



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

Academic year: 2022/2023

**Student's name and surname:** Kathleen Hooks  
**Student's ID:** 69452158

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

**Study ID:** 722491

**Title of the thesis:** Natural Resource Monopolies, Power Consolidation and Regime Longevity in Equatorial Guinea and Cameroon  
**Thesis department:** Department of Security Studies (23-KBS)  
**Language of the thesis:** English  
**Language of defence:** English  
**Advisor:** Walt Kilroy, Dr.  
**Date of defence:** 21.09.2023    **Venue of defence:** Praha  
**Attempt:** regular

**Course of defence:** The student studied how natural resource monopolies interacts with power consolidation and regime longevity, in the cases of Equatorial Guinea and Cameroon. The student suggested that she wanted to point attention to an issue that has been overlooked. Her methodology was a comparative qualitative case study. What she found that there was a feedback loop of three variables that together continuously reinforce the often corrupt regimes. The student offered a number of empirical examples in support of her claims. Moving on to the reviews: 1) first review was positive, nothing much to address there; 2) lack of inclusion of the question of why some states use rich resources well others not - the student mentions that this is in the thesis but is not important; selection of qualitative research, methodology chapter - what about quantitative? The student concedes that the latter might have complemented her qualitative work; analysis - the student justified her in-depth examination of the cases; reformat the dissertation? - the student agrees that it might have been a good idea to follow the idea of turning the logic of the thesis upside down. The committee asked: do you consider the contribution empirical or theoretical? The student sees them as more theoretical, addressing a gap in existing literature. Then the committee also asked about structural differences between smaller and larger countries and how these might speak to the student's research. The student addressed this question in some detail, using empirical examples. The committee thanked the student and announced her successful completion of the defense.

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