

## IMSISS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

<b>Student Matriculation No.</b>	<b>Glasgow</b> 2686684 <b>DCU</b> 233474 <b>Charles</b> 81920313
<b>Dissertation Title</b>	The Impact of Water Weaponization on Human Security: A Case Study in the Sahel

### INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

<p><b>Word Count Penalty</b> (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)</p> <p><b>Word Count:</b> 22166 <b>Suggested Penalty:</b> no penalty</p>		

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

**Final Agreed Mark:** C1 [14]

### 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>	Satisfactory
• <i>Appropriate methodology and evidence of effective organisation of work</i>	Satisfactory
• <i>Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions</i>	Satisfactory
• <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>	Good
• <i>Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument</i>	Good
• <i>Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence</i>	Satisfactory
• <i>Accuracy of factual data</i>	Good
<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>	Very Good
• <i>Consistent and accurate referencing (including complete bibliography)</i>	Very Good
• <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**

The dissertation focuses on the climate-conflict nexus and analyses two cases of conflict-ridden territories (Lake Chad and Central Sahel). Apart from the relevant case justification from a methodological perspective, case studies are politically relevant and timely. However, the dissertation suffers from a number of weaknesses and instances of vagueness / ambiguity - something that can be seen from the interchangeable use of the idea of weaponisation of climate change and water, respectively. Likewise, there are some parts that read under-referenced or at least written in a too "didactic" style possibly targeting the general public rather than a specialised readership of a Master dissertation. Other parts (especially in the literature review section and in the theoretical section) are not entirely exhaustive and are organised in a rather fragmented way. The research question is interesting and relevant but I am unsure whether the methodological choices are the most effective to reply that research question (the former is on how the weaponisation of water impact on human security, the latter consist in the analysis of "frames" and narratives developed by a selection of NGOs around those topics). On the other hand, it should be added that the student has carried out a careful analysis of the data she gathered, and I particularly appreciated the details provided in the manuscript and in the appendix, about the coding protocols.

#### **Reviewer 2**

The thesis is solid and brings together a lot of relevant data. It also starts very promising. However, the actual execution of the analysis has some major weaknesses. The main research question is explicitly introduced too late, after the theoretical framework. Its formulation is unfortunate too. Why would the analysis focus on the interpretation of NGOs rather than the author's own analysis of the relationship between water weaponization and human security in the selected case studies (based on the reports by NGOs and other sources whenever possible)? The author provides an explanation on p.29 but it seems insufficient. Therefore, much of the analysis represents more an overview of the existing reports rather than the author's original analysis. Also, the connection between water weaponization and different dimensions of human security, i.e. the very core of this study, remains underdeveloped both theoretically and practically (at the level of theory, various dimensions of human security are introduced without any initial conceptualization of the possible linkages which are not obvious for some dimensions at least; and at the empirical level, the discussion of security challenges in the region was sometimes unfocused, meaning not always clearly linked to the core objective of this study which is the impact of water weaponization particularly on human security, even the respective sections in the empirical part are separated into "6.3 Human Security" and "6.4. Water Weaponization"). However, the thesis certainly meets the requirements of a Master's thesis, the text is coherent, the analysis relies on a quite detailed analysis, and a good discussion of the key findings is contained in the end. Also, the novelty of the topic and the lack of the available data needs to be recognised.