

SECINTEL Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	Glasgow 2226142	Charles
Dissertation Title	Arctic Defence Diplomacy	

INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

Glasgow Marker <i>Office Use</i>	Charles Marker <i>Office Use</i>	Grade Conversion UoG-CU CU-UoG	Charles Additional Info <i>Please advise ranking</i>
--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------

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

Final Agreed Mark D3 [9] 3 [Satisfactory]

DISSERTATION FEEDBACK

Assessment Criteria	Rating
A. Structure and Development of Answer	
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>	Poor
• <i>Appropriate methodology and evidence of effective organisation of work</i>	Poor
• <i>Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions</i>	Poor
• <i>Application of theory and/or concepts</i>	Poor
B. Use of Source Material	
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>	Satisfactory
• <i>Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument</i>	Poor
• <i>Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence</i>	Poor
• <i>Accuracy of factual data</i>	Very Good
C. Academic Style	
This refers to your ability to write in a formal academic manner	
• <i>Appropriate formal and clear writing style</i>	Good
• <i>Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation</i>	Excellent
• <i>Consistent and accurate referencing (including complete bibliography)</i>	Very Good
• <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

There is nothing analytical about the argument that unfolds in this thesis. The candidate, essentially, paraphrased the five documents on which he was supposed to conduct research work based on discursive analysis technique. No connections are established between these five documents and the overarching argument of the thesis: the reader is therefore left puzzled about the structural rationale of the argument itself. This examiner never felt, while reading the thesis, that there was any scholarly outlook developed by the candidate, as no theoretical ambition was ever built up by the different chapters. In this sense, the disconnection between the research question and the content of the thesis appeared to be quite strikingly. Style and presentation, despite many repetitions and recurrent typographical mistakes were adequate, but never elegant.

Charles Marker

The thesis proposes to be a discourse analysis of security strategies of the 'Arctic Five' with focus on the prospect of the conduct defence diplomacy to mitigate regional security dilemma. While the chosen subject is undoubtedly one of considerable topicality and import, the thesis in its current form is characterised by major flaws in research design and conduct. Therefore, serious questions need to be asked within the defence. It is unclear, first, how the chosen methodology (discourse analysis) can lead to substantively responding to the RQ. In effect, however, the methodology is not deployed as the analysis cannot be considered to be interpretive in any sense, and the author seems to harbour a mistaken notion about what constitutes quantitative methods or how and to what purpose hypotheses are used. (In data analysis section, a hypothesis is formulated that the strategies are manifestations of 'realism', but the hypothesis is not aligned with the RQ or used to organise the following analysis.) Instead, a close reading of the arctic strategies is provided; however, it is not done with focus on elements of defence diplomacy introduced in the literature review, the only section that can be considered to be sufficiently referenced (otherwise, the thesis manifests limited and rather superficial engagement with source material); nor does it follow any other conceptual framework. The inevitable result is merely extended paraphrase with only occasional analytical claims some of which are dubiously substantiated. What constitutes 'mutual understanding and empathy' in the U.S. strategy when the claim is supported by a quote reading '[a]s ice receded and resource extraction technology improves, competition for economic advantage and desire to exert influence over an area of increasing geostrategic influence could lead to increased tension' (p. 51)? A more serious flaw, however, are repetitions of entire paragraphs in the introductions and conclusions of the subsections related to the individual strategies. Each is concluded (with only a formal variation) with the same paragraph: 'In alignment with the themes of the research project, the individual analysis of the Realm's strategy provides critical information on its defensive material skills; aspects of the tri-governmental identity, language, and shared culture; understanding and empathy for neighbouring interests; as well as intentions to align aims with its Arctic partners. The buildup of defence forces is interpreted as the repercussion of climate change, need to protect the region's human and economic assets, and to counter neighbouring defence developments. The analysis concludes that defence diplomacy is currently an active element of the Realm's foreign and security policies and has a high potentiality to increase within the Arctic region.' This devaluates the analysis and is inconsistent with the standards of academic writing. The comparative analysis that follows comprises either findings that are unrelated to the RQ - the 'external' and 'visual' components of the strategies - or would deserve a significantly deeper development (commonalities related to defence diplomacy). The author is commended for including a series of tables in the appendix, but in the current form, these are populated with data insignificant in terms of the thesis' objective. In summary, as a result of these deficiencies the thesis may only arrive at conclusions that have limited analytical value and are unrelated to the methodology (which would point to interpretive



SECINTEL Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

analysis of e.g. recurrent discursive and/or intertextual patterns), i.e. that defence diplomacy can provide stability to the now prevalent security dilemma. (It should be pointed out that security dilemma is an unstable position by definition, in contrast e.g. to balances of power which can be associational when they are based on shared norms, or dissociational.) The author is therefore advised to submit an amended version of the thesis, considering the suggestions made both now and earlier in writing where it was pointed out, among other, that it was in need of anchoring in theory, or that the thesis statement had to be aligned with appropriate methodology. (He was not discouraged from using PMESII, but it was suggested to him that it is not a methodology, but a structuring device.) While there clearly are habitual differences across the fields of military/intelligence analysis and the academia, I do not share the author's view that they had any impact on the writing process. Moreover, in my personal experience, to clearly define a problem, collect and evaluate evidence methodically and based on transparent criteria are the means to reaching sound analytical conclusions in either field.

Please note that this grade is recorded as the provisional final grade for the University of Glasgow degree. All grades remain provisional until confirmed at the joint examination board.

The Czech State Exam/Oral Defense may make a difference to the final grade for the Charles University degree.

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). All dissertations must display an accurate word-count including the citations, footnotes/endnotes and chapter/section titles.

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.