

## IMSISS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

<b>Student Matriculation No.</b>	<b>Glasgow</b> 2683817 <b>DCU</b> 21109711 <b>Charles</b> 94540890
<b>Dissertation Title</b>	Deploying French forces on French soil. Using the armed forces to combat domestic terrorism and the implications for civil-military relations

### INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

<b>Word Count:</b> 24067		

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

**Final Agreed Mark :** B3 [15]

### 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>	Good
• <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>	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>	Excellent
• <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>	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**

The dissertation explores civil-military relations in France in the context of the Operation Sentinel. The topic is relevant and precisely chosen. The introduction is clear and concise, but the research question is, surprisingly, presented only in the methodology chapter. The research question could have been split into two and simplified a bit.

The methodology chapter is well structured. The research design is a correct one, with the combination of desk research and interviews. The methodological sections account for the research process in detail, including the selection of interviewees and the approach to interviews as well as the use of software for content analysis. Methodological choices are accompanied by the references to the topical literature, which is another plus. Some parts are a bit too general (e.g. on qualitative research) but overall the chapter constitutes a strong point of the dissertation.

The literature review chapter is another forte of the dissertation. It demonstrated the Author's broad familiarity with the problematique of civil-military relations, even though some parts related to the history of the topic seem superfluous. Distinguishing developments in the academic field as a separate section does not serve the chapter well, though. This part is sometimes too focused on individual works rather than arguments they make and key divisions in the field.

The two main weaknesses of the dissertation are its structure and the absence of a proper analytical/theoretical framework.

In terms of the structure, chapters 4-6 would have worked better as a single chapter, dedicated to the dissertation's background. Chapter 7 - discussing the findings - would have been strengthened either by its signposting in the beginning or by employing an analytical framework. This would have helped understand the choices of topics explored in this chapter. The link to the research question could also have been more explicit.

Overall, the dissertation provides excellent empirical material but the presentation of results is its key weakness.

#### **Reviewer 2**

Overall, this dissertation is reasonable and I am happy with it. You have chosen an important topic that needs much more research on. The structure of the work is fine and many ingredients are there, although it could have been structured more logically. I am happy with the embedding in the literature and the design of the project. Your analysis is good and improves our knowledge on the area.

However, I would recommend a bit more work on:

- (1) Research questions.
- (2) Analytical framework is absent
- (3) structure of the dissertation.

Nonetheless, this is a reasonable dissertation.