

## IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

<b>Student Matriculation No.</b>	<b>Glasgow 2701005 DCU 21109303 Charles 86787043</b>
<b>Dissertation Title</b>	<b>The Russian Hybrid Gambit and Baltic Countermoves: Hybrid War, Grand Strategy, and Whole-of-Society Defence</b>

### INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

		<b>Late Submission Penalty</b> no penalty
<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)		
<b>Word Count: 24173 Suggested Penalty: no penalty</b>		

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

<b>Final Agreed Mark.</b> (Following correspondence reviewers should list the agreed final internal grade taking before and after any penalties to be applied).	
<b>Before Penalty:</b> B1 [17]	<b>After Penalty:</b> B1 [17]

### DISSERTATION FEEDBACK

<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Rating</b>
<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>	Very Good
• <i>Appropriate methodology and evidence of effective organisation of work</i>	Good
• <i>Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions</i>	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>	Very Good
• <i>Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence</i>	Very Good
• <i>Accuracy of factual data</i>	Very 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>	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**

This is an excellent thesis on a topic, which deserves attention but has been somehow understudied, i.e. Georgia and mainly Baltic states' response to Russian hybrid destabilization campaign in these theatres. The key concepts used are hybrid warfare, grand strategy, and resilience aka the whole of society defense. The author delimits the research problem well, and the lit-review part allows him to prepare the main conceptual building-blocks. Research design of the study is solid, as well as its application. The case of Georgia is used as a necessary context to understand the Near Abroad Grand Strategy of the RF, and is traced back to the Primakov Doctrine. The Baltic preparation to Russian subversion is delimited by diplomatic, information, military and economic dimensions and thus justifies both the focus on hybrid warfare (RF) and whole of society defense (the Baltics). I value the balance of conceptual discussion, its richness, as well as empirical analysis contained in the thesis. As for the formatting, style, formal requirements, all is in order here.

#### **Reviewer 2**

I thought there was a certain degree of structural and analytical confusion underpinning this dissertation. The argument is somewhat clear, yet its contextualisation appears mostly opaque, mostly due to the structural and stylistic weaknesses that I detected in the sighted draft. What mostly concerns this reviewer, however, is the poor triangulation between argument, literature and the insufficient methodology you designed for this piece. I am not sure how the case study selection results from the methodological approaches you used here and, most importantly, how focus on Georgia and the Baltics is conducive to address the gap you identified in the literature.