

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Student Matriculation No. | Glasgow 2409058 DCU 18114806 Charles 20757380 |
| Dissertation Title | Hybrid Governance in Post-Apartheid South Africa |

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: 20,154 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: B1 [17] **After Penalty:** B1 [17]

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> | 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> | Excellent |
| • <i>Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument</i> | Very Good |
| • <i>Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence</i> | Good |
| • <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> | 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 |

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Reviewer 1

This dissertation considers the applicability of the concept of hybrid security governance in a non-conflict context, South Africa, and presents a number of interesting insights. In doing so, the author demonstrates an impressive command of existing research; shows creative, independent and critical thinking in identifying key gaps in the application of this theory; and presents a persuasive case for the rationale and value of the research. However, the dissertation suffers somewhat from its ambition: the proposed research questions are in places, wide-ranging, and the case design explores a wide array of actors, themes and sub-national contexts. Both could have benefited from a narrower focus. Similarly, although generally demonstrating a strong grasp of the literature and underlying theories, the literature review would have benefited from a clearer structure to more logically lead the reader through the synthesis of different bodies of existing research, key theories, and their applications in different contexts. The resulting analysis in some places does not succeed in comprehensively answering all of these ambitious questions, and the line of argument throughout the dissertation is not consistently clear. At times, the empirical sections are quite descriptive, and the author's own original contribution is not always brought to the forefront. Overall, a generally well-written study.

Reviewer 2

I generally agree with the comments made by Reviewer 1. The thesis is well written and well structured. The research questions are properly situated in the existing academic debate. The theoretical premises of the study are well explained. All in all, the thesis makes the topic accessible even for someone who is not an expert on the issue. I would strongly recommend, however, to have the main point of the research stated on page 1 of the introduction (in the present version it only starts to emerge somewhere around page 8). Stating your point clearly is very helpful from the reader's perspective as it allows him to contextualize the subsequent literature review. I would also expect the conclusion to have been somewhat longer for a text of this length.