

## IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

<b>Student Matriculation No.</b>	<b>Glasgow 2486257 DCU 19108737 Charles 78099315</b>
<b>Dissertation Title</b>	<b>Building Positive Peace: Investigating Institutional Approaches to Peacebuilding and the “Local Turn”</b>

### INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

<b>Reviewer 1 Initial Grade</b> <i>Select from drop down list</i>	<b>Reviewer 2 Initial Grade</b> <i>Select from drop down list</i>	<b>Late Submission Penalty</b> <i>no penalty</i>
<b>Word Count Penalty</b> (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)		
<b>Word Count: 21,861 Suggested Penalty: no penalty</b>		

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

<b>Final Agreed Mark.</b> (Following correspondence reviewers should list the agreed final internal grade taking before and after any penalties to be applied).
<b>Before Penalty:</b> B1 [17] <b>After Penalty:</b> B1 [17]

### DISSERTATION FEEDBACK

Assessment Criteria	Rating
<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>	Very 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>	Very Good
• <i>Application of theory and/or concepts</i>	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>	Very Good
• <i>Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument</i>	Good
• <i>Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence</i>	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>	Excellent
• <i>Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation</i>	Excellent
• <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>	Yes

## IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

- *Appropriate word count*

Yes

### ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

#### **Reviewer 1**

This is a well-written thesis. It has identified an important question. The literature review chapter is satisfactory overall but there was more scope to unpack the normative and institutional peace and the institution-building element, since the focus of this thesis is on that aspect of peacebuilding. The discussion of norms and institutions in the conceptual chapter is good but that is a different level of analysis since it concerns more with methodological and conceptual aspects. This notwithstanding, the research design is very good. Though, it can be noted that there was a limited number of interviews which focused only on AU. The two case study chapters are overall well written and contain a number of important observations and original supporting empirical evidence. However, the LoN and UN chapter is a bit too broad and tries to cover too much which has impacted the depth of document analysis. The AU chapter is more focused and narrower in scope. In conclusion, there was more scope to engage with the overall argument and the implications emerging from the evidence.

#### **Reviewer 2**

This is a highly original and well-researched dissertation. The comparison of the UN and AU's approaches to peacebuilding processes, the relevance of state sovereignty and the importance of non-state and local actors provides fresh and often counter-intuitive findings. The dissertation's structure is coherent, the parts dedicated to the documents' analysis are well-organized and easy to follow. The dissertation is very-well embedded in the topical literatures.

The main weakness of the dissertation is that it does not convincingly demonstrate the relationship between the historical context of both institutions and their shifting approaches to peacebuilding in the post-Cold War period. While chapter 3 discusses the ideational sources of the League of Nations and the UN at length, the link with the developments in the 1990s is missing.

At times, the dissertation attempts to discuss too many topics, which leads to the lack of focus. The theoretical framework in particular would have benefitted from more in-depth engagement, as a number of theoretical concepts are mentioned but not explored further.

The dissertation also tends to simplify the complexity of political processes taking place in the UN. While the focus on the Western primacy is justified in the 1990s, the lack of discussion of the role of the Soviet Union in the establishment and initial practices of the UN as well as of the Soviet anti-colonial agenda is particularly acute.

Finally, while the local turn features in the dissertation's title, it is treated only to a limited degree in the dissertation's body.

The Annex demonstrates substantial self-reflection that deserves particular praise.