IMSISS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	**Glasgow** 26101755 **DCU** 20109776 **Charles** 28457171 **Trento**
Dissertation Title	Sources of Innovation in the Brazilian Amazon Rainforest

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:* *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: C1 [14]*   *After Penalty:* Select from drop down list

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	
• *Originality of topic*	Very Good
• *Coherent set of research questions and/or hypothesis identified*	Good
• *Appropriate methodology and evidence of effective organisation of work*	Good
• *Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions*	Satisfactory
• *Application of theory and/or concepts*	Satisfactory
B. Use of Source Material This refers to your skills to select and use relevant information and data in a correct manner	
• *Evidence of reading and review of published literature*	Good
• *Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument*	Good
• *Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence*	Good
• *Accuracy of factual data*	Very Good
C. Academic Style This refers to your ability to write in a formal academic manner	
• *Appropriate formal and clear writing style*	Very Good

IMSISS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

• *Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation*	Very Good
• *Consistent and accurate referencing (including complete bibliography)*	Very Good
• *Is the dissertation free from plagiarism?*	Yes
• *Evidence of ethics approval included (if required based on methodology)*	Not required
• *Appropriate word count*	Yes

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Reviewer 1

The student identifies a very interesting and promising thematic direction. However, at the theoretical level, the student starts from very far away and the significance of certain discussions within the context of this thesis remains unclear (except for the purpose of providing a general context perhaps). Too many perspectives are presented, some with little to no value for the argument in question. The same problem persists at the level of empirics – many irrelevant details and the lack of focus. At the same time, much less attention is dedicated to the very core of this dissertation in theoretical terms – the conceptualization of innovation and its sources. Perhaps the most important section on the sources of innovation is rather short and, even though it presents some relevant insights, it does not really offer a way to conceptualize these sources or order them in terms of their significance, which would at least serve as a justification for the author's choice of AI. One of the key goals, which was dealt with almost in passing in the end, as a matter of fact, was to understand the effectiveness of innovation and this aspect has not been properly theorized either. Besides the above, choices concerning the general structure are not always fortunate (e.g. the theoretical discussion is split into two different parts and this distinction does not reflect a proper distinction between the literature review and the theoretical framework, as seemingly intended; most of the concepts and approaches, including the ones on innovation, are presented even before the main research questions are posed at p. 21). From a more general perspective, it is a good thesis, showing the author's extensive knowledge of various related aspects and diligent research, but there lacks a clear line of argument throughout the text, and the link between theory and empirics is not always clear and straightforward. The general (and likely wrong) impression that the reader is left with after reading this dissertation is that AI is the only reliable source of innovation in this particular context.

Reviewer 2

The dissertation is original in its goals, and thorough in the range of discussion presented. It shows great sensitivity (albeit towards the end) to the range of tricky - even 'wicked' - problems linked to finding solutions to environmental degradation, and problems linked to technological 'fixes' in particular. The construction of the dissertation left me a little confused at times: the link between environmental security, the emergence of the architecture of global environmental governance, then the introduction of STS theory in the research design felt rather disjointed. Many of the questions raised by this choice are then tackled in the discussion, but only briefly and without reference to the theoretical framework adopted in many instances: the nature/culture divide and the hegemony of market/capitalist reasoning in environmental governance; the lack of a clear definition of sustainable development; the ongoing

IMSISS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

problem of colonial relationships between global north and south; the problem of how to make power asymmetries visible and address them. These issues could have been woven into the theoretical framework of the dissertation to give them more space for proper discussion and reflection, for example by broadening the literature review to include key work around questions of environmental politics, risk and technology (e.g. Beck, Hajer..). Overall a well written, well researched and wide ranging piece that touches on all the central questions, but needed to engage in a more systematic and thorough way.