

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	Glasgow 2686678 DCU 233433 Charles 19215846
Dissertation Title	The Securitisation of the Issue of Sea Level Rise by Major Militaries in the Western Pacific

<p>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)</p> <p>Word Count: 23,249 Suggested Penalty: no penalty</p>		

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

Final Agreed Mark: B3 [15]

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>	Very 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>	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
• <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>	Satisfactory
• <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

This is a clearly structured piece of work that tackles the theme of the securitization of climate change in two countries, China and Australia, in a systematic way. The work is based on content analysis as a central method, and analyses a range of documents from each of the countries, focusing on leaders and military leadership, to determine to what extent climate change (explored through a focus on sea level rise) has been discursively constructed as a security issue in each. The analyses are thorough and attention is paid to their full discussion, though the discussions could be much more clearly linked and reflected upon in the light of current literature. The findings on the domestic and international oriented discursive constructions of threats associated to climate change despite relatively scarce securitisation are interesting and echoed in the broader literature on environmental politics. The work would have been sharper and more convincing with more effort to link the analysis to this broader literature on environmental politics rather than relying on government and media sources. It would also have been improved and easier to interpret if a little more effort had been invested in the research design. The reviews of the literature should be presented in order to lead up to a clear research questions and hypotheses. The methodology should be based on a careful operationalisation of the selected theoretical framework. For content analysis in particular, explaining how the theoretical framework is built into an analytical approach to the documents and how conclusions about the extent and change over time of the securitisation of climate change needs to be made explicit. A particular issue here is around the role of the audience, discussed in the literature review and taken up again in the comparative discussion, but not presented in the methodology nor in the substantive chapters. There is a tendency throughout the work to understand militarisation, or uptake of climate change issues by militaries, as the ultimate expression of securitisation. This sits a bit uncomfortably with the theoretical framework, as well as appearing to assume that military action is a natural consequence of securitisation that does not seem obvious in this policy field, I would rather expect emergency measures, but not enacted through the military. The discussion on politicisation is interesting and could have been explored more thoroughly, for example with a discussion of securitization as a method of preventing backsliding that would seem particularly pertinent in the Australian case. Overall, the piece is well written and well-structured, and the theoretical frame is picked up nicely in the conclusions despite missing steps in the methodology.

Reviewer 2

This dissertation shows that the student has acquired some knowledge on the topic. However, it has several weaknesses that suggest the student has not fully understood the research process. First of all, the research question should have emerged from a systematic literature review. Here, instead, the question is introduced before any literature is considered. The section entitled 'literature review' does not actually offer a review of the literature, but rather presents the theoretical framework of the dissertation. This section on securitization is a bit outdated and ignores quite a lot of literature on securitization. In particular, it does not engage with all the literature that has discussed the limitations of equating securitization with existential threats and has advocated for a less "extreme" understanding of securitization (e.g. Abrahamsen, Neal, Leonard, van Munster, etc.). Engaging with such literature would have given the student a more nuanced understanding of securitization processes, which would have had a significant impact on the analysis of the case studies. The empirical discussion presents interesting information and makes some good points. However, it is rather confusing as it does not mirror the previous theoretical section. It also includes theoretical discussions, such as a discussion of the role of the audience, which should have been included in the earlier theoretical section. The conclusion is

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

rather lengthy. Although it makes some insightful points, it fails to develop a clear, over-arching argument.

In general, the dissertation should have been better structured with a different set of chapters (1. literature review; 2. theoretical framework; 3. methodology; etc.). Here, there is no proper literature review, whilst the section entitled 'literature review' comprises a theoretical discussion and some reflections on data. The latter two have no place in a literature review, but should have been examined in greater details in separate chapters.

Furthermore, the dissertation does not adhere to academic conventions when it comes to referencing. The first reference to an item in the footnotes should be a complete reference (not a short one). The dissertation should have also been more carefully proof-read, as there are various typographical errors, sentences missing a capital letter at the start, etc. The presentation could have also been more consistent, in terms of font selection, font size, use of capital letters, etc.