

IMSISS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Student Matriculation No. | Glasgow 2567964 DCU 20109903 Charles 38434983 |
| Dissertation Title | Environmental security and indigenous peoples: perspectives from the Arctic |

INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

| | | |
|---|---------------------------------|--|
| Reviewer 1 Initial Grade | Reviewer 2 Initial Grade | 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: 20320 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> | Excellent |
| • <i>Coherent set of research questions and/or hypothesis identified</i> | Very Good |
| • <i>Appropriate methodology and evidence of effective organisation of work</i> | Excellent |
| • <i>Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions</i> | Excellent |
| • <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> | Excellent |
| • <i>Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence</i> | Very Good |
| • <i>Accuracy of factual data</i> | Excellent |
| C. Academic Style | |
| 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> | Not required |
| • <i>Appropriate word count</i> | Yes |

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Reviewer 1

The dissertation presents a thoughtful, original take on possible applications of the post-colonial perspectives. Instead of looking at the ‘Global South’, it ventures to the ‘High North’ to assess how the indigenous populations’ interests have (or have not) been incorporated to the security strategies crafted by the states in the region. The author employs the methodology of a comparative case study, including three states: Canada, Norway and Denmark (in relation to its governance over Greenland).

The author skilfully and fruitfully mixes three major aspects: besides the regional focus on the Arctic and the application of the post-colonial theoretical perspectives, the final element in the mosaic is environmental security. This broad topic appears to be both global (especially in connection to climate change, which stimulates various types of activity in and related to the Arctic) and intrinsically local, as it represents the pivotal, vital concern for the preservation of the indigenous communities and their ways of life.

Based on these conceptual foundations, the author has built an impressive analytical structure, which relies on a broad array of sources which the author utilized for the dissertation. Ultimately, the analysis is satisfying not only in the fulfilment of its grand theoretical goal (though it succeeds in the respect as well), but especially in its nuanced assessment of the partial successes and continuing shortfalls of the incorporation of the objectives of indigenous communities of the Arctic into the strategies and policies from which their (or ‘their’) regions should notionally benefit.

Reviewer 2

I really enjoyed reading this thesis. The topic is extremely original and the student approached it with a realistic sense of limitation - yet a great determination to make a significant contribution to the study of cc, which has traditionally ignored Indigenous people’s perspectives.

The strengths of this thesis are numerous. The topic is original, the methodology is appropriate and there is a critical analysis and evaluation of secondary and primary sources. The most significant weakness is perhaps the fact that the thesis does not include a thorough analysis of indigenous thought and approach to CC. It is repeated in the thesis that indigenous ppl are the most affected (with good analysis of industry impact and other types of impact on the environment and, consequently, indigenous communities), and tokenism is rightly noticed and analysed as a problem. However, there is little thorough analysis of what an indiegnous approach to CC means - apart from a critique of the commodification of nature, greenwashing and industrial project; a need to preserve and protect culture; and a more meaningful relation to nature as the provider of most of means of subsistence and survival considering the material conditions where life and sociality take place. It is important to emphasise that the student is aware of this, and has explicitly addressed the limitations of the thesis.

The case studies are well selected, with clear emphasis on the similarities and differences. The discussion of the latter, however, could have been more detailed to include other issues than conceptions of sovereignty. What is the link between sovereignty, and the different perspectives on CC that indigenous communities have in these settings?



IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Overall, the thesis attains all intended learning outcomes, it is grounded in a familiarity with a wide range of supporting evidence, which constructively utilised to reveal appreciable depth of understanding of both the thesis' contributions and limitations.