

## IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Student Matriculation No.</b> | <b>Glasgow</b> 2685728 <b>DCU</b> 21109729 <b>Charles</b> 82733938                             |
| <b>Dissertation Title</b>        | Unmasking Russian Hybrid Warfare in Europe: A Comparative Study of Estonia and the Netherlands |

|                           |  |  |
|---------------------------|--|--|
|                           |  |  |
| <b>Word Count:</b> 23,739 |  |  |

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

**Final Agreed Mark:** A3 [20]

### 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>   | Excellent    |
| • <i>Appropriate methodology and evidence of effective organisation of work</i>                                  | Excellent    |
| • <i>Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions</i>                           | Excellent    |
| • <i>Application of theory and/or concepts</i>   | Excellent    |
| <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>  | Excellent    |
| • <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>  | Excellent    |
| • <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 ambitious piece of work that immediately benefits from a strong research design and clear research hypotheses. I would usually counsel students to put the literature review before the methodology but this is not a deal-maker and it all works well in this case. The literature review is substantial and progresses at a strong, gradual pace, leaving the reader not only wiser about the general area, but also this dissertation's contribution. Thereafter, the case studies are solid and do justice to the structure applied to the dissertation. While it does not re-invent the wheel or shift the literature to a massive degree, I think it is appropriate for this level and the student should be proud of what they produced. The conclusion section could have been leveraged for even more closing impact. Very solid bibliography. Well done.

#### **Reviewer 2**

This is a very strong thesis with a solid research design, a logical and easy-to-follow structure, a robust conceptual basis, a detailed, systematic and balanced empirical analysis and a clear contribution to the body of knowledge on (Russian) hybrid warfare. One outstanding shortcoming is that the literature review serves largely as the conceptual framework. However, these would usually be two separate sections, with the literature review focused primarily on the discussion of the niche and contributions of this study (i.e. in this case the discussion of the existing conceptual and empirical approaches to studying hybrid, particularly Russian, warfare, their strengths, limitations and respective gaps in the understanding of this phenomenon, and the explanation of how this thesis builds on and contributes to the existing literature) and the conceptual framework oriented primarily towards the introduction of the key concepts (i.e. in this case the introduction of hybrid warfare as a concept, its conceptual properties relevant for this analysis, etc.). Therefore, especially as the literature on Russian hybrid warfare is abundant (incl. on Russian hybrid warfare in the Baltics and some European countries), more attention could have been devoted to discussing the contributions of this study vis-à-vis the variety of other pieces of literature on Russian hybrid warfare in the Baltics, Europe, other comparative approaches, etc. from both conceptual and empirical perspectives. One of the sub-questions ("what is hybrid warfare, and how can we conceptualize this term?") is redundant as a thesis focusing on hybrid warfare strategies would unavoidably have to deal with this question at the conceptual level.