

Research Issues 2

RSC811 - Task 2

Prepared by
Abdulaziz Alarfaj



Part
01

عنوان البحث - Research Title

Assignment : Critique of Research Paper in Terms of

theoretical framework تقييم الاطار النظري

Article Chosen :

“Cybersecurity: What About U.S. Policy?” by Lawrence J. Trautman

<https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm?abstractid=2548561>

Part
01

١. شمولية الأدبيات

Comprehensiveness of Literature Review**Criteria:**

Does the thesis cover key theories, historical context, and gaps in cybersecurity policy?

Are multiple perspectives (e.g., legal, technological, political) included?

Evaluation of Trautman's Paper:**Strengths:**

Reviews U.S. cybersecurity laws (2002–2014), NSA/DHS roles, and private-sector challenges.

Cites interdisciplinary sources (law, tech, economics) like Schneier, Zittrain, and NIST frameworks.

Weaknesses:

Lacks global comparisons (e.g., EU's GDPR or China's cyber sovereignty).

Minimal discussion of grassroots/activist perspectives (e.g., Edward Snowden's leaks).

Score: 3/4 (Comprehensive but misses non-U.S. and non-governmental viewpoints).

Part
02

٢. ترابط الافكار

Coherence of Ideas**Criteria:**

Logical flow between sections (problem → analysis → solutions).

Clear connections between theories and evidence.

Evaluation:**Strengths:**

Clear progression: (1) Threat urgency → (2) Policy gaps → (3) Legislative solutions.

Uses the Ebola analogy consistently to unify arguments.

Weaknesses:

Jumps between constituencies (consumers, businesses, government) without transitions.

Ends abruptly with Appendix (CAE list) unrelated to core arguments.

Score: 2.5/3 (Strong logic but minor disconnects).

Part
03

٣. مبررات اختيار الموضوع وأهمية الدراسة

Criteria:

Reliance on peer-reviewed, authoritative, or primary sources.

Balance between academic and practical/policy sources.

Evaluation:**Strengths:**

Cites U.S. laws, NSA reports, and Harvard/Stanford scholars (e.g., Jonathan Zittrain).

Uses government documents (e.g., Executive Orders, NIST frameworks).

Weaknesses:

Over-reliance on U.S. government/national security sources (potential bias).

Few peer-reviewed journal articles (most are reports or speeches).

Score: 2/3 (Authoritative but lacks academic diversity).

Part
04

٤. التقييم العام

Final Grade & Suggestions for Improvement

Total: 7.5/10 (Good but could be stronger).

To Improve:

Add global perspectives (e.g., EU's ENISA, UN cyber norms).

Strengthen transitions between sections.

Include more peer-reviewed studies (e.g., from *Journal of Cybersecurity*).