



# Report on the part of the final state examination Record of the thesis defence

Academic year: 2022/2023

**Student's name and surname:** Rabia Turnbull  
**Student's ID:** 20231714

**Type of the study programme:** Master's (post-Bachelor)  
**Study programme:** International Master in Security, Intelligence and Strategic Studies (IMSISS)

**Study ID:** 722543

**Title of the thesis:** Sustaining Violence - A Colonial Déjà Vu?  
**Thesis department:** Department of Security Studies (23-KBS)  
**Language of the thesis:** English  
**Language of defence:** English  
**Advisor:** prof. Louisa Rosemary Parks  
**Date of defence:** 22.09.2023    **Venue of defence:** Praha  
**Attempt:** regular

**Course of defence:** The student thematized her research and provided her motivations, showing both the theoretical and empirical that gave rise to her inquiry. Following that, she defined her research question and explained how her research strategy would work to address it. Methodology-wise, the student mentioned she went with a single-case study, following which she outlined and justified the selection of her case in terms of relevance and timeliness. Moving on, the student spoke about her conceptual framework and explained how they were chosen with the eye to best addressing the puzzle. She also mentioned existing approaches to the phenomenon and explained that she chose a different approach to ensure that her work had an added value. That being explored, the student moved to describe her findings in rich empirical detail, with recourse also to normative considerations. Coming to the reviews, the student disputed one reviewer's comment as its critique was not directly relevant to the topic of her research, esp. in relation to the question of conflict. She also spoke about her theoretical framework and defended her choices. The student then asked the committee if her grade could be reconsidered, but the committee explained that it was not within the scope of their competence. One committee member also explained that an author is never happy with reviews. The student then asked if there could a third reviewer brought in. The committee explained that it has happened but probably was not applicable to this case. Instead, however, the committee suggested that the student tried to refine her work and the get it published, as that was of greater importance in the end. Another committee member praised the work. The third member then asked the student about policy recommendations. The student said that she had not formulated them explicitly but suggested ways that she thought should be taken.

<b>Result of defence:</b>	excellent (B)	
<b>Chair of the board:</b>	prof. PhDr. Emil Aslan, Ph.D. (present)	.....
<b>Committee members:</b>	Georgios Glouftsios (present)	.....
	Marcin Kaczmarski, Dr. (present)	.....