

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	Glasgow 2574450 DCU Charles 31212267 Trento 225140
Dissertation Title	United in misogyny: the manosphere – far-right nexus and marginalized masculinities

INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

Reviewer 1 Initial Grade	Reviewer 2 Initial Grade	Late Submission Penalty Select from drop down list
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: 23,885 Suggested Penalty: Select from drop down list		

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 After Penalty: B1

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>	Very good
• <i>Application of theory and/or concepts</i>	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>	Good
• <i>Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument</i>	Very good
• <i>Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence</i>	Very Good

IMSISS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

• <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>	Yes
• <i>Appropriate word count</i>	

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Reviewer 1

The dissertation presents an important and original analysis of the relationship between far-right activism (using the case study example of the far-right American group the Groypers) and the much wider groups of men attracted to and contributing to the manosphere online. It argues that shared constructions of masculinity as well as misogyny and homophobia connect these groups and can potentially be used as a 'gateway' drug to draw young men and boys into the more extreme, violent and politicised activities of the far right.

The early parts of the dissertation are impressive in their ability to cover and synthesise conceptual insights from a range of literatures on masculinities, neoliberalism, far-right extremism and its contemporary mainstreaming. The Section on masculinities and neoliberalism is very good and certainly adds an important conceptual angle to the study. Empirically it feels a little over generalised however and includes some rather sweeping claims about working-class men. More broadly I think the tone of the piece could perhaps make clearer that whilst these are pressing and important concerns both the manosphere and the far-right are still only attractive to a minority of men.

The methodological approach is well explained and given the potential ethical difficulties and complexities of such a study it has been thoughtfully designed and is well managed to deal with a very large corpus of data. There is a good justification of why CDA was the most appropriate methodological approach and how it fits with wider framing of the study and a thoughtful discussion of ethical risks and sensitivities.

However, given the emphasis put in the earlier parts of the thesis, both on the importance of analysing socially constructed, diverse and intersectional masculinities, and on the importance of recognising multiple and sometimes oppositional understandings of reality, the empirical sections seem to fall into a rather descriptive and categorical tone. They are certainly impressive in their detail and build up a comprehensive if disturbing picture of the deeply misogynistic, homophobic and frequently violent rhetoric of the groypers' leaders. But rather than moving on from previous studies which you critique for focusing on misogyny rather than masculinity I feel a little that you do the same. Certainly, there are many areas in these chapters where masculinities and their construction and indeed hierarchies between them are mentioned, but this could have been tackled in greater analytical depth and with more clear and explicit connections to

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

the conceptual frameworks set up at the start of the dissertation.

The conclusions are ambitious in setting out potential ways to combat the influence and power of such groups and return more forcefully to the need to unpick, understand and then deal constructively with a wide range of men's experiences and associated masculinities.

Overall this is a very good piece of work and it is clear that a huge amount of time, effort and emotional energy has gone into its development.

Reviewer 2

I appreciate your passion for this critical area of literature. I enjoyed reading your work. Please find my comments below.

You excelled at:

- an independent approach through the initial bridge between disciplines.
- ethical considerations are clearly highlighted. I can see your care and attention.
- I find your point on page 43 of interest and highlights your contribution. "Indeed, experts argue that ever since their creation, the Groypers aimed to unify white and Christian nationalist movements (Tanner & Burghart, 2020)." I like how you unpack this statement.

A few points for reflection:

- I work in the field, and I sometimes found the terminology challenging to follow. I recommend starting slow and explaining key terminology to your reader. Also, try to make every effort to connect these terms to your primary research question.
- grammar/ proof-reading could be improved
- try not to use "our" I would omit this if possible
- quote from Fuentes on page 26 doesn't clearly show the source (i.e., speech/internet comment)?
- the limitations could have been more fully explored (i.e., does the focus on the global north allow your work to be applied to other areas, why or why not?)
- on page 37, you draw the reader's attention to some initial results, this is great, but your argument would be stronger with the presentation of a table outlining your findings.
- on page 38, I like how you set up the argument, but it could have been better linked with literature to support your points.
- I wonder if your work in Chapter 4 could have been divided differently (i.e., perhaps an additional chapter?)
- reflect on phrases likes: "many Groyper". For example, using a reference on page 74 would help your argument.
- I struggle to fully understand your points in relation to your main focus on pages 77/78.
- do you engage with the theory selected?
- do you fully address competing theories?

My concerns:

- Your research question does not read as a question but rather as a statement. This creates a situation in which it is difficult to articulate your argument fully. A lesson I have learned, try not to be vague and spell it out clearly for your reader. Even if it is clear to you, remember you have spent significant time researching the topic. Consequently, the associations may be clear to you but less clear to your reader. I would like to note that your sub-questions are clear.

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

-your literature review is expansive and well-done. However, I struggled to connect it back to your main research focus. It seems to stray to other topics. These topics are undoubtedly interesting; not all topics advance your research focus. For example, on page 25 (section 2.4), this is where the focus becomes clear to me. This focus should be more prominent in the introduction and be at the start of your second chapter.

-I would have liked to read more about how you apply critical discourse analysis (i.e., the actual steps used). Take a look at the top of page 33. There are opportunities to provide information to your reader.

-your central aim was to counter the “gender-less” analysis of the far-right, but I find this misleading. There is research that has been skipped over. It would be better to frame your work as a ‘contribution.’ Please see the following research that you could have ‘built upon’.

Katrine Fangen & Inger Skjelsbæk (2020) Editorial: special issue on gender and the far right, *Politics, Religion & Ideology*, 21:4, 411-415, DOI: 10.1080/21567689.2020.1851866

Blee, Kathleen. (2012). Does Gender Matter in the United States Far-Right?. *Politics, Religion & Ideology*. 13. 10.1080/21567689.2012.675705.

Blee, K. (2017). Similarities/Differences in Gender and Far-Right Politics in Europe and the USA. In: Köttig, M., Bitzan, R., Petö, A. (eds) *Gender and Far Right Politics in Europe*. Gender and Politics. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-43533-6_13

Christine Agius, Alexandra Edney-Browne, Lucy Nicholas & Kay Cook (2022) Anti-feminism, gender and the far-right gap in C/PVE measures, *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, 15:3, 681-705, DOI: 10.1080/17539153.2021.1967299

Graff, Agnieszka, Ratna Kapur, and Suzanna Danuta Walters. "Introduction: Gender and the rise of the global right." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 44, no. 3 (2019): 541-560.

https://extremism.gwu.edu/sites/g/files/zaxdzs2191/f/Women-of-Jan6_Matfess-and-Margolin.pdf

All the best with your future endeavours and thanks for your contribution.