REPORT ON THE MASTER THESIS

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

Title of the thesis:	Simplified decision-making or concealed strategy? A test of Peter Coleman's Attractor Landscape Model using a comparative case study of the Israel-Palestine peace process 2007-2011.
Author of the thesis:	**James Pepper**
Referee *(incl. titles)*:	**Michael Romancov, Ph.D.**

Remark: It is a standard at the FSV UK that the Referee's Report is at least 400 words. In case you will assess the thesis as "non-defendable", please explain the concrete reasons for that in detail.

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

1) Theoretical background:
Peter Coleman´s Attractor Landscape Model was described, evaluated and applied in a well arranged way, logically and convincingly.

2) Contribution:
Thesis supported use of the ALM in studies of intractable conflict and author´s argumentation was clear, dutiful and compelling.

3) Methods:
Submitted thesis is well, logically and systematically organized. Therefore, reader can easily and clearly follow author´s argumentation.

4) Literature:
List of literature and other sources of information is well organized, plentiful and correctly reflects topic of the thesis.

5) Manuscript form:
Completely convenient without any defects.

Box for the thesis supervisor only. Please characterize the progress in the working out of thesis (e.g. steady and gradual versus discontinuous and abrupt) and the level of communication/cooperation with the author:

I recommend the thesis for final defence. I recommend the following grade: "1" excellent

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

CATEGORY	POINTS
Theoretical background (max. 20)	20
Contribution (max. 20)	18
Methods (max. 20)	18
Literature (max. 20)	18
Manuscript form (max. 20)	20
TOTAL POINTS *(max. 100)*	**94**
The proposed grade (1-2-3-4)	**1**

You can use the decimal point (e.g. giving the grade of 2.4 for 61 points).

DATE OF EVALUATION: June 19th, 2017

                                         _____

                                               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? Has the author demonstrated a genuine **understanding** of the theories addressed?*

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 12 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**. (Remarks: 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. Any sort of **plagiarism** disqualifies the thesis from admission to defence.)*

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 the academic **format for quotations**, graphs and tables. The text effectively refers to graphs and tables, is easily readable and **stimulates thinking.** The text is free from typos and easy to comprehend.*

Strong   Average   Weak
20   10   0   points

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:

TOTAL POINTS	GRADE	Czech grading	US grading
81 – 100	1	= excellent	= A
61 – 80	2	= good	= B
51 – 60	3	= satisfactory	= C
41 – 50	3	= satisfactory at a margin of failure	= D a marginal passing grade
0 – 40	4	= failing is recommended	= non-defendable