

## IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

<b>Student Matriculation No.</b>	<b>Glasgow</b> 2687288 <b>DCU</b> 21108943 <b>Charles</b> 31883925
<b>Dissertation Title</b>	The Russian Narrative Strategy on Telegram. Analyzing Propaganda, Disinformation, and the Pursuit of Influence in Colombia and Mexico in the Context of Ukraine's War

<b>Word Count:</b> 22,724		

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

**Final Agreed Mark** : B2 [16]

### 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>	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>	Excellent
• <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 a good dissertation, dedicated to Russian propaganda in Latin America since the beginning of the war in Ukraine, using Mexico and Colombia as case studies. The dissertation is well focused, with the analysis of Telegram channels of Russian embassies in both states. The overview of key concepts of propaganda and disinformation is the dissertation's strength. The choice of Telegram and country case studies is well justified. The empirical analysis is robust and the conclusions are justified.

The key weakness of the dissertation is its structure. The methodology section, which is right after the introduction, is a bit difficult to follow and at times resembles literature review. The presentation of chosen methods lacks clarity. The literature review chapter - focused on Russia - comes relatively late in the dissertation. The role of the subsequent chapter (chapter 6 dedicated to Russia's lessons from post-2008 hybrid warfare) is not entirely clear.

There are some factual inaccuracies ('military confrontation in Estonia in 2007', p. 5).

#### **Reviewer 2**

This dissertation deals with a highly relevant and novel (from the perspective of the choice of Telegram) topic. The analysis is theorised and executed well. There are certain shortcomings, however, too. At the theoretical level, repeated references to the concept of hybrid warfare are unjustified (they may only be contextually relevant for this analysis, rather than in the form and extent discussed in this work). The link between the theoretical framework and the actual empirical analysis could have been more systematic and straightforward as parts of the empirical analysis are rather descriptive. Structural choices are not always clear (e.g. historical background on Russian disinformation comes too late, same as the explanation of case selection; methodological remarks are dispersed throughout the text). The scope of this work is very limited too when it comes to the selection of Telegram channels. More comparative insights between the two studied cases would be useful too. Also, there lacks a detailed discussion of the contributions of this work to the existing literature grounded in the identification of the strengths and weaknesses of the existing bodies and pieces of research. The general contribution of this work is evident and its strength lies in the selection of the platform and the two case studies, which the author does mention, but a more detailed and systematic literature review in this sense would make all the distinct contributions more explicit.