

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	Glasgow 2299969 DCU 17116198 Charles 48405273
Dissertation Title	The Determinants of Chinese Civilian Nuclear Cooperation: A Comparative Analysis of China's Nuclear Export Strategy in Eastern Africa

INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

Reviewer 1 Initial Grade <i>For internal use only</i>	Reviewer 2 Initial Grade <i>For internal use only</i>	Late Submission Penalty <i>no penalty</i>
Word Count Penalty (1 UofG grade point per 500 words below/above the min/max word limit +/- 10%)		
Word Count: 20200 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>	Excellent
• <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>	Very Good
• <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>	Satisfactory
• <i>Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument</i>	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>	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

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

- *Appropriate word count*

Yes

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Reviewer 1

In terms of originality, coherence of the research questions, and the methodology chosen, this is an excellent dissertation. The author has engaged at a deep level with the prior literature and identified an appropriate body of theory to guide the hypotheses. The dissertation is extremely well written, referencing is accurate and the style is appropriate. On these criteria, it certainly merits a distinction.

I do have a number of minor criticisms. First, in the Introduction, I was expecting some kind of preview of findings and of the structure of the dissertation to tell me why it was original and what the main contribution was. Second, the Literature Review explored hypotheses in the literature, but then developed new ones in a separate chapter on Theory. I found this confusing, as I expected the relevant theory to be covered in the Literature Review, and for the hypotheses to emerge directly from it. Third, I am not generally in favour of Background chapters. Much of the relevant information could have been folded into the Introduction, which would have become more substantial and interesting. Fourth, the Empirical Analysis chapter could have been broken into several smaller chapters, as it is quite long, and 'Empirical Analysis' as a heading is not very informative. In short, a bit more thought could have gone into the structure, with less reliance on generic headings.

The Conclusion also is rather brief. It essentially just notes the conclusions and points to those which the author finds interesting. In a piece of this length, I would have expected a longer exploration of the implications of the findings, whether for policy or for academic research, and a more thorough, reasoned explanation of items for further study.

Reviewer 2

An original, engaging, and excellently written dissertation on an important subject. The author demonstrates their knowledge of and fluency in existing issues in nuclear proliferation, and the relevant institutional bodies charged with overseeing same. The author ably demonstrates the added-value of their dissertation to the existing literature, and effectively argues for its originality and contribution to the area. The chosen methodological approach is explained well. The author also convincingly shows that the tested hypotheses do not seem to hold up in explaining Chinese civilian nuclear cooperation.

There was, however, a lack of criticality in some areas. For instance, 'the West' and its 'norms, values and ideals' are mentioned numerous times in the dissertation, but at no stage is the (often amorphous) 'West' defined, and nor are its norms, values and ideals described. Similarly, the author refers to Chinese 'norms, values, and ideals', which, presumably, the author believes to be different than those of 'the West'. I would have liked to see more specificity in these areas, and more critical engagement with these ideas.

Further reading would have been beneficial, as there was a lack of referenced sources in some areas, and an uncritical overreliance on a number of the sources used. It would also have been useful to consider some of these issues from the procurer's point of view re: cooperating with

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

China for nuclear energy, or at least to read some of the literature in this area, in which work has been done.

These small criticisms should not take away from the fact that I think this is an excellent dissertation (which I enjoyed reading), and a valuable one at that.