



Diploma Thesis Evaluation Form

Author: David **Kořínek**

Title: **Bc.**

Programme/year: **Security Studies / 2018**

Author of Evaluation (supervisor/external assessor): **Jan Beneš / external**

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Research question, definition of objectives	10	7
	Theoretical/conceptual framework	30	20
	Methodology, analysis, argument	40	34
<i>Total</i>		80	61
Minor Criteria			
	Sources	10	10
	Style	5	5
	Formal requirements	5	5
<i>Total</i>		20	20
TOTAL		100	81

Evaluation

Major criteria:



FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES Charles University

Research question, definition of objectives

The research question is reasonable and offers sufficient space for possible research. Thesis' focus is clear, coherent and relevant.

I would welcome more precisely defined purpose and aim of the Thesis, some streams of author's thought are only very briefly sketched. Concerning the very well elaborated (see below) methodological framework, it is a pity that author didn't spend more time thinking about the desired outcomes. It is possible to agree with the author that observing the development of perceptions of nuclear sharing concept (NSC) provides a solid base for future research. However, the thesis could have aimed on more ambitious results.

Theoretical/conceptual framework

The theoretical concepts are carefully chosen and well described. The author uses relevant academic works to support his understanding of the concepts. The thesis is also logically set into the broader constructivist theory of international relations.

The problem lies in linking these concepts together with the methodological and empirical part of the Thesis as well as linking them together in homogenous set of knowledge. The concept are valid and fairly elaborated pieces, which however do not constitute a solid ground for research.

Methodology, analysis, argument

The methodology follows a logical set of steps, which work good together. I highly appreciate the choice of data, large data set and relatively sophisticated analysis. The chosen methodology does fulfil the criteria for conducting reliable research.

The composition of the work is slightly questionable. The historical part is too long at the expense of other important parts of the thesis. It is a pity that the author didn't work with the obtained results more deeply, the thesis could have provided much greater insight into the problematics.

Minor criteria:

The author uses relevant sources in sufficient amount. Author cites appropriate academic works. The used language and style of writing are without major flaws. Formal requirements are met.

Overall evaluation:

The thesis is well written piece of research with good methodology, meeting the required criteria. The research was conducted carefully, thoughtfully and with respect to the observed matter. The results are relevant and argued. There are two problems: first, the theoretical part is incoherent and detached from the rest of the



**FACULTY
OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**
Charles University

thesis; second, the research could have brought much more information if the goal was set more ambitiously and the results discussed more deeply. However, the thesis represents a relevant and solid academic work.

Suggested grade: B

Signature: