

## SECINTEL Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

<b>Student Matriculation No.</b>	Glasgow 2276318	Charles 14578950
<b>Dissertation Title</b>	The EU Intelligence Community: Elements of a EU intelligence Culture	

### INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

<b>Glasgow Marker</b> <i>Office Use</i>	<b>Charles Marker</b> <i>Office Use</i>	<b>Charles Additional Info</b> <i>Please advise ranking</i>
--	--	--

### JOINT GRADING (subject to agreement of the external examiner and approval at Joint Exam Board)

**Final Agreed Mark. Markers should make reference to the Joint Charles University-University of Glasgow Grade Conversion Table**

B3 [15]    C [Good]

### DISSERTATION FEEDBACK

<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Rating</b>
<b>A. Structure and Development of Answer</b>	
This refers to your organisational skills and ability to construct an argument in a coherent and original manner	
• <i>Originality of topic</i>	Excellent
• <i>Coherent set of research questions and/or hypothesis identified</i>	Good
• <i>Appropriate methodology and evidence of effective organisation of work</i>	Very Good
• <i>Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions</i>	Very Good
• <i>Application of theory and/or concepts</i>	Very Good
<b>B. Use of Source Material</b>	
This refers to your skills to select and use relevant information and data in a correct manner	
• <i>Evidence of reading and review of published literature</i>	Excellent
• <i>Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument</i>	Very Good
• <i>Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence</i>	Very Good
• <i>Accuracy of factual data</i>	Excellent
<b>C. Academic Style</b>	
This refers to your ability to write in a formal academic manner	
• <i>Appropriate formal and clear writing style</i>	Very Good
• <i>Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation</i>	Very Good
• <i>Consistent and accurate referencing (including complete bibliography)</i>	Excellent
• <i>Is the dissertation free from plagiarism?</i>	Yes
• <i>Evidence of ethics approval included (if required based on methodology)</i>	Not Required
• <i>Appropriate word count</i>	Yes

## SECINTEL Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

### ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

#### ***Glasgow Marker***

This is a very interesting and original topic. Understanding the development of the EU's intelligence structures, purpose and ultimately culture is something that is not widely written about in general literature and indeed when discussed it is often in the context that no culture exists. The student does recognise that there is some discussion of the theme in wider contexts of foreign and security policy and that a small body of scholars is working in the area. I would like to have seen more exploration of this literature. The literature review was limited and reflected more of a description of what publications existed rather than providing a detailed critical review with oversight of themes. I would also point out that a lack of research time and word count issues are not acceptable limitations for research. Access to data is a more valid concern and I recognise the challenge of identifying primary source materials in an area where secrecy is often paramount. In saying this the student has made a good job of utilising existing EU Commission documentation to give some insight to the inner workings and direction of intelligence issues within the EU which have been placed in the public domain. The comparison with the US, in terms of using this as a means to provide a model by which to compare the EU, does work to a degree. This could have been given greater emphasis as a central element of the overall thesis. The student has made an effort to incorporate a theoretical underpinning to the work and selected neofunctionalism, with specific focus placed on cultivated spillover. There is some logic to this and it is an interesting modern use of an older theoretical position. There is some confusion in how you define your research focus at times and the central research question is not necessarily as clear as it should be. This leads to some confusion about the direction of the research at times: For example: the following sentence from page 39 states "Before answering to the question whether it exist an intelligence culture in the EU community it is important to define the intelligence community of the EU itself, and how, fomrally, it has been created". This is a problematic sentence both in terms of the general use of English, but also in terms of what you are trying to say and do in relation to the research focus. There are other similar examples throughout the dissertation. Overall, you have engaged with the topic and the literature which is better used in the latter sections of the dissertation. You have identified a gap which you have sought to address and you present a finding which has some merit. Structurally, you could have made some changes which would have benefitted the overall dissertaion including establishing key terminology (such as what is intelligence) earlier than you do. The idea that the EU has an intelligence culture is intriguing and your overall finding that this is different from other states and institutions is not unsurprising considering the history of the EU. Also be careful with style and general readability. However, there is merit to this work and the potential basis for a more substantive project is easily recognised by the reader.

#### ***Charles Marker***

This dissertation argues that the European Union has developed a specific intelligence culture and describes what specific elements of the European Union's intelligence culture are. The argument stands in contrast with conventional wisdom among rather skeptical experts and practitioners, some of them would even doubt the existence of anything close to the EU intelligence. The central argument is a good one, except for the fact that the reader has to infer the argument indirectly from the dissertation. Too much is unsaid but only subtly implied in the text. Even the research question is rather hidden in the introductory paragraph. I think it is a bit unfortunate. The reader should not be left to imply the arguments from the empirical data himself. Being more explicit about the dissertation's central argument would not only improve the clarity. It would

## SECINTEL Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

also guide the dissertation and help remove unnecessary paragraph with a loose contextual connection to the central question whether there is European Union's intelligence culture. At least two other points could be improved to enhance the clarity of the text. First, it would be beneficial to specify what intelligence culture is early in the text. The author argues that there is no agreed definition, but then it would be helpful if he could provide one, which he uses to identify what is intelligence culture and what are its elements. Second, it is a bit unclear what the role of theory in the text is? What role does the neo-functionalism serve in explaining EU's intelligence culture? It is often unclear to the reader, whether neo-functionalism serves as an explanatory theory which helps us understand the process of European integration, or whether neo-functionalism is a policy which dominated the development of the European community. Having said that, I still think the dissertation is a good one. It deals with a challenging topic of intelligence, where the secrecy usually prevents researchers from accessing vital data. The dissertation develops, albeit too implicitly, an original argument. The author also demonstrates a very good understanding of the topic and has thoroughly studied the relevant literature. While certain aspects of the text remain in need of further improvement, the overall impression is a positive one.

### Charles University > University of Glasgow Grade Conversion

CU General Grade	Grade Specification for Conversion	Percentage	UoG equivalent
<b>A - excellent</b>	Excellent upper (1)	100 – 96	22 (A1) Excellent
	Excellent lower (2)	95 - 91	19 (A4) Excellent
<b>B – very good</b>	Very good upper (1)	90 - 86	17 (B1) Very Good
	Very good lower (2)	85 – 81	16 (B2) Very Good
<b>C - good</b>	Good upper (1)	80 – 76	15 (B3) Very Good
	Good lower (2)	75 – 71	14 (C1) Good
<b>D - satisfactory</b>	Satisfactory upper (1)	70 – 66	13 (C2) Good
	Satisfactory lower (2)	65 – 61	12 (C3) Good
<b>E - sufficient</b>	Sufficient upper (1)	60 - 56	11 (D1) Satisfactory
	Sufficient lower (2)	55 – 51	9 (D3) Satisfactory
<b>F - fail</b>		50 – 0	8 (E1) Weak

### University of Glasgow > Charles University Grade Conversion

UofG General Grade	Grade Specification for Conversion	Percentage	CU equivalent
<b>A1-A3</b>	Excellent upper (1)	100 – 96	A - Excellent
<b>A4-A5</b>	Excellent lower (2)	95 - 91	A - Excellent
<b>B1</b>	Very good upper (1)	90 - 86	B – Very Good
<b>B2</b>	Very good lower (2)	85 – 81	B – Very Good
<b>B3</b>	Good upper (1)	80 – 76	C - Good
<b>C1</b>	Good lower (2)	75 – 71	C - Good
<b>C2</b>	Satisfactory upper (1)	70 – 66	D - Satisfactory
<b>C3</b>	Satisfactory lower (2)	65 – 61	D - Satisfactory

### SECINTEL Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

<b>D1</b>	Sufficient upper (1)	60 - 56	E - Sufficient
<b>D2-D3</b>	Sufficient lower (2)	55 – 51	E - Sufficient
<b>E1-H</b>		50 – 0	F - Fail

## SECINTEL Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

**Notes for Markers:** When grading the SECINTEL Dissertation markers are asked to reflect upon the aims and learning outcomes for the dissertation. Each dissertation should also adopt a clear security focus reflecting the relevant programme pathway

**Aims:** The course aims to provide students with independent research opportunities. It will include engagement with research methods training leading up to a period of independent research and the production of a substantial dissertation that builds upon themes and issues covered within the MSc International Security, Intelligence and Strategic Studies. Students will be encouraged to develop their own ideas and demonstrate their capacity for original thought and independent research. The dissertation element aims to enable students to identify and research particular issues or problems, linked to security, intelligence and strategy, at a deeper level than is possible within assessed essays and to develop a critical analysis of the existing body of academic work relating to their topic of choice. Students taking this course will be prepared for further research, study or professional careers through the development of their skills in data collection and analysis, use of original and secondary sources and the conducting and writing up of a detailed research project.

**Intended Learning outcomes:** By the end of the dissertation, students will be able to:

- > Devise a realistic programme of research on a topic reflecting the main themes of the programme;
- > Collect, select and critically analyse relevant background literature and arguments of a range of scholars;
- > Understand and select the appropriate methodology for dealing with information sources and data;
- > Apply these methods to gather and interrogate data in an open-minded, rigorous and undogmatic manner;
- > Be able to critically evaluate competing theories and apply relevant theoretical frameworks to guide the study
- > Organise the data collected and analyse the findings in a competent manner that allows for a fluid and logical argument to be presented;
- > Be reflexive and self-critical about findings and the limitations of analysis;
- > Work independently, organising and maintaining own programme of study to meet academic deadlines so as to produce work containing a substantial element of originality.

### **Word Count:**

Dissertations should be 20,000 words in length for students undertaking work-placement as part of the independent study portfolio and 22,000 words in length for standard dissertation students. Word counts exclude the title page, abstract, contents, bibliography and appendices). There is a 10% leeway for words above the upper limit, but no leeway for dissertation that fall under the word requirement. All dissertations must display an accurate word-count including the citations, footnotes/endnotes and chapter/section titles. One point (on the Glasgow 22-point scale) will be deducted for each 750 words under the minimum or over the 10% upper limit.

### **Language:**

The dissertation **must** be written in British English. A Czech Language cover page / abstract may be included

### **Late Submission Penalty:**

Dissertations that do not have an extension or are submitted after an extension deadline are subject to a penalty of 2 secondary bands per day (this includes weekends and holidays) on the Glasgow grading Scale.

### **Plagiarism:**

Dissertations which suffer from excessive (e.g. serious and/or deliberate) plagiarism will be subject to a grade of 0/Fail and be referred to the appropriate authorities at both universities. Dissertations that contain some elements of plagiarism, but which are deemed not to be excessive (e.g. minor instances that are not considered deliberate) based on consultation of both internal markers, should be graded accordingly and will be subject to scrutiny from the external examiner and could still result in a mark of 0 as well as referral to appropriate authorities for disciplinary action.

### **Consultation prior to final grading:**

First marking by both institutions should be completed blind with no prior consultation. Once both markers have graded the dissertation and provided written comments, they should consult on the grading and come to a joint final grade, taking into consideration any late submission or excessive word count penalty. It is the responsibility of the Glasgow marker to oversee this. Where markers cannot come to a joint agreement then the dissertation should be referred to the Programme Convenors at Glasgow and Charles (Dr. Eamonn Butler & Dr Vít Střítecký). The external examiner will be used to moderate any dissertation in this position and the comments referred back to the internal markers for confirmation.