FACULTY
OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
Charles University

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

Academic year: 2022/2023

| | |
|---|---|
| **Student's name and surname:** | Megan Delaney |
| **Student's ID:** | 14070740 |
| | |
| **Type of the study programme:** | Master's (post-Bachelor) |
| **Study programme:** | International Master in Security, Intelligence and Strategic Studies (IMSISS) |
| | |
| **Study ID:** | 722618 |
| | |
| **Title of the thesis:** | How can intelligence be used for benign purposes, in order to solve current global governance issues? |
| **Thesis department:** | Department of Security Studies (23-KBS) |
| **Language of the thesis:** | English |
| **Language of defence:** | English |
| **Advisor:** | Marcin Kaczmarski, Dr. |
| **Date of defence:** | 21.09.2023     **Venue of defence:** Praha |
| **Attempt:** | regular |

**Course of defence:**

The student recapped her research question which was related to how can intelligence be used for benign purposes, ethically in contexts other than espionage, how its image can be changed; she then noted the subquestions that guided her research. She moved to how she defined intelligence and linked it to the issue of ethical framework, where she mentioned some of the concepts she used, many of which were related to the issues of global governance. Interview methodology and ground theory methodology were what guided her research strategy. Results-wise, she mentioned patterns that recurrently emerged in the literature. She highlighted that her four case studies showed that intelligence companies could work to the social benefit, each in different aspects, suggesting her findings that intelligence can be used for benign purposes and help solve issues related to global governance. She also recognized some limitations of her study, notably how the interviews could not go beyond the respondents' efforts to create a positive image of their companies. Critiques: three main points: 1) not concise enough - the student mentioned how she grappled with a large amount of data, which she explained was on account of the kind of data sources she was working with; 2) not critical enough of the companies - the student acknowledged this and noted an unhelpful attitude on part of the intelligence companies; 3) some formal, grammatical errors, and the use of grounded theory was said to be underused - the student recognized this. Turning to the positive points, the student highlighted how the data collection process was a highly laborious process but she found it worth it. The committee asked if the student would be interested in publishing her research, she responded positively. Another question was about what definition of ethics the student used. The student replied that there is no universal definition

of ethics, noting that she centered on the issues of justice, but found out that if she defined it in a highly philosophical way she would find it hard to translate it to empirical analysis. Lastly, the committee asked if the student had an ethical approval, she responded positively. In the end, the committee highly praised the student's work and concluded that she passed the defense.

**Result of defence:**          excellent (A)

**Chair of the board:**        prof. PhDr. Emil Aslan, Ph.D. (present)      ...........................

**Committee members:**      Marcin Kaczmarski, Dr. (present)      ...........................

                                    Sarah Leonard (present)      ...........................