

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	Glasgow 2629573 DCU 21109389 Charles 41412389
Dissertation Title	Disinformation in France: A Strategy of Information Warfare in the Digital Age

Word Count: 20,474		

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

Final Agreed Mark : D2 [10]

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>	Satisfactory
• <i>Appropriate methodology and evidence of effective organisation of work</i>	Poor
• <i>Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions</i>	Weak
• <i>Application of theory and/or concepts</i>	Poor
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>	Satisfactory
• <i>Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument</i>	Poor
• <i>Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence</i>	Weak
• <i>Accuracy of factual data</i>	Good
C. Academic Style	
This refers to your ability to write in a formal academic manner	
• <i>Appropriate formal and clear writing style</i>	Good
• <i>Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation</i>	Good
• <i>Consistent and accurate referencing (including complete bibliography)</i>	Good
• <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

The dissertation seeks to analyze disinformation campaigns in France, focusing on far-right extremism. The conceptual framework is too broad and does not follow a clear logic, allowing its straightforward application to the analyzed case. Although relevant literature is included, I would expect much broader reach that would enable the dissertation to engage with other key piece of literature on the topic. Thematic analysis is used to process the evidence, with the themes being appropriately contextualized. The topical structure is, however, inadequately flat despite the considerable empirical richness of the issue. In other words, two thematic categories cannot operationalize the studied phenomenon on their own. Hence, the presented treatment is at best partial. Empirically, the material is selective and, hence, not representative. The conclusion is self-evident, only strengthening the fact that the analysis did not deliver on the research goals. Overall, the dissertation fails methodologically and barely satisfies the requirements. That being said, some empirical insights are provided.

Reviewer 2

In the introduction, I had difficulty understanding whether this was about disinformation in general or whether disinformation facilitated the rise of far-right parties/candidates to rise. The introduction meanders before getting to concrete points on p 8. If anything the questions are too wide ranging—the author is trying to do too much, particularly by linking disinformation in campaigns to security studies

Chapter2 is a bit too broad and covers well known literature—it potentially distracts from the topic on disinformation in a French campaign.

Chapter 3: Parts of the methodology section is repetitive from the introduction. Some attempt is made to justify the case but a bit more putting the French 2022 election in comparative context (cross-national, cross-time) would have aided the justification. Too much of the methodology section discusses well known aspects of the methodology of thematic analysis rather than justifies document selection and how they get at the specific research questions asked in the introductory section.

Chapter 4 goes back into grand theory distracting the reader from the case—some of this work is interesting but a clearer link between concepts (e.g. “othering”) should be brought into the conversation—otherwise it reads like an unlinked encyclopaedia article.

Chapter 5-- Again, too much basic background. Returning to my comments for chapter 4, both chapters read like distinct pieces rather than melded together—the link between theory and case therefore gets muddled.

Chapter 6 moves completely away from the French case—a “wider context of the work” section is perfectly permissible and can even strengthen the project, but it reads autonomously from Chapters 4-5 and detracts from the key questions asked in the introduction.