IMSISS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	**Glasgow** 2687271 **Trento** 233435	**Charles** 26675445
Dissertation Title	Farmers, Framing, and the Far Right: A Content Analysis of Far Right Framing in the Case of the Dutch "Nitrogen Crisis"	

Word Count Penalty (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)

Word Count: 21994   **Suggested Penalty:** no penalty

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

Final Agreed Mark: A5 [18]

DISSERTATION FEEDBACK

Assessment Criteria	Rating
A. Structure and Development of Answer This refers to your organisational skills and ability to construct an argument in a coherent and original manner	
• Originality of topic	Excellent
• Coherent set of research questions and/or hypothesis identified	Very Good
• Appropriate methodology and evidence of effective organisation of work	Very Good
• Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions	Excellent
• Application of theory and/or concepts	Excellent
B. Use of Source Material This refers to your skills to select and use relevant information and data in a correct manner	
• Evidence of reading and review of published literature	Very Good
• Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument	Excellent
• Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence	Very Good
• Accuracy of factual data	Excellent
C. Academic Style This refers to your ability to write in a formal academic manner	
• Appropriate formal and clear writing style	Very Good
• Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation	Excellent
• Consistent and accurate referencing (including complete bibliography)	Excellent
• Is the dissertation free from plagiarism?	Yes
• Evidence of ethics approval included (if required based on methodology)	Not required

IMSISS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

• *Appropriate word count*	Yes

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Reviewer 1

The author offers an exceedingly interesting study into the use of crises by far-right movements with a look at the ongoing Dutch Nitrogen Crisis. What is clear from the work is that "crisis" comes in all different shapes and forms, creating a prime real estate for malign actors to interfere in seemingly unattached (to far-right) events. The work is academically-solid and thorough throughout the text, with the introduction setting up the rest of the study nicely. Moreover, essential for the thesis was a research question and goal that could highlight the far-right's use of crises and the contextual/discursive framing for the given conflict, which the author does well to establish in a two-part query between how and why (although it could have easily been split into two separate questions).

Impressive is the painstaking effort undergone in the literature review to highlight the longstanding extent of the Nitrogen Crisis and the overlapping and oftentimes confusing linkages the far-right has with the environment. The author does a great job clearing up any concerns the reader may have about the link between the two. The same can be said about the extensive theoretical and conceptual coverage made in defining crises and elaborating on the operationalised tools for this study. The author covered significant and differentiated research on topics of crisis, weaponised language, and their links to the far-right coherently and interestingly.

The use of methodology is well-suited for the study, relying on the quantitative and qualitative aspects of Content Analysis. The argumentation for the approach is convincing, and the details on how they were conducted are adequate - this translates well to the analysis. The "cases" or Telegram groups offer an unhinged look into how the far-right communicate within their channels and how those narratives diffuse into the crisis themselves, making the selections an excellent choice. The number of messages (data) analysed is also extensive and provides a comprehensive picture of the framings used.

The work shines in the analysis, an exceptional display of the study's effort. What was particularly interesting was the qualitative interpretations of the selected quotes, which were only aided by the author's knowledge of Dutch. These results on the different frames are then reinterpreted for the discussion. The only gripe is that the discussion section does little to connect to other research in the field, leaving an empty space where the outlined framings can be reinforced by other contexts of crises and the far-right. The conclusion does well to reiterate the findings and reconnect to the original research question.

Reviewer 2

The dissertation addresses an important and timely topic: the rise of the far-Right in Europe and the narratives advanced by these movements in times of crisis. The case selection provides a particularly interesting context within which to examine this phenomenon, using original datasets and a robust methodology. The study produces some novel insights about the case, although its intervention in wider theoretical debates is underdeveloped.

The dissertation outlines a clear research question, supported by three objectives. These aims structure the dissertation reasonably well, although more signposting throughout the discussion would have enhanced readability.

IMSISS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

The literature review demonstrates a strong grasp of the literature. Key concepts of the theoretical framework are well explained. More work was needed to situate the study within the literature - what theoretical insights was this study adding? A more critical reading of the literature would have supported this aim, highlighting limitations of existing work that the study addresses, for example. Emerging links between historic ideas of ecofacism and the climate crisis (as embodied by the case study) seemed like a fruitful avenue for exploration, but this discussion is underdeveloped.

The empirical analysis is a real strength of this dissertation. The author clearly outlines their methodology, and analyses an original dataset. The findings chapter outlines many interesting points. Although there is some good discussion of these results, a stronger argument would have helped to pull together these points and articulate the contribution. The author, for example, draws some comparisons between their findings and those of McNeil-Wilson, and offers some explanation for the divergence in results. More work was needed, though, to unpack these differences and their significance.

Overall, this dissertation contained much good work, and provided novel insights into an important topic.