

## IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

<b>Student Matriculation No.</b>	<b>Glasgow</b> 2338542 <b>DCU</b> 17116490 <b>Charles</b> 65716598
<b>Dissertation Title</b>	Three Shades of Green: Anthropocentric, Biocentric, and Ecocentric Conceptualisation of Green Violence

### INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

<b>Reviewer 1 Initial Grade</b> <i>For internal use only</i>	<b>Reviewer 2 Initial Grade</b> <i>For internal use only</i>	<b>Late Submission Penalty</b> <i>no penalty</i>
<b>Word Count Penalty</b> (1 UofG grade point per 500 words below/above the min/max word limit +/- 10%) <b>Word Count:</b> 21104 <b>Suggested Penalty:</b> 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:** A5 [18]      **After Penalty:** A5 [18]

### 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>	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>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>	Very Good
• <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>	Excellent
<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>	Very Good
• <i>Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation</i>	Good
• <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**

This was an interesting and mostly well-written dissertation, and I consider it to be a valuable piece of literature (particularly in the area of ecocentrism) on a topic which is only likely to grow in importance. There were a number of spelling and grammar errors throughout the piece, a number of which were recurring (e.g. 'extend' instead of 'extent'); further proofreading is advised.

I think there was a missed opportunity to engage with the neocolonial aspects of environmentalism - the dissertation would have been strengthened with a discussion which included postcolonial scholarship in the area of environmental activism and 'green violence' and, in particular, a lengthier discussion on ecofascism as it relates to each of the three approaches described in the dissertation. Ecofascism - which, as the author notes, springs from ecocentrism - (and ecofascist movements linked to white supremacist movements) is of growing concern.

The author contradicts themselves at times. For instance, sections 6.3 and 6.4 discuss ecofascism in terms of the ecocentric approach - something of particular concern, given that self-identified ecofascists (e.g. the Christchurch shooter in March 2019) have already committed acts of violence, and active killing. Yet, in section 7, it is stated that 'ecocentrism would not inspire active killing'. Section 8 goes some way toward correcting this, but I would have liked to see more.

This leads me to my next suggestion for how this work could be improved: a discussion of actual incidents of 'green violence'. While I appreciate that this dissertation is a theoretical work, I do think that further, prolonged discussion of such incidents (aside from the few examples re: poachers provided) would further illuminate points made in the paper, and would have made for a stronger dissertation overall.

Overall, I very much enjoyed this dissertation, and hope that the author will build on this work.

#### **Reviewer 2**

This dissertation seeks to examine 3 types of environmental ethics through the lens of security and determine their relation, if any to green violence. This was a very well chosen dissertation topic, one with current significance and a very good claim to originality.

The dissertation follows a clear and appropriate research design which is very well articulated, explained and executed. A slight issue here is that the dissertation seems a bit imbalanced, with too little time taken up with examining green violence itself, which a significant aspect of the dissertations' claim to originality and features really prominently in the dissertation's title. In other words, spending a bit more time on this would have enriched the dissertation.

The dissertation was well researched, displaying a breadth and depth of knowledge of the 3 ethical paradigms. Furthermore, it does a great job of synthesising them with the main elements of security studies, thus producing an original take on both security and these paradigms' security implications. An issue here was that that literature review sections were often uncritical: they presented the research but it would have been great to hear the author's own voice in these

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

sections. This could have taken the form of critically analysing some of the claims made by authors, rather than just presenting the debate between them. Opportunities to do that existed throughout the dissertation, especially considering the fact that there is quite a bit of repetition from section to section which could have been excluded to make more space for critical analysis. Furthermore, these sections, as well as latter ones could have benefitted enormously from the use of examples to illustrate the points being made and to strengthen your arguments. Nevertheless, the literature review was thorough, accurately written and used effectively.

In general the dissertation was excellently structured and well written though some spelling and grammar errors persist throughout.

Finally, the dissertation would have benefitted by 1) the author considering or reflecting upon their own standpoint and 2) if they analysed in a bit more detail their dissertation's contribution to the security and environmental ethics literature. Regarding point 1, the author obviously has a slight anthropocentric standpoint, seeing as they are concerned with green violence against humans as evidenced by the issues identified with ecocentrism. Acknowledging and examining this would have enriched their account and made the argument stronger. Regarding point 2, the author does mention the originality of their work as well as shows the extent to which the dissertation's aims were met- this is great, but being a bit more detailed here would have strengthened the argument as a whole.