

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	Glasgow 2673945 DCU 21109290 Charles 82449305
Dissertation Title	Human Intelligence Throughout History: An Analysis in the Changes in Human Intelligence Collection Techniques from the Cold War to the Present

<p>Word Count Penalty (1-15% over/under = 1 gr point; 15-20% over/under = 2 gr points; 20-25% over/under = 3 gr points; more than 25% over/under = 0 fail)</p> <p>Word Count: 22,055 Suggested Penalty: no penalty</p>		

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

Final Agreed Mark. C1 [14]

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>	Very Good
• <i>Coherent set of research questions and/or hypothesis identified</i>	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>	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>	Good
• <i>Accuracy of factual data</i>	Excellent
C. Academic Style	
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

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| • Evidence of ethics approval included (if required based on methodology) | Not required |
| • Appropriate word count | Yes |

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Reviewer 1

The dissertation deals with on human intelligence collection techniques (HUMINT) in their historical development from Cold War to present days, in the United States, Russia and China. It shows the persistence of the importance of these techniques when technological developed made available new different intelligence collection techniques. Interestingly, it shows that the use of technology did not change very much HUMINT activities.

It is well-structured, shows an informed use of the relevant literature, and is methodologically convincing. The chosen case studies, are well presented and analysed in depth.

It was not the purpose of the dissertation, of course, but more could be said about the persistence of HUMINT techniques in history, especially in the early modern period.

Reviewer 2

The dissertation investigates how human intelligence collection practices evolved over time in the case of three major world powers and how human intelligence collection remained vital even given the wide availability of different technologies. Three major revolutions in intelligence, OSINT, cybersecurity, and AI, are discussed to show that the role of HUMINT is not diminishing. I have a problem with the way in which the dissertation speaks about individual technological changes. It is problematic to speak about cybersecurity and AI in isolation, as these two phenomena cross-fertilize each other. The same applies to OSINT, which, when connected to social networks, benefits from similar effects. More could be done to make this logically coherent. The review of recent as well as past intelligence operations is interesting. However, historical cases are only indirect evidence for the hypothesis. By its unusual design, the analysis is forced to accept claims stated in the beginning of the dissertation, which are, moreover, rather self-evident. This could be remedied by engaging arguments from literature claiming that technology is replacing HUMINT. This is, however, not done. Overall, the original intention was clearly good, however, the initial hypothesis lacks nuance, which renders it rather self-evident.