

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	Glasgow 2486661 DCU 19108265 Charles 24340631
Dissertation Title	The nexus between nuclear energy and climate change

INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

Reviewer 1 Initial Grade E1 [8]	Reviewer 2 Initial Grade C1 [14]	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: 22762 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: D1 [11] After Penalty: D2 [10]

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>	Very Good
• <i>Coherent set of research questions and/or hypothesis identified</i>	Good
• <i>Appropriate methodology and evidence of effective organisation of work</i>	Satisfactory
• <i>Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions</i>	Satisfactory
• <i>Application of theory and/or concepts</i>	Satisfactory
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>	Good
• <i>Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument</i>	Satisfactory
• <i>Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence</i>	Satisfactory
• <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>	Satisfactory
• <i>Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation</i>	Good
• <i>Consistent and accurate referencing (including complete bibliography)</i>	Good
• <i>Is the dissertation free from plagiarism?</i>	No (minor)
• <i>Evidence of ethics approval included (if required based on methodology)</i>	Not required
• <i>Appropriate word count</i>	Yes

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Reviewer 1

I am afraid this dissertation is seriously deficient. It formulates a reasonably sound analytical objective but fails to deliver an appropriate analysis. The dissertation asks why nuclear energy isn't used more widely in the context of climate change mitigation. How the dissertation answers this question, however, is a disappointment.

The literature review demonstrates some ability to collect background literature but does not provide critical analysis of this literature.

The methodology section explains that the dissertation chooses qualitative methodology and promises a narrative analysis. No narrative analysis is however provided in the remainder of the text.

The dissertation fails to organize and analyze relevant data. The empirical part misses any analytical framework. Most of the subchapters basically explain that 'nuclear energy is good'.

This obviously cannot explain why it is not used more widely.

Overall, the dissertation appears to be rather a set of random ideas which are loosely connected by an overarching topic of nuclear energy. Most of the time, I find it difficult to find linkages between chapters, subchapters, and even individual paragraphs. Furthermore, many sentences are simply odd, leaving the reader wondering what should have been said there. It is impossible to find any overarching argument in the dissertation.

This dissertation is not only plagued with plagiarism, but I do not think it demonstrates the acceptable attainment of intended learning outcomes.

Reviewer 2

The dissertation engages with the role of nuclear energy in the global politics of climate change. It seeks to address the question of reasons behind low acceptance of nuclear energy as a way of decarbonizing the global energy production.

The literature review chapter's main weakness is that it contains plagiarised fragments.

The methodology section correctly justifies the choice of qualitative methods.

The chapter discussing the research engages with a number of factors that shape and limit the role played by nuclear energy in mitigating the effects of climate change. This part of the dissertation would have benefitted from a conceptual/analytical framework. It is not clear how particular factors relate with one another and how they influence each other. This would also allow for focusing on the most relevant factors. In the current form, the breadth of the approach - including the discussion of newcomers in the energy market - did not allow for sufficiently in-depth discussion.

The concluding part suffers from plagiarised fragments.