



Diploma Thesis Evaluation Form

Author: Bruss Ostreni

Title: Understanding Hybrid Warfare Constructivism and Ontological (in) Security.

Programme/year: International Security Studies / 2021

Author of Evaluation (supervisor/external assessor): Jan Ludvík, Ph.D.

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Research question, definition of objectives	10	5
	Theoretical/conceptual framework	30	15
	Methodology, analysis, argument	40	15
<i>Total</i>		80	35
Minor Criteria			
	Sources	10	10
	Style	5	3
	Formal requirements	5	2
<i>Total</i>		20	15
TOTAL		100	50



Evaluation

Major criteria:

This is potentially a very interesting thesis. In fact, having read the abstract, I was looking forward to an outstanding thesis. Unfortunately, the thesis does not do what the abstract promises. I am afraid, in its current form, the thesis rather represents an unfinished draft. The thesis suffers from serious weaknesses, which need to be addressed.

- There is no introduction in the thesis's current form. Instead, the thesis starts with a review of literature about hybrid warfare. In fact, this review is pretty good. However, the thesis needs a proper introduction. What are the aims of this thesis? What is the research question? What is the argument? What is the motivation for such work? What contribution it makes? That I cannot say is deeply problematic.
- Similarly, neither methods nor analytical strategies are adequately described. How does the thesis investigate NATO's ontological security? What data are used? The reader is left in the dark, guessing what is being done.
- It is extremely difficult to evaluate the rest of the thesis without being able to say what are the aims and analytical strategy. Certainly, the thesis appears enormously heterogeneous. The reader cannot avoid feeling the chapters just present random observations. At least, that is my impression. I think the logic of the argument needs to be explained.

Minor criteria:

- The thesis suffers from several problems with style and formal requirements. Footnotes and references do not adhere to a single style and are plagued with typos. Some references are also really odd (e.g. Beate, N. (1979). Kenneth N. Waltz, Theory of International Politics, New York 1979. In Schlüsselwerke der Politikwissenschaft, pp. 481-485. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften).
- Typos and missing words also appear in the text (e.g., "He reason I choose" at p.41, "was setting the ground for better' socializing structures' such as the Mediterranean Dialogue (MD), North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC), *Membership Action Plan (MAP)*,



**FACULTY
OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**
Charles University

Partnership for Peace (PfP), and the *Membership Action Plan (MAP)*" at p.31 my emphasis, "Central European countries such the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland" at p.32).

- The style would really benefit from using topical paragraphs with a central idea/argument in the first paragraph and supporting evidence in the remainder of the paragraph.
- I would also encourage dropping we form. This is a single-authored thesis, which really makes we form inappropriate.

Overall evaluation:

It isn't easy to evaluate this thesis. In contrast to other theses with a low grade, this one contains some really good ideas. What is written is not perfect and needs some restructuring to avoid confusing the reader. However, it is not bad. The real trouble, however, comes with what is not written. The thesis lacks introduction, aims, a research question, motivation, and analytical strategy. I think the thesis should not be defended in its current form. Instead, I think it should be withdrawn. The thesis has the potential to be a good one if it is completed.

Suggested grade: E/F

Signature: