

MASTER'S EXAMINER REPORT

GPS – Geopolitical Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Thesis title:	The power of the General: Does increased militarization lead to increased authoritarianism in Southern Africa?
Name of Student:	Ronan Peter Wordsworth
Referee (incl. titles):	Bohumil Doboš, Ph.D.
Report Due Date:	24.8.2022

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

1) Contribution and argument: The thesis very thoroughly develops military-related factors affecting the level of authoritarianism in the SADC countries. It sets 5 hypotheses that are answered through a mixed-method approach. The contribution of this very detailed analysis lies in clearly highlighting the relationship of the military expenditure, threat to the regime and nature of the civil-military relations to the type of the political regime. The argument is thus strong presenting clear conclusions based on a very solid work done by the author. A significant portion of the paper contains of the author's original work which must be applauded.

2) Theoretical and methodological framework: The utilization of the mixed-method approach is very well suited and conducted without any issues. The author develops his own authoritarian index that further strengthens the methodological quality of the thesis. There are, however, two methodological issues. First, the wording of H1 does not really tie it to the RQ. It asks on proportion of budget but don't address causes as per the RQ. While this is more of a wording issue, it should be addressed in case author wants to develop this text further. Second, the threat perception calculation seems sometimes rather intuitive. It is hard to calculate perceptions to begin with and the scale might have been better explained as well. This might pose an issue with possible publication and should also be looked at.

3) Sources and literature: The text is based on a large amount of relevant literature sources. Citing is OK but for some minor issues.

4) Manuscript form and structure: The thesis is not following formal criteria as per the layout of the faculty. There are necessary data that should be placed prior to the text itself missing. The standard formatting of the text itself is not always followed. The structure of the text is logical.

5) Quality of presentation: There are no major language issues. The paper holds some limited typos, especially to the end of the text that might have been corrected by an additional proof-reading.

CATEGORY	POINTS
<i>Contribution (research quality, analysis, and conclusions) (max. 40 points)</i>	40
<i>Theoretical and methodological framework (max. 25 points)</i>	24
<i>Sources and literature (max. 10 points)</i>	10
<i>Manuscript form and structure (max. 15 points)</i>	8
<i>Quality of presentation (grammar, style, coherence) (max. 10 points)</i>	9
TOTAL POINTS (max. 100 points)	91
The proposed grade (A-B-C-D-E-F)	A

Suggested questions for the defence are:

I recommend the thesis for final defence.

Referee Signature

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:

TOTAL POINTS	GRADE	Quality standard
91 – 100	A	= outstanding (high honor)
81 – 90	B	= superior (honor)
71 – 80	C	= good
61 – 70	D	= satisfactory
51 – 60	E	= low pass at a margin of failure
0 – 50	F	= failing. The thesis is not recommended for defence.