

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	Glasgow 2131171 DCU 19108460 Charles 45077962
Dissertation Title	An Analysis of EU Strategic Culture and the Role of the Autonomous Projection of Hard Power Therein

INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

Reviewer 1 Initial Grade <i>Select from drop down list</i>	Reviewer 2 Initial Grade <i>Select from drop down list</i>	Late Submission Penalty <i>no penalty</i>
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: 21,480 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: A3 [20] **After Penalty:** A3 [20]

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>	Excellent
• <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>	Very Good
• <i>Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence</i>	Excellent
• <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>	No

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Reviewer 1

This is an excellent thesis which deals with a popular topic of EU strategic culture (its presence, nature, and manifestations). While the general topic has been proliferating in academic, and especially "EU Studies" circles, the approach here is set differently and more interestingly: the nexus between EU strategic culture and the bloc's hard power strategy and projection willingness/capabilities. As for the empirical scope, three cases were selected: Operations Althea, Artemis and Sophia/Irini. First, the thesis benefits from a clear structure which is clear, symmetrical and yet comprehensive. The balance between theory/concepts/methods and the empirical material is exemplary here, which is rarely the case to this extent. The literature review is robust, as is the research design of the thesis. When it comes to the empirical analysis, it is being situated within the wider terrain of EU security and defence policy, and the related politics. The empirical examination of the three cases benefits from clear, light, yet effective structure contained in each of the cases. I find the synthesis and generalization featured in the conclusion relevant, stimulating and well-thought through. In short, this is a quality thesis which deserves, in my opinion, high marking as it looks as a benchmark MA thesis should.

Reviewer 2

This dissertation was very clearly presented, structurally, in terms of sections and headings and summaries and provided a very detailed synthesis of the relevant literature. The discussion was very well-written and appeared well-informed. Perhaps the research question could have been unpacked more to present 'sub-questions' or 'sub-areas' that might have helped better frame the research? Also a clearer definition of what and how the author identified an 'EU Strategic culture' would have been helpful.

The nature of the procedure for document analysis & discourse analysis was not really unpacked in the methods section to tell us how empirical evidence was collected from these materials. So, the dissertation demonstrated an excellent overall understanding of relevant events and the literature but could have engaged more in discussion of concepts and also more clearly identified how the research was conducted to draw the conclusions found.