



Diploma Thesis Evaluation Form

Author: Natalia Cmunť Secaf Massita

Title: Comparative analysis on EU and ASEAN counterterrorism efforts

Programme/year: MAIN/2019

Author of Evaluation (external assessor): Associate Professor Běla Plechanovová

Criteria	Definition	Maximm	Points
Major Criteria			
	Research question, definition of objectives	10	6
	Theoretical/conceptual framework	30	15
	Methodology, analysis, argument	40	20
Total		80	41
Minor Criteria			
	Sources	10	6
	Style	5	2
	Formal requirements	5	2
Total		20	10
TOTAL		100	51



Evaluation

Major criteria: The thesis as presented is clearly a product of a hasty work, both in terms of the collection of information on the topic and constructing the outline of the thesis and its writing. The structure of the text reflects this claim, as methodology is presented, in a very general and superficial way, before any introduction of the theoretical framework and research design, which is in fact missing in the thesis. Confronted with the outline of the thesis in SIS, the text does not follow the analysis into any detail that was planned. While the thesis is supposed to be a comparative analysis, there are no clear indicators defined that would lead the analysis in terms of criteria for comparison and their theoretical embedding. The theoretical chapter has no clear connection to the analytical part of the text, the author does not explain how the selected theories of regional integration are going to relate to her research plan. As a result, the thesis offers very shallow description of institutional setting of the counterterrorist policies in the EU and ASEAN, their policy initiatives and their implementations based on academic literature, arbitrary choice of online texts, and official documents.

Minor criteria: The thesis suffers from a significant number of flaws. The author does not present any concise literature review that would provide the general setting of the work. The references do not follow any consistent form not to mention particular style. Very often some of the obligatory parts of the bibliographic information are missing (most often year of publication, publisher or place of publication, but also the title of the journal as a publication venue). Some of the sources mentioned in the list of references are not relevant for the topic and type of study, others are not used through the text. Some references in the text are not credible or it is unclear what they refer to (e.g., p. 20, para 1). The language of the thesis would deserve some more editing as well.



FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
Charles University in Prague

Overall evaluation: All in all, the thesis barely meets the criteria for the MA thesis as it does not present any coherent research plan and its implementation.

Suggested grade: E-

Signature:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'J. Janda', written over a faint, large watermark of the number '123456789'.