



Diploma Thesis Evaluation Form

Author: Martina Camicia

Title: Analyzing the Security Dilemma in the Arctic Region through the Lenses of Securitization

Programme/year: International Security Studies / 2024

Author of Evaluation (supervisor/second reader): Jan Ludvik

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Research question, definition of objectives	10	8
	Theoretical/conceptual framework	30	20
	Methodology, analysis, argument	40	30
<i>Total</i>		80	58
Minor Criteria			
	Sources	10	8
	Style	5	5
	Formal requirements	5	5
<i>Total</i>		20	18
TOTAL		100	76



Evaluation

Major criteria:

- The introduction is notably brief and does not sufficiently motivate the specific research question. While the thesis claims to employ a unique construct combining securitization and the security dilemma, this construct is not clearly articulated. The lack of theoretical integration between securitization and the security dilemma leaves the reader unclear about their compatibility and potential utility.
- The methodology section is rather generic and lacks specificity regarding the data used and their analysis. The chapter mentions "official declarations, meetings and conferences, military and national strategic plans..." as sources of data, but this description is too broad and could apply to any thesis. More specific and detailed information is needed. The thesis contains more detailed data descriptions in the empirical chapters on Russia and the US, but this information should be relocated to the methodology section and further refined.
- The theoretical section lacks integration and reads more like a secondary literature review. It does not adequately provide a theoretical framework to answer the research question. Also, the thesis seems to treat all innovations of the Copenhagen School as aspects of securitization; however, this interpretation is incorrect.
- The historical overview section appears unnecessary to the thesis's core arguments. The rationale behind including a subsection titled "Historical Overview" within the "Historical Overview" section is unclear and seems redundant.
- The tables listing documents analyzed in the chapters on Russia and the US are useful. However, they require better descriptions, including a justification for the inclusion of specific documents. Additionally, a factual inaccuracy was noted on page 38: the claim that the US deployed 330 submarines in Trondheim is incorrect. The US did not have that many submarines even during World War II.

Minor criteria:

- The literature review successfully frames the scholarly conversation rather than merely summarizing existing works, which is commendable. However, the identification of the research gap is not sufficiently clear. Despite the presence of a dedicated section on the gap, it remains ambiguous what specific gap this thesis intends to address.



Assessment of plagiarism:

Based on the anti-plagiarism software checks, it is formally confirmed that the submitted thesis is original and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, does not, in an ethically unacceptable manner, draw from the works of other authors.

Overall evaluation:

Overall, this thesis presents a commendable effort in analyzing the security dilemma in the Arctic through the lenses of securitization, successfully framing the scholarly conversation and providing a thorough empirical examination of US and Russian actions in the region. However, the work falls short in several critical areas: the introduction lacks sufficient motivation for the research question, the theoretical integration of securitization and the security dilemma is unclear, and the methodology is too generic, requiring more detailed and specific descriptions. While the historical overview and theoretical sections are underdeveloped, the empirical chapters are well-written and informative, albeit with some factual inaccuracies and a need for stronger theoretical connection. Despite these shortcomings, the thesis demonstrates solid research and a clear understanding of the subject matter, making it a good, though not excellent, piece of work deserving of a grade of C.

Suggested grade: C

Signature: