

## IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

<b>Student Matriculation No.</b>	<b>Glasgow</b> 2674655 <b>DCU</b> 21109338 <b>Charles</b> 27697771
<b>Dissertation Title</b>	Flying Under the Radar: Understanding US Influence on Air Power Strategies of Non-Major Allies

### INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

<b>Word Count Penalty</b>		
Word Count: 23,075		

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

<b>Final Agreed Mark</b> : B1 [17]
------------------------------------

### 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>	Excellent
• <i>Coherent set of research questions and/or hypothesis identified</i>	Excellent
• <i>Appropriate methodology and evidence of effective organisation of work</i>	Very 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>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>	Excellent
• <i>Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument</i>	Very Good
• <i>Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence</i>	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>	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>	-Select from list-

## IMSISS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

### **ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS**

#### **Reviewer 1**

The dissertation covers an interesting topic with a great relevance for strategic studies. The choice of case studies, Australia, Morocco and Chile, presents a geopolitically and culturally diverse set of cases. The author did a good job in describing mechanisms the USA uses to influence their partners' air power and the competing factors that limits this influence. However, this thesis' contribution is limited by the almost uncritical reliance on political proclamations in official strategic documents and their use in the text. Much greater depth of analysis would be desirable. The text would benefit from clearer identification of strategic and doctrinal dilemmas that the analysed air forces faced and how the US influence pressed for specific strategic choices. More detailed theoretical foundation and analytical framework would also help in this direction.

#### **Reviewer 2**

This thesis sets out to explore how the US has influenced the development of air power in three countries - Morocco, Chile and Australia. It sets out a reasonably clear framework to answer this question empirically however is there a a lack of a puzzle here? Would we expect a different outcome for these countries in terms of capability or mission focus without the US influence? Does the thesis address why the US seeks this type of influence given the contribution of allied airforces in actual operations has always been at the margins of and dependent on US capabilities? The Australian case study gives a good description, but there is little analysis of the causes and implications of the relationship - particularly from a political-economy perspective though defence industry elements are briefly discussed the focus here is more on the impact of particular technologies being developed rather than looking at the role of defence contracts on the relationship Similarly the Morocco case study doesn't engage with the political context of US-Morocco relations, particularly the significant Moroccan lobby in Washington. The methodology section adopts an interpretivist approach but the analysis presents security concerns as though they are simply an objective matter that present themselves to both the US and Morocco. The Chile case also remains at a descriptive level. The concluding chapters summarise the findings, and make some clear recommendations that would be relevant to policymakers but the findings are lacking in a political understanding of why this influence exists. There is also a lack of attention to the slightly broader context of military cooperation in other areas between these countries.