

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	Glasgow 2657290 DCU 21109176 Charles 69452158
Dissertation Title	Natural Resource Monopolies, Power Consolidation and Regime Longevity in Equatorial Guinea and Cameroon

INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

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: 22,559 Suggested Penalty: no penalty		

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

Final Agreed Mark : B1 [17]

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	
• <i>Originality of topic</i>	Good
• <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>	Very Good
• <i>Application of theory and/or concepts</i>	Good
B. Use of Source Material	
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>	Satisfactory
• <i>Accuracy of factual data</i>	Very Good
C. Academic Style	
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>	Very Good
• <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 thesis has a clear research question, is well organised, and makes a strong argument for a causal connection between natural resource wealth and the ability of authoritarian regimes to stay in power. The case studies are appropriate and properly justified in the methodology. Data are gathered from relevant sources, despite language limitations (which are already noted in the thesis as a limitation).

There is a coherent and logical analysis, and well-argued conclusions, pointing to a link between exploitation of natural resources and how the regime manages to extend its time in power.

Overall, it is an excellent piece of work.

Reviewer 2

The research question is relevant and clearly defined and it is placed in the strand of literature on the resource curse hypothesis.

The literature review is very good, but it is missing some relevant and seminal paper at the frontier between the economy and the political science (such as van der Ploeg, 2011).

Methodology: in my view, it is not fully clear what is the main hypothesis that is assessed through the case studies. Despite the candidate justify the choice of the qualitative analysis, this methodology does not fully allow to trigger a real critical thinking from the student, since it is difficult to extract common lessons or factors that could have driven different outcomes. In the end, the analysis section appears as a complete and in-depth systematic review of what happened in the two countries instead than providing a contribution on how reading the causal linking between the explored variables. On the other hand, excluding native language documents is a recognized shortcoming, but remains a limitation in a qualitative research.

Nevertheless, I enjoyed reading the dissertation, and I think that its main contribution is providing details on the relationship between natural resource wealth, authoritarian big men and corruption in two countries, Equatorial Guinea and Cameroon, for which we have poor evidence and literature. The Academic style adopted is overall very good.

My suggestions to improve the quality of this dissertation is to insist on a comparative type of analysis, starting from lessons learnt from other case studies and identifying common drivers or peculiarities of the explored nexus in the two countries.