



Diploma Thesis Evaluation Form

Author: Bianka Béres

Title: The future of NATO: between territorial defense and out-of-area operations

Programme/year: International Security Studies, 2021

Author of Evaluation (supervisor): Tomáš Karásek

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Research question, definition of objectives	10	6
	Theoretical / conceptual framework	30	16
	Methodology, analysis, argument	40	19
<i>Total</i>		80	41
Minor Criteria			
	Sources	10	6
	Style	5	2
	Formal requirements	5	2
<i>Total</i>		20	10
TOTAL		100	51



Evaluation

Major criteria:

The author intends to tackle an important and currently very relevant question of NATO's adaptation to new strategic challenges. While the overall structure and the declared general intention make sense, the dissertation as a whole suffers from serious problems at several levels.

First of all, the ambition to study NATO's behaviour in such a broad historical sweep (combined with a multitude of research sub-questions) can hardly result in focused and specific enough analytical results. As a result, the dissertation is quite general and overly descriptive.

The author also overuses text formatted as bullet-points that is hardly appropriate for an academic work at this level. This is combined with long sections (e.g. chapter 2, sub-chapter 4.2) of text that essentially repeat the message from various NATO official documents, not adding any analytical level, or even combining the information from primary sources with its reflection in academic literature.

The dissertation as a whole reads more like an overview or summary, not a text with a discernible analytical or conceptual ambition.

Minor criteria:

The writing and style of the dissertation are not a very high level, but this is not a major issue. The author, however, faces a serious problem in the use of text from various sources which is often almost exactly copied from the original but seldom formally quoted. While this is usually the case with shorter fragments of sentences (however, there are exceptions featuring longer portions of almost fully copy-pasted paragraphs on pp. 34-35 or 39), the author would be well advised to explain her approach to referring to sources to the examination committee.

Overall evaluation:

While the dissertation features a highly relevant and important topic, the author's effort is marred by structural, methodological and formal problems which, from the



**FACULTY
OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**
Charles University

perspective of this reviewer, posit it just above the border where it is suitable for defence.

Suggested grade: **E**

Signature: