

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	Glasgow 2485890 DCU Charles
Dissertation Title	Assessing coercion in liberal peacebuilding: The EU peacebuilding attempts in Palestine

INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

Reviewer 1 Initial Grade Select from drop down list	Reviewer 2 Initial Grade Select from drop down list	Late Submission Penalty no penalty
Word Count Penalty (1-15% over/under = 1gr point; 15-20% over/under = 2 gr points; 20-25% over/under = 3 gr points; more than 25% over/under = 0 fail)		
Word Count: 21985 Suggested Penalty: no penalty		

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

Final Agreed Mark. (Following correspondence reviewers should list the agreed final internal grade taking before and after any penalties to be applied).
Before Penalty: A4 [19] After Penalty: A4 [19]

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>	Good
• <i>Coherent set of research questions and/or hypothesis identified</i>	Very 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>	Good
• <i>Application of theory and/or concepts</i>	Very Good
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>	Very Good
• <i>Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument</i>	Excellent
• <i>Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence</i>	Excellent
• <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>	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>	No

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

• <i>Appropriate word count</i>	Yes
---------------------------------	-----

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Reviewer 1

This dissertation sets to explore the role of coercion in liberal peacebuilding, looking at the case of the EU peacebuilding agenda in Palestine. The topic is not necessarily original but the student have managed to investigate it from a novel angle, bringing to light the many forms in which coercion (structural and not) takes place in the relationship between the EU and Palestine, as perceived by Palestinian people themselves.

The review of the literature is solid. The student shows to have a deep understanding of the various ways in which coercion has been assessed in the diverse branches of the literature, particularly as a form of soft power. Yet, the student managed to show that there is still scope to expand and broaden the ways in which scholars assess it, so as to achieve a fuller understanding of how coercion remains structural not only to liberal peacebuilding but also to the EU donors' very same identity. Of particular interest in this dissertation, is indeed the discussion of coercion as inherent to the EU identity as a liberal actor, leading the student to conclude that as far as the values upon which liberal peacebuilding remain the same, coercion cannot be fully eradicated from the peacebuilding process.

The research methodology is suited to this project. The student have relied on original interviews conducted with Palestinian actors. The interviews bring to light diverse coercive aspects of the EU peacebuilding in an interesting manner, and also suggest much more areas of potential investigations, that the student recognise as areas for further study, as suggested in the conclusion. The methodology is well outlined. I would have expected to have some discussion around the anonymity of the interviewees and how the student have dealt with it, giving the sensitivity of the topic.

There are areas that could have been improved. The initial theoretical discussion on the scholarship on coercion, as mentioned, is solid. The student have shown that there is still scope to study this subject from within the specific geographical and historical context in which it takes place. However, reaching the conclusion it remains a bit unclear whether the student are suggesting that a novel method or a novel conceptualization of coercion is needed, or both, moving forward. One original aspect of this work is the use of the recipients' perception of coercion, but the student have not fully elaborated how this perspective could or should be included in current models of coercion, if at all, so as to reach a better understanding of coercion in liberal peacebuilding.

Overall, this is a very interesting dissertation resting on original data; it points to several areas of inquiry that can be expanded upon in further research. Well done.

Reviewer 2

This dissertation tackled a complex topic and clearly had engaged deeply with a wide selection of relevant literature. The structure was helpfully clear and the discussion was interesting. But I wasn't always clear how 'coercion' fitted in with the other mechanisms described exactly. For example you introduce this in the context of hard and soft power but the discussion could have probed if/how coercion can be seen to apply in the use of hard power, but maybe probe whether it

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

could ever apply in the context of soft power?

I was not clear on the logic or reasoning behind the following statement, but perhaps that is because I have not consulted the coercion literature:

“Therefore, the actors do not necessarily have to be in a causal coercive relationship. Consequently, coercion must not be an intentional act”

I was quite surprised that there was no discussion of the statement: “Most literature conceptualises coercion either as the opposite of peace (Chandler, 2017; Bercovitch and Kadayifci, 2002; Lake et al., 2020) or as a set of background conditions for successful peace resolutions.” Slightly more analysis of the apparent contradictions in the literature would have been helpful: to what extent is there an agenda behind these interpretations/definitions? So if revising, I would recommend that you look at this literature more critically (and confidently!) to synthesise it more effectively.

The statement: “The perception of coercion and its justification is highly coloured by whether the agent is on the perpetrating or receiving end” touches on issues of interpretation of when ‘coercion’ is in play, but I felt this could be unpacked more explicitly.

Clearly the interviews provided a rich selection of expert data from Palestinian scholars and practitioners from the author’s own network: very well done. And there was a helpful discussion relating to bias on page 34. Perhaps if developing this research it would be a good idea to interview other (non-Palestinian) experts to better address bias? Chances are that you would get supporting evidence that would make these arguments appear stronger.

The methodology section was well done and thematic analysis seemed a very good choice. I guess ideally it would have helped to see a template of the themes generated, in an appendix? Perhaps this was the ‘conceptual map’ – although the font was very small.

There was a statement that the project had been approved by UoG but not clear why the ethics approval was not attached to the dissertation? This would have been helpful. Also slightly more about the way in which you minimised risk for participants would have been helpful since it is a relatively sensitive topic?

Overall, though, very well done.

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

PLEASE READ: Information Notes for Markers:

IMPORTANT Please note that all grading should be done using the University of Glasgow Marking Scale. Details of this scale and advice on how to use it are included at the end of this information section.

When grading the IMSIS Dissertation reviewers are asked to reflect upon the aims and learning outcomes for the dissertation. Each dissertation should also adopt a clear security focus relevant to the programme.

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 MUST meet the required word length as detailed below.

- Route A (Standard dissertation/ non-work placement students) – minimum 22000 words (10%+ upper limit = 24200 words)
- Route B (Work placement students) – minimum 20000 words (10%+ upper limit = 22000words)

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. A 10% leeway is provided for additional words, but the dissertation **must not be less than the stated minimum word length** for each route. The minimum word count is necessary to ensure that students meet the Czech legal requirements for the degree. One secondary band point (on the Glasgow 22-point scale) should be deducted for each 500 words under the minimum or over the 10% upper maximum 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 band points 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 the University of Glasgow. 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.

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

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 an agreed joint final grade, taking into consideration any late submission or word count penalty. Where markers cannot come to a joint agreement then the dissertation should be referred to the Programme Directors who will appoint a third review to take place. The external examiner will be used to moderate any dissertation in this position and the comments referred back to the internal markers for confirmation.

Programme Directors:

All correspondence for the programme directors should be directed to Dr Eamonn Butler who will directly liaise with the co-directors. For information the 3 programme directors are:

- At University of Glasgow: Éamonn Butler (eamonn.butler@glasgow.ac.uk)
- At Dublin City University: James Fitzgerald (james.fitzgerald@dcu.ie)
- At Charles University: Vitek Střitecky (vit.stritecky@fsv.cuni.cz)

External Examiner:

The external examiner for the IMSIS programme is Dr James Worrall from the University of Leeds (UK). The external examiner is responsible for final moderation of grading. The external examiner cannot overrule the internal examiners but can make recommendations which will be considered following consultation with the internal reviewers and confirmed at the programme examination board.

Feedback and Marking Sheet:

The above feedback form utilises drop down boxes. It is important that your selected assessment criteria rating reflects the overall grading mark for the dissertation. For example, if the dissertation is graded in the 'A' band, then we would expect to see a majority of excellent ratings. Student matriculations numbers for each university should be added to the form. These numbers should be obtained from the front cover of the dissertation. Occasionally students do not add these numbers so if you do not find them all then please do not worry. Both reviewers should include some written comment on the dissertation. Please note that these comments will be provided to the students in advance of their oral defence examination.

Ethics is required for any dissertation where the students has undertaken person-to-person research (e.g. interviews, survey).

IMPORTANT – Only one feedback and grade sheet should be returned to the IMSIS team. It must include both reviewers initial suggested grade, the agreed joint grade, details of any penalty, both sets of written comments and revised rating descriptors to reflect the final agreed grade. Reviewer 1 should take responsibility to complete the form and check it before emailing it to the IMSIS mail box – IMSIS@glasgow.ac.uk no later than Tuesday 27th August.

Oral Defence:

Each student will be required to sit an oral defence of their dissertation. These will take place on Thursday 12th and Friday 13th September. We must provide students with their provisional grade and a copy of the written feedback by Monday 2nd September to allow them time to make arrangements for the oral defence and written Czech State exam.

Deadline for return of joint agreed grade:

IMPORTANT - We have set a deadline of Tuesday 27th August for return of the joint agreed feedback and grading sheet. It is essential that reviewers meet this deadline, because we have to undertake moderation, process grades and confirm to students that they are allowed to sit their oral defence exam and an additional end of programme written exam (based on courses taken during Semester 3 at Charles University) which takes place on Monday 9th September. Students can only sit these if they have met a minimum GPA for the dissertation and we have to confirm this grade with students at least one week in advance to allow them time to make arrangements to take the written paper.

Reviewer list:

You will be sent an excel document with the names and email address of the different reviewers. Reviewers for each dissertation are listed as Reviewer 1 and Reviewer 2. Reviewer 1 has been given responsibility to complete the final version of the mark sheet and return it to the IMSIS@glasgow.ac.uk email inbox. Please consult these list to identify who you should be liaising with to confirm a final grade.

University of Glasgow Marking Scale:

This is a joint degree so the programme has agreed to use one single marking scale. Therefore, all marking must be done to the University of Glasgow marking scale. We are aware that you may not be familiar with this scale so please read over the following table and advice carefully. It will help you to identify the most appropriate marking band. The Glasgow grading Scale is based on a list of 22 grade points reflecting primary grade bands A-H. Each primary grade is divided into secondary bands which indicate the degree to which the work possesses the quality of the corresponding descriptor. Please note that while there are normally 3 secondary bands for each primary grade, the A-grade has 5 secondary

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

bands to reflect the need to distinguish the specific quality of the A grade. It is advised that reviewers place the work at the midpoint of the secondary band scale and then make a decision whether the work is of a top level, standard/average or lower level for that primary grade. Please note that reviewers are actively encouraged to use the full range of the 22-point scale should be used. Examples are listed below:

- Student 1's dissertation is regarded to be of excellent quality and to be given an A-grade. The secondary point band should be placed at A3 initially, however, the reviewer believes that this piece of work is of the highest standard therefore the secondary band is increased to A1 to reflect the quality of the work.
- Student 2's dissertation is regarded to be of excellent quality and to be given an A-grade. The secondary point band should be placed at A3 initially, however, the reviewer believes that this piece of work is while an A grade is a lower quality A therefore the secondary band is decreased to A5 to reflect the quality of the work.
- Student 3's dissertation is regarded to be of very good quality and to be given a B-grade. The secondary point band should be initially placed at the mid-point of the B range which is B2, the reviewer believes that this piece of work is a solid average B grade so the secondary band remains as B2 to reflect the quality of the work.
- Student 4's dissertation is regarded to be of weak quality and to be given an E-grade. The secondary point band should be initially placed at the mid-point of the E range which is E2, the reviewer believes that this piece of work while weak does have some redeeming elements of analysis so the secondary band is increased to an E1 to reflect the quality of the work.
- Student 5's dissertation is regarded to be of good quality and to be given a C-grade. The secondary point band should be initially placed at the mid-point of the C range which is C2, the reviewer believes that this piece of work is a solid average C grade so the secondary band remains as C2 to reflect the quality of the work. However, the student was 1000 words over the word limit, so this incurs a 2 secondary point penalty so the final grade should be listed as D1.

Primary Grade	Gloss	Secondary Band	Grade Point	Primary verbal Descriptor for Attainment of Intended Learning Outcomes	Honours Class Equivalent
A	Excellent	A1	22	Exemplary range and depth of attainment of intended learning outcomes, secured by discriminating command of a comprehensive range of relevant materials and analyses, and by deployment of considered judgement relating to key issues, concepts and procedures	First
		A2	21		
		A3	20		
		A4	19		
		A5	18		
B	Very Good	B1	17	Conclusive attainment of virtually all intended learning outcomes, clearly grounded on a close familiarity with a wide range of supporting evidence, constructively utilised to reveal appreciable depth of understanding	Upper 2 nd
		B2	16		
		B3	15		
C	Good	C1	14	Clear attainment of most of the intended learning outcomes, some more securely grasped than others, resting on a circumscribed range of evidence and displaying a variable depth of understanding	Lower 2 nd
		C2	13		
		C3	12		
D	Satisfactory	D1	11	Acceptable attainment of intended learning outcomes, displaying a qualified familiarity with a minimally sufficient range of relevant materials, and a grasp of the analytical issues and concepts which is generally reasonable, albeit insecure	Third
		D2	10		
		D3	9		
E	Weak	E1	8	Attainment deficient in respect of specific intended learning outcomes, with mixed evidence as to the depth of knowledge and weak deployment of arguments or deficient manipulations	
		E2	7		
		E3	6		
F	Poor	F1	5	Attainment of intended learning outcomes appreciably deficient in critical respects, lacking secure basis in relevant factual and analytical dimensions	
		F2	4		
		F3	3		
G	Very Poor	G1	2	Attainment of intended learning outcomes markedly deficient in respect of nearly all intended learning outcomes, with irrelevant use of materials and incomplete and flawed explanation	Fail
		G2	1		
H			0	No convincing evidence of attainment of intended learning outcomes, such treatment of the subject as is in evidence being directionless and fragmentary	
CR	CREDIT REFUSED			Failure to comply, in the absence of good cause, with the published requirements of the course or programme; and/or a serious breach of regulations	



IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet