

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	Glasgow 2409541 DCU 18114211 Charles 13462799
Dissertation Title	Saving President Assad: Russian Impact on the Eruption of the Syrian Civil War

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: 22263 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: D2 [10] **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	
• Originality of topic	Weak
• Coherent set of research questions and/or hypothesis identified	Satisfactory
• Appropriate methodology and evidence of effective organisation of work	Satisfactory
• Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions	Satisfactory
• Application of theory and/or concepts	Weak
B. Use of Source Material	
This refers to your skills to select and use relevant information and data in a correct manner	
• Evidence of reading and review of published literature	Good
• Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument	Good
• Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence	Good
• Accuracy of factual data	Good
C. Academic Style	
This refers to your ability to write in a formal academic manner	
• Appropriate formal and clear writing style	Very Good
• Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation	Satisfactory
• Consistent and accurate referencing (including complete bibliography)	Good
• Is the dissertation free from plagiarism?	Yes
• Evidence of ethics approval included (if required based on methodology)	Not required

IMSISS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

- *Appropriate word count*

Yes

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Reviewer 1

The thesis is centered around an idea that is not innovative. That the intervention of Russia to save the Assad regime has been effective, along with the engagement of Iran and Iran-backed Shiite militias, has been a well-known fact for anyone following the developments in Syria. Apart from a non-original central idea and RQs, the thesis sits on two unrelated goals: while the first one is the analysis of Russia's involvement in the Syrian Civil War (and its impact, which is somewhat sidelined in the actual analysis), the author goes an extra mile to explicate the causes of the Western non-engagement in the War and an array of factors that led to the Assad regime's success. The disconnect between the two goals permeates the thesis, which is unfocused, at times descriptive, theoretically uninformed, and in spite (or because of) its empirical richness, fails to deliver a coherent message. The resultant thesis is thus a mere repetition of well-known empirical truths put together without actual contribution. On the other hand, I appreciate the effort put by the author to make sense of an extremely complex phenomenon. While it has little to offer in terms of its innovative contribution, the thesis offers a relatively well-written summary of the causes of Russia's involvement, Western failure to engage in the conflict in a thoughtful way, and the general causes conducive to the fiasco of the revolution.

Reviewer 2

This is an exclusively descriptive thesis that tries to make sense of a very complex issue through a rather inadequate methodological approach. The main problem here is that the research puzzle appears to be too wide for scope and purposes of a Master's thesis. This fundamental weakness, to my mind, results in the production of a draft that is empirically rich, yet makes little to no effort to contribute theoretically or in any original way to the comprehension of a very complex issue.