



Diploma Thesis Evaluation Form

Author: Kevin Karabin

Title: Extremism-countering Security Measures in Bosnia-Herzegovina: Room for Improvement?

Programme/year: Security Studies

Author of Evaluation (supervisor/external assessor): Hana Oberpfalzerova

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Research question, definition of objectives	10	8
	Theoretical/conceptual framework	30	10
	Methodology, analysis, argument	40	16
<i>Total</i>		80	
Minor Criteria			
	Sources	10	6
	Style	5	2
	Formal requirements	5	3
<i>Total</i>		20	
TOTAL		100	45



Evaluation

Major criteria:

Research questions are quite broad but satisfactory, however more or less satisfactory. The third research question is unclear and should be formulated more precisely as to what recommendations are meant to be given.

The theoretical framework is unsatisfactory and it does not serve as a tool and basis for the empirical analysis itself. The link between protracted conflict, identity and counter-terrorism is not made clear at all based on theoretical literature, only some vague empirical references regarding the Balkans are made. Also, the theories described are not being properly applied since not enough attention is dedicated to identity issues. On page 36, the author makes the reader believe that counter-radicalization in Bosnia will be analyzed “through the lenses of the emancipation and Azar’s theory of protracted social conflict”, however this was not properly done in the empirical part. No theory of counter-radicalization is given whatsoever, except for a brief review of the measures taken in Bosnia. Also, the thesis contains a conceptual part which consists of a list of copy-pasted definitions, with no comments or transitions from the author whatsoever.

The analysis also consists of a list. In the first empirical sub-chapter, the author only lists all the measures taken in a table, without any further explanation, description or evaluation. Some of the sources on the counter-terrorism measures are regular websites or news sources, which should not be the aim for a master’s student. The second sub-chapter consists of a list of codes that are not further explained, put in context or even analyzed. The supposed analysis consists of a reproduction of the experts’ overall opinion on the issue and does not seem to stem from a proper analysis of the codes. I do appreciate the author’s effort to do a two-round coding of the interview transcripts and an effort to sort them into categories.

Minor criteria:

Many of the sources are regular websites or sources that should be of better quality (academic) given the argument under scrutiny.

No citation norm is respected: the author includes most of the necessary information but does not follow any specific established citation norm (e.g. italics is not used at all). No references from the interviews are accredited to a concrete interviewee and cited as such – they are merely cited as “the experts reported..”. Several chapters are written as a list in bullet points (the conceptual part, empirical analysis, parts of methodology).



**FACULTY
OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**
Charles University

Overall evaluation:

The author has worked with a vast amount of literature and conducted field research, which I appreciate. There is also an evident effort to get the methodology right. However, the way the thesis is structured and written, the lack of a proper theoretical foundation regarding counter-terrorism measures (that is widely available in academic literature), the lack of depth of the analysis and no linkage of the findings to theory and among themselves, as well as the lack of proper interpretation of data do not make this thesis sufficient for a successful defence at the Institute of Political Studies.

Suggested grade:

F

Signature: