly stated as well as the hypotheses but they are not defined in any theoretical framework.

**4) Literature:** The author quotes relevant and recent literature which shows that the author has good knowledge of the literature concerning the topic. On the other hand, Bibliography is not in an alphabetical order.

**5) Manuscript form:** The thesis is clear and well structured, the author uses appropriate language (but sometimes he repeats some formulations) and the thesis has proper academic format. However, the thesis has only 68 pages together with the Master's Thesis proposal and with Bibliography.

**DATE OF EVALUATION: 8.9. 2014**

---

***Referee Signature***

**The referee should give comments to the following requirements:**

**1) THEORETICAL BACKGROUND:** Can you recognize that the thesis was guided by some **theoretical fundamentals** relevant for this thesis topic? Were some important theoretical concepts omitted? Was the theory used in the thesis consistently incorporated with the topic and hypotheses tested?

Strong                      Average                      Weak  
20                              10                              0                      points

**2) CONTRIBUTION:** Evaluate if the author presents **original ideas** on the topic and aims at demonstrating **critical thinking** and ability to draw conclusions based on the knowledge of relevant theory and relevant empirical material. Is there a distinct **value added** of the thesis (relative to knowledge of a university-educated person interested in given topic)? Did the author explain **why** the observed phenomena occurred? Were the policy implications well founded?

Strong                      Average                      Weak  
20                              10                              0                      points

**3) METHODS:** Are the **hypotheses** for this study clearly stated, allowing their further verification and testing? Are the theoretical explanations, empirical material and **analytical tools** used in the thesis relevant to the research question being investigated, and adequate to the aspiration level of the study? Is the thesis **topic comprehensively analyzed** and does the thesis not make trivial or irrelevant detours off the main body stated in the thesis proposal? More than 10 points signal an exceptional work, **which requires your explanation "why" it is so**.

Strong                      Average                      Weak  
20                              10                              0                      points

**4) LITERATURE REVIEW:** The thesis demonstrates author's full understanding and **command of recent literature**. The author quotes relevant literature in a proper way and disposes with a representative bibliography. (Remark: references to Wikipedia, websites and newspaper articles are a sign of **poor research**). If they dominate you cannot give more than 8 points. References to books published by prestigious publishers and articles in renowned journals give much better impression.

Strong                      Average                      Weak  
20                              10                              0                      points

**5) MANUSCRIPT FORM:** The thesis is **clear and well structured**. The author uses appropriate language and style, including academic **format** for quotations, graphs and tables. The text effectively refers to graphs and tables, is easily readable and **stimulates thinking**.

Strong                      Average                      Weak  
20                              10                              0                      points

**Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:**

TOTAL POINTS	GRADE	Czech grading	US grading
81 – 100	<b>1</b>	= excellent	= A
61 – 80	<b>2</b>	= good	= B
51 – 60	<b>3</b>	= satisfactory	= C
41 – 50	<b>3</b>	= satisfactory	= D
0 – 40	<b>4</b>	= fail	= not recommended for defence