

Name of the student:	Luísa Pussieldi Moratelli
Title of the thesis:	Narratives about the Bosnian War: The United States Intervention through a Discourse Analysis of CIA Documents
Reviewer:	Natasza Styczyńska

1. KNOWLEDGE AND CONNECTION TO THE FIELD

(relevance of the research question, research objective, literature review):

The main aim of the thesis is to investigate the colonial discourse on the Bosnian war using the collection of declassified CIA documents. Topics is timely, relevant and under-researched, telling us about the narratives and framing of the Balkans (and Bosnia) in particular by the Western actors. Author properly frames research questions and adds hypothesis.

The work is well structured, the research objective is clear. The state of the art presents not only the literature produced so far but the existing gap in the field. There are small gaps in the literature review (mostly due to the language barrier) and generalisations. E.g. reasons for dissolution of Yugoslavia are listed only according to Dragović-Soso (2007) while literature on this topic is abundant.

2. ANALYSIS

(methodology, argument, theoretical backing, appropriate work with sources):

The research questions (“Through which discourse framework(s) did the CIA interpret the Bosnian War?” and “What Postcolonial and Decolonial lenses can tell us about how discourses might have affected how decision-makers acted in the Bosnian War?”) are formulated properly and the chosen method allows to answer them. The research is explained step by step and all the methods are explained and justified.

The analysis is conducted by using a Critical Discourse Analysis of the collection of declassified CIA documents. Hansen’s model is applied to identify and name the discourses. Although Hansen’s work is indeed a significant the Author does not explain the reasons behind this choice, nor mentions other options.

Some minor issues require correction or re-thinking (such as a statement that according to “the Western perspective of nationality is centred on the idea of one state, one nation” which is obviously just one of the approaches to nation and nationality in the West) but they do not influence the overall argument and interpretation of data.

3. CONCLUSIONS

(persuasiveness, link between data and conclusions, achievement of research objectives):

Clear, well written, summarising the aim of the thesis and research results but leaving reader longing for more explanations and critical assessment.

I would appreciate conclusions to be more elaborated and analytical but still this is a solid wrap-up of the research.

4. FORMAL ASPECTS AND LANGUAGE

(appropriate language, adherence to academic standards, citation style, layout):

Although the thesis is written using appropriate academic language, the work would benefit from proofreading, some parts are hard to follow due to the language shortcomings. Apart from that the layout and the citation style are appropriate with some minor issues that do not influence the reception of the thesis. The word limit is within the guidelines.

5. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT

(strong and weak point of the dissertation, other issues)

This is a very interesting topic making use of the dataset that was not available before. The Author put much effort into analysing data and familiarising herself with the literature as well as designing the research in the best possible manner (to answer the RQ).

Strong point: Important and understudied topic, well-stated RQ and solid (although relatively short) analytical part.

Weak point: Short analyses compared to the whole body of the text, partially weak justification of a adapted classifications.

I would strongly encourage the Author to work more on the manuscript and convert the thesis into a journal article.

Grade (A-F):	B (4,5 in Krakow scale)
Date:	Signature:

GRADE CONVERSION MA EPS

Percentile	Prague	Krakow	Leiden	Barcelona
A (91-100)	91-100 %	4,51-5,00	8.0-10	9-10
B (81-90)	81-90 %	4,21-4,50	7.5-7.9	8-8,9
C (71-80)	71-80 %	3,71-4,20	7-7.4	7-7,9
D (61-70)	61-70 %	3,21-3,7	6.5-6.9	6-6,9
E (51-60)	51-60 %	3,00-3,20	6-6.4	5-5,9

Assessment criteria:

Excellent (A): 'Outstanding performance with only minor errors';

Very good (B): 'Above the average standard but with some errors';

Good (C): 'Generally sound work but with a number of notable errors';

Satisfactory (D): 'Fair but with significant shortcomings';

Sufficient (E): 'Performance meets the minimum criteria';

Fail: 'Some/considerable more work required before the credit can be awarded'.