

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	Glasgow 2682012 DCU 21110999 Charles 15072483 Trento
Dissertation Title	Powering up the European Union: Addressing the Energy Security Crisis

INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

	Late Submission Penalty no penalty
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: 20,906 Suggested Penalty: no penalty	

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

Final Agreed Mark. (Following correspondence reviewers should list the agreed final internal grade taking before and after any penalties to be applied).

Before Penalty: C3 [12] **After Penalty:** C3 [12]

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>	Satisfactory
• <i>Coherent set of research questions and/or hypothesis identified</i>	Satisfactory
• <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>	Satisfactory
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>	Good
• <i>Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument</i>	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>	Very Good
• <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 student has made substantial revisions to the dissertation and as a result there are improvements in many areas. The provision of a review of relevant literature is particularly welcome. The dissertation is well-structured and fluidly written. However, description frequently eclipses analysis.

There remains lingering issues regarding the originality of the puzzle. This can be attributed to the failure to identify a real gap in the literature which the dissertation will address.

The section devoted to methodology, including the definition and rationale for a case study approach, has also been greatly enhanced. However, the rationale for why this particular was chosen could have been more cogently established and a more fulsome explanation of how data was utilised in preparing the dissertation. But overall, this revised dissertation is a major advance on the earlier submission.

Reviewer 2

The student has undertaken significant desk-based research, and this is a substantially revised dissertation. The general structure is much improved, and the student has an easy-to-read writing style. The dissertation reflects a valid, albeit not highly original research puzzle. In part, this stems from limitations with the literature review, which concentrates more on the theoretical and definitions of energy security. Therefore, the real gap in the literature is never adequately established, and this has consequences for the research and dissertation focus more broadly.

The third research sub-question, 'Can these policies guarantee EU energy security?', is a problematic question as it takes the author into the realm of prediction rather than empirically evaluative study. This tells me that the dissertation itself is not rooted in the literature, but rather is based on a speculative interest in the topic and that the questions likely existed before a deep analysis of the literature took place. As a result, there is a tendency for the dissertation to take on more of a policy analysis approach.

In the methodology chapter, what is a case study is well defined, drawing on a range of literature and the decision to opt for a particular approach to the case study is well made. However, I would suggest that the justification for the specific case study is not itself established, linking back to the point I made about the research question being established first. The student also talks about using qualitative methods, but doesn't explore or explain these in any detail. A meaningful explanation how the data was analysed was missing.

While the dissertation was interesting to read, it did come across as quite descriptive and could have benefitted from more critical analysis. I feel that this harks back to the issues with the research question itself. There is still a lot of relevant work presented, with the student clearly engaging with the subject, but in terms of offering us something new or a revised take on the topic, I feel that the final output is lacking.

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

In terms of feed forward, I would encourage the student to broaden the initial literature review to establish a broader state of the art and from there start to narrow down the themes to identify a more unique research puzzle. I would also encourage the student to root the research in data that can be analysed and to stay away from predictive questions. There are many more original ways this topic could have been explored. For example, noting the EU's policy to repower itself, what challenges has it faced from within its own membership body and what does this mean for implementation of the policy? Secondary questions might ask what is driving these challenges? The literature review could easily establish differing attitudes among member states, indeed the student actually alludes to this in the dissertation as it is. Essentially, I feel that the dissertation offered more but undersold.