

## IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

<b>Student Matriculation No.</b>	<b>Glasgow 2573321 DCU 20109440 Charles 19049672</b>
<b>Dissertation Title</b>	The Cyber Social Phenomenon of Doxing: An Examination of Hong Kong's Anti-doxing Law

### INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

<b>Reviewer 1 Initial Grade</b> <i>Select from drop down list</i>	<b>Reviewer 2 Initial Grade</b> <i>Select from drop down list</i>	<b>Late Submission Penalty</b> <i>Select from drop down list</i>
<b>Word Count Penalty</b> (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)		
<b>Word Count:</b> 23934 <b>Suggested Penalty:</b> <i>Select from drop down list</i>		

### JOINT GRADING (subject to agreement of the external examiner and approval at Joint Exam Board)

<b>Final Agreed Mark.</b> (Following correspondence reviewers should list the agreed final internal grade taking before and after any penalties to be applied). <b>Before Penalty:</b> C2 [13] <b>After Penalty:</b> C2 [13]
---

### DISSERTATION FEEDBACK

Assessment Criteria	Rating
<b>A. Structure and Development of Answer</b>	
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>	Good
• <i>Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions</i>	Very Good
• <i>Application of theory and/or concepts</i>	Satisfactory
<b>B. Use of Source Material</b>	
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>	Good
<b>C. Academic Style</b>	
This refers to your ability to write in a formal academic manner	
• <i>Appropriate formal and clear writing style</i>	Good
• <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>	Yes
• <i>Evidence of ethics approval included (if required based on methodology)</i>	Not required

## IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

- *Appropriate word count*

Yes

### ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

#### **Reviewer 1**

Overall, this is a well-structured and clearly laid out dissertation with a clear set of research questions. At the outset the dissertation provides a very good account of doxing and its consequences, clearly identifying a gap in the literature and situating the focus of the dissertation within that gap. The focus of the dissertation is original and to this effect the literature review clearly identifies the state of scholarly debates on the phenomenon of doxing and the fact that the literature suggests that law has not kept pace with this phenomenon. There are parts of the literature review which could have been improved through an expanded account, such as the interdisciplinary nature of the debates and more on the theoretical handling of doxing as a new cyber phenomenon. The methodology is good in terms of providing a justification for the approaches chosen, but this could often be expanded upon in terms of justifying a focus on Hong Kong. It is also not clear whether the chosen methodology was suitable for the types of data which were collected and analysed as much of the data is more of a legalistic, quantitative account than a sociological one. The findings and discussion section are largely descriptive accounts, where at the outset the Hong Kong protests should have been contextualised, as the political backdrop and influences are largely ignored. In other words, the legislation needs to be interpreted within its contextual and political environment and there is need for a more critical engagement with the criminalisation of doxing in light of the protests and the doxing of police officers. Many of the inferences made are not necessarily supported by the types of data presented. Some inferences are also made based on an uncritical interpretation of the data and thereby miss a bigger picture in terms of data collection by agencies, what constitutes 'success' and 'effectiveness' given the reliance on secondary data and institutional collection of that data.

There are also several issues with the dissertation in terms of typos, errors, language use, missing text, incomplete sentences. For instance, there is an incomplete sentence in the abbreviation list so the reader never knows what HKPCPD stands for in full as it is never stated elsewhere in the dissertation, this is the same for HKPPD – the reader does not know what this stands for and thus the presentation of findings is difficult to understand. Furthermore, these organisations need to be contextualised, again within the political climate in which they operate so the reader has a better sense of their institutional function and power.

Overall, the dissertation has promise, focusing on an important topic, but there is little to justify a specific focus on Hong Kong unless there is a deeper, more critical engagement with the political environment within which doxing legislation is produced and implemented, without which the dissertation remains a descriptive account of the law.

#### **Reviewer 2**

This a clever dissertation examining an original topic of doxing in a context of social and political unrest. As such, the paper contributes to the field with an agenda that often remains overshadowed by other cyber-related phenomena. The dissertation is well-structured and clearly written. I appreciate the literature review linking doxing with TFV and digital vigilantism as well as with the Chinese version of Internet crowdsourcing. Similarly, I find the typologies useful when trying to fence doxing as an unique interdisciplinary phenomenon and I understand a relevancy of its ethical and legal dimension. That said, I think the paper would benefit from a coherent theoretical/analytical framework, which would result from the extensive and complex literature review. Here, the theoretical discussion seems to remain divorced from the empirical

### **IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet**

investigation. More precisely, the dissertation correctly opts for a case study methodology, but fails to offer theory-supported categories that would analytically structure the case. As such, the empirical analysis often reads descriptive, or only intuitively analytical at best. Apart from the conceptual deficiencies, the analysis would also very much benefit from a broader contextualisation. The context of the violent events taking place in Hong Kong should be more emphasized to underline the security and political dimension of doxing. At least from the program perspective this might be more important than the legal treatment of the problem.

However, this criticism should not overshadow the strengths of the dissertation. Again, I think the topic is interesting and pertinent and the author managed to collect the most relevant sources tackling this rather niche agenda. The case appears to be well-selected to illustrate larger effects of doxing. And finally, the empirical part seems to be dutifully elaborated and clearly shows the author's substantive orientation in the problem, particularly its legal and institutional dimension in Hong Kong.

Overall, the dissertation would benefit from a more rigorous disciplinary approach which would also underline its contribution to the field. Additionally, the political and security dimensions could have been more emphasized. Despite all this I think it is a decent dissertation interestingly tackling an under-researched phenomenon.