



FACULTY
OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
Charles University

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

Academic year: 2023/2024

Student's name and surname: Valeria Cavallin
Student's ID: 61408179

Type of the study programme: Master's (post-Bachelor)
Study programme: International Security Studies with specialisation in Peace and Conflict Studies

Study ID: 713672

Title of the thesis: Perspectives on Resilience Against Radicalization in the Ranks: Personal Experiences of the U.S. Ex-Military Personnel
Thesis department: Department of International Relations (23-KMV)
Language of the thesis: English
Language of defence: English
Advisor: Mgr. Markéta Kocmanová
Reviewer(s): Mgr. Jan Ludvík, Ph.D.
Date of defence: 31.01.2024 **Venue of defence:** Praha
Attempt: regular

Course of defence: The committee began by presenting the results of the written part and asked the student to briefly present her thesis. The student began by unpacking the title and exploring the main aims she defined. Following that, she explained her motivation for writing the thesis, noting both personal reasons but also gaps in the existing research. Then, the student described at length her research questions. Following that, the student explained her multidisciplinary theoretical approach, which included insights from sociology to political science to psychoanalysis. Based on that, she described her concepts and the overview and justified the case studies she chose for her study. She mentioned a number of limitations and suggested in which way she tried to compensate for them. Methodologically, the student explained how she sought to address her question, basing her approach especially on personal interviews. Then the student turned to the main findings, which she advertised were extensive; duly, she explained them in concrete detail. Finally, the student provided her findings and results. The committee moved to the reviews and noted a discrepancy in them - while there were positives, the reviewers wished the work had better connected its findings with existing literature. Also, narrowing down would have been useful. A proper conceptual part was also said to be missing; the methodology was questioned; and the presentation of the findings was not absolutely clear and synthetic. Finally, there was also the question of potential plagiarism, as the degree of similarity was found to be considerably high. The student reacted. On plagiarism, the student defined her approach in terms of APA citation manual which she said did not require concrete pages or paragraph numbers. She also noted that

only one source was noted by the plagiarism system as extensively drawn upon, which she justified in terms of the sources importance for her work. Then the student turned to the question of her literature review. She noted a necessity of the approach and noted that her approach was scholarly enough. On interviews, the student mentioned the existence of other academic works that used only one interview, noting that it was setting a precedent. Also, she reminded that hers was an exploratory study that did not aim to generalize extensively. The committee thanked the student and noted that the question of citations was the most important one.

Result of defence:	very good (D)
Chair of the board:	prof. Mgr. Oldřich Bureš, Ph.D., M.A. (present)
Committee members:	PhDr. JUDr. Tomáš Karásek, Ph.D. (present) Mgr. et Mgr. Tomáš Kučera, Ph.D. (present)