



## Diploma Thesis Evaluation Form

Author: Monika Váňová

Title: Intelligence Accountability in Modern Europe: Comparative Case Study of the United Kingdom and Slovakia

Programme/year: Bezpečnostní studia / 2024

Author of Evaluation (supervisor/second reader): Jan Ludvík

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
<b>Major Criteria</b>			
	Research question, definition of objectives	<b>10</b>	9
	Theoretical/conceptual framework	<b>30</b>	25
	Methodology, analysis, argument	<b>40</b>	30
<i>Total</i>		<b>80</b>	64
<b>Minor Criteria</b>			
	Sources	<b>10</b>	10
	Style	<b>5</b>	4
	Formal requirements	<b>5</b>	5
<i>Total</i>		<b>20</b>	19
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>100</b>	83



## Evaluation

### Major criteria:

Thank you for the opportunity to read and evaluate your thesis. It was a pleasure to review, and I commend the originality of the topic and the effort to conduct a systematic, methodologically sound analysis of a well-delineated corpus of data. This reflects the kind of analytical rigor expected at this level of study. Your thesis demonstrates many strengths, including a solid understanding of the literature and an innovative approach to the research problem.

However, as with any research project, there are areas that could benefit from improvement. Most of my comments are minor and aimed at elevating your analysis to an advanced level, often beyond the typical expectations for a master's thesis. Nonetheless, two points—concerning case comparability and empirical depth—are more substantive, and I would like to invite you to address these during your defense.

- The introduction, while strong in its rationale for studying intelligence accountability in hybrid regimes, ends prematurely. The two hypotheses are introduced abruptly, without sufficient explanation or connection to the broader research question. The introduction should establish a clear logical flow, starting with the relevance of the topic, followed by a brief literature review or theoretical framework, then leading into the research questions or hypotheses. An explanation and justification for the hypotheses are needed to bridge this gap.
- The conceptual framework is strong but could be better integrated throughout the empirical chapters and conclusion. While you argue that one-dimensional distinctions between democratic and authoritarian regimes are insufficient, the application of a one-dimensional distinction when discussing hybrid regimes is inconsistent. Strengthen the coherence of the conceptual framework by ensuring that the theoretical insights introduced earlier are consistently applied in the empirical sections and conclusions.
- The selection of cases poses a significant challenge. The two countries differ widely in multiple dimensions, making it difficult to isolate regime type as the sole factor influencing differences in intelligence systems and accountability practices. Moreover, the classification of Slovakia as a hybrid regime is debatable, as most scholarly accounts still consider Slovakia a democratic state despite recent political developments. Provide a more detailed justification for your case selection, acknowledging potential confounding factors beyond regime type. Consider re-evaluating Slovakia's classification,



**FACULTY  
OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**  
Charles University

as much of the data presented reflects the democratic structures inherited from its past rather than more recent political shifts.

- The empirical analysis is relatively shallow, focusing primarily on formal structures and legal frameworks rather than the practical workings of intelligence oversight. Expanding the empirical chapters with more detailed analysis or case studies that explore the real-world functioning of intelligence oversight would significantly strengthen your thesis.

**Minor criteria:**

- Some paragraphs are overly long, which can affect the clarity and flow of the argument. Consider breaking up long paragraphs and using clear topic sentences to introduce each new idea. This will improve the readability and overall coherence of the thesis.

**Assessment of plagiarism:**

- Based on the anti-plagiarism software checks, it is formally confirmed that the submitted thesis is original and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, does not, in an ethically unacceptable manner, draw from the works of other authors.

**Overall evaluation:**

Overall, this is a very good thesis with several notable strengths. While there are some areas in need of improvement—particularly with respect to case comparability and empirical depth—your work demonstrates considerable promise and is an important contribution to the field. With further refinement, particularly in the areas mentioned, this thesis could achieve an even higher level of scholarly rigor.

**Suggested grade: B**

**Signature:**