

# Literature review



**ACADEMIC**  
GHOSTWRITER

**Article Review: Common Myths of Terrorism**

Student Name

Institution

Course Code

Date

## Article Summary and Rationale

The purpose of this article titled "Common myths of terrorism" is to identify and debunk nine myths associated with terrorism and counter-terrorism. The article aims to comprehensively evaluate these myths by drawing from statements made by politicians, the media, policy analysts, and researchers. The focus is on myths that have gained special policy relevance since the September 11, 2001, attacks and the subsequent increased security concerns. The article also aims to address contradictory conclusions that have arisen from previous research articles by providing recent statistics and a literature evaluation. Additionally, the article seeks to present updated estimations regarding the alleged macroeconomic consequences of terrorism. The authors utilize post-2001 literature and statistical evidence, considering the advancements in empirical methods and procedures to offer clearer and more robust findings.

Investigating and analyzing the article's topic is crucial for several reasons. First off, false information and preconceived notions about terrorism can have serious negative effects on the actual world. These fallacies can mold public opinion, affect policy choices, and affect security measures. By addressing and dispelling these stereotypes, the essay helps a more accurate knowledge of terrorism and counter-terrorism, enabling educated and evidence-based approaches in dealing with this difficult subject.

### Strengths

This paper portrays literal strengths in various ways. First, the paper exhibits comprehensive identification and evaluation of myths. The authors have offered a thorough review of the existing myths by drawing on statements made by numerous stakeholders, including politicians, the media, policy analysts, and scholars. This strategy ensures that the essay addresses a variety of myths that have surfaced since the 9/11 events. The essay seeks to clarify and offer a more practical knowledge of terrorism-related topics by dispelling these myths.

Secondly, the authors utilize recent statistics and literature evaluation to address the contradictory conclusions found in previous research articles. The authors acknowledge that research in terrorism has produced conflicting findings at times, and they aim to provide more clarity by examining recent statistics and conducting a literature evaluation. By considering empirical methods and procedures that have evolved since the 9/11 attacks, the article presents more robust findings that contribute to a better understanding of the myths associated with terrorism. The authors ensure the data is current and pertinent by limiting the time frame to the years following the 9/11 events (Gaibullov & Sandler, 2022). Understanding the fallacies that have surfaced in this environment is vital since the immediate aftermath of the 9/11 attacks represented a turning point in global security concerns. The

essay offers a more accurate and up-to-date evaluation of the prevalent fallacies about terrorism and counter-terrorism activities by adding post-9/11 literature and statistical facts.

Thirdly, there is an emphasis on empirical evidence and advanced estimation procedures. The authors highlight the evolution of empirical methods and procedures, which have led to more clear-cut and robust findings in the field of terrorism studies. By incorporating these advancements, the article provides a more rigorous analysis of the myths associated with terrorism. This approach enhances the credibility of the article's conclusions and helps to dispel any unsupported claims or misconceptions. By employing these strengths, the article contributes to a more accurate understanding of terrorism-related issues and provides a valuable resource for policymakers, researchers, and anyone interested in the field of counter-terrorism.

The inclusion of post-9/11 literature and statistical evidence, as well as the acknowledgment of the evolution of empirical methods and procedures, are two additional strengths of this article. These strengths contribute to the article's relevance, credibility, and methodological rigor, enhancing its value as a resource for policymakers, researchers, and those interested in gaining a deeper understanding of the common myths surrounding terrorism and counter-terrorism efforts.

### **Weakness**

The article also has two notable weaknesses. First, the article delves into the limited discussion of contextual factors. The article evaluates popular myths and discusses results that are in conflict, but it does not go into great detail into the socio-political, cultural, and historical circumstances in which these myths originate. For a thorough examination of terrorism and counter-terrorism activities, understanding the contextual elements is essential. For instance, the article makes only a passing reference to poverty as a motivator of terrorism but skips over the complex link between socio-economic issues and radicalization. Political resentments, identity disputes, religious extremism, and geopolitical dynamics are only a few of the many interrelated elements that might have an impact on terrorism. The essay may oversimplify the intricacies of terrorism and counter-terrorism by failing to examine these contextual elements in greater detail.

Secondly, there is a lack of counterarguments and alternative perspectives. While the article seeks to dispel these misconceptions and offer a deeper perspective, it is crucial to take into account other points of view and engage with opposing ideas to guarantee a thorough study. The article may give the impression of being biased because it does not thoroughly cover opposing arguments and opposing viewpoints. Since terrorism is a complicated and multifaceted topic, there are frequently varying viewpoints and interpretations among academics. The post could have encouraged a more robust and intellectually rigorous conversation by including a wider range of ideas, allowing readers

to critically assess many points of view and draw their own well-informed conclusions.

Addressing these weaknesses would have enhanced the article's overall strength and credibility. By considering the contextual factors that shape the prevalence of myths and engaging with counterarguments, the article could have provided a more nuanced and comprehensive analysis of the complex issues surrounding terrorism and counterterrorism efforts.

### **Validity**

The validity of the article lies in its comprehensive identification and evaluation of common myths associated with terrorism and counter-terrorism, supported by recent statistics and literature evaluation. The article's focus on post-9/11 literature and statistical evidence ensures its relevance and currency in the field, providing an up-to-date understanding of prevailing misconceptions.

Moreover, the author's recognition of the evolution of empirical methods and procedures demonstrates their commitment to methodological rigor, enhancing the credibility of the article's findings. By addressing contradictory conclusions from previous research, the article contributes to a clearer understanding of the complexities surrounding terrorism. While the article exhibits strengths in its approach and analysis, there are potential weaknesses, such as limited discussion on contextual factors and a lack of engagement with counterarguments. Addressing these weaknesses would have further strengthened the article's validity by providing a more nuanced analysis and incorporating diverse perspectives. Overall, the article contributes to the discourse on terrorism by dispelling common myths and offering valuable insights for policymakers, researchers, and individuals interested in the field of counter-terrorism.

### **Conclusion**

The article's thorough review of misconceptions, use of current statistics, analysis of the literature, and acknowledgment of the development of empirical methodologies and procedures all stand out as its major qualities. With an updated and thorough research of terrorism-related topics, these strengths support the article's legitimacy and reliability. The essay does, however, contain significant flaws, including a scant examination of contextual elements and a lack of interaction with opposing viewpoints. The complexity and thoroughness of the material would have been significantly increased if these flaws had been addressed. Despite this, the essay dispels common misconceptions and offers evidence-based insights, making it a useful tool for policymakers, researchers, and anyone else seeking a better knowledge of terrorism and counter-terrorism activities.

## Reference

Gaibulloev, K., & Sandler, T. (2022). Common myths of terrorism. *Journal of Economic Surveys*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/joes.12494>

**ACADEMIC**  
GHOSTWRITER

Want a paper of the same quality?  
Our experts can help you today!

[Hire an expert](#)

sitejabber ★ 4.9  
REVIEWS.io ★ 4.8  
Trustpilot ★ 4.8

**Norma S.**  
Florida, USA

★★★★★

Lifesavers! Managed to complete my coursework in 6 hours and I got an A!

- ✓ 100% human writing – no AI tools used
- ✓ Compliance with guidelines & standards
- ✓ Timely delivery, even for looming orders

**ACADEMIC**  
GHOSTWRITER