

## SECINTEL Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

|                                  |   |                  |
|----------------------------------|---|------------------|
| <b>Student Matriculation No.</b> | Glasgow 2277253   | Charles 79830727 |
| <b>Dissertation Title</b>        | Securitisation of Islam and Counterterrorism Policy in France |                  |

### INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Glasgow Marker</b><br><i>Office Use</i> | <b>Charles Marker</b><br><i>Office Use</i> | <b>Charles Additional Info</b><br><i>Please advise ranking</i> |
|--|--|--|

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

**Final Agreed Mark. Markers should make reference to the Joint Charles University-University of Glasgow Grade Conversion Table**

C1 [14]    C [Good]

### DISSERTATION FEEDBACK

| Assessment Criteria  | Rating       |
|--|--------------|
| <b>A. Structure and Development of Answer</b>  |              |
| 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>                                  | Very Good    |
| • <i>Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions</i>                           | Good         |
| • <i>Application of theory and/or concepts</i>   | Good         |
| <b>B. Use of Source Material</b>   |              |
| 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>  | Very Good    |
| <b>C. Academic Style</b>   |              |
| This refers to your ability to write in a formal academic manner   |              |
| • <i>Appropriate formal and clear writing style</i>  | Satisfactory |
| • <i>Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation</i>  | Satisfactory |
| • <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 |
| • <i>Appropriate word count</i>  | Yes          |

## SECINTEL Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

### ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

#### **Glasgow Marker**

This is an interesting dissertation that focuses on an important political issue - the securitisation of Islam in contemporary France. The author begins with a clear overview of securitisation theory and some of the literature on the securitisation of Islam. This is followed by a similarly clear research design and a competently executed empirical analysis of elite discourse about the terrorist threat in France.

There are, however, several issues with this dissertation which mean that it doesn't hang together as a cohesive piece of research. The first issue is that the author doesn't fully demonstrate clear links between the different discursive strategies they identify in their analysis chapter and the wider securitisation of Islam in France. Indeed, it isn't clear that their research design can fully support such an empirical claim, since it focuses on elite discourse rather than wider audience acceptance of this discourse. Second, the introduction of Van Leeuwen's framework for identifying different discursive strategies is an interesting contribution, but both underdeveloped (in that the different categories are only briefly explained) and not fully integrated into the theoretical framework and/or methodology for this research (i.e. it is unclear why it first appears in the analysis chapter). Third, the dissertation does have some grammar and word choice problems throughout, which is probably the result of the author not leaving enough time to proof-read and redraft the text before submission. Fortunately this doesn't result in any major confusions about what the author was attempting to say.

Overall, this is a good piece of research in which the author does a good job of presenting new empirical material in an analytical and at times illuminating manner. Sadly, however, it doesn't quite live up to its initial promise.

#### **Charles Marker**

This dissertation focuses on a politically as well as intellectually very relevant issue of France's acceptance of emergency measures against terrorism. The author tries to identify the securitisation discourse legitimising the emergency measures.

The text builds on a competent introduction of the securitisation theory and a literature review.

Van Leeuwen's conceptual framework is adequately utilised to structure the empirical analysis.

Though I appreciate the author's rigorous approach that points out the discursive figures legitimising the introduction of emergency measures, the overall argument lacks sufficient depth.

Moreover, the connection between the legitimisation of emergency measures and securitisation of Islam is somewhat underexplored.

The text suffers from quite a few formal and stylistic deficiencies. It is apparent that the author was completing the work in a rush and did not have sufficient time for the final polishing.

Although this dissertation leaves something to be desired, it is a piece of writing that is accessible to the reader, brings interesting information, and proves the author's research competences.

### Charles University > University of Glasgow Grade Conversion

| CU General Grade        | Grade Specification for Conversion | Percentage | UoG equivalent    |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|-------------------|
| <b>A - excellent</b>    | Excellent upper (1)                | 100 – 96   | 22 (A1) Excellent |
|                         | Excellent lower (2)                | 95 - 91    | 19 (A4) Excellent |
| <b>B – very good</b>    | Very good upper (1)                | 90 - 86    | 17 (B1) Very Good |
|                         | Very good lower (2)                | 85 – 81    | 16 (B2) Very Good |
| <b>C - good</b>         | Good upper (1)                     | 80 – 76    | 15 (B3) Very Good |
|                         | Good lower (2)                     | 75 – 71    | 14 (C1) Good      |
| <b>D - satisfactory</b> | Satisfactory upper (1)             | 70 – 66    | 13 (C2) Good      |

### SECINTEL Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

|                       |                        |         |                      |
|-----------------------|------------------------|---------|----------------------|
|                       | Satisfactory lower (2) | 65 – 61 | 12 (C3) Good         |
| <b>E - sufficient</b> | Sufficient upper (1)   | 60 - 56 | 11 (D1) Satisfactory |
|                       | Sufficient lower (2)   | 55 – 51 | 9 (D3) Satisfactory  |
| <b>F - fail</b>       |                        | 50 – 0  | 8 (E1) Weak          |

#### University of Glasgow > Charles University Grade Conversion

| UofG General Grade | Grade Specification for Conversion | Percentage | CU equivalent    |
|--------------------|------------------------------------|------------|------------------|
| <b>A1-A3</b>       | Excellent upper (1)                | 100 – 96   | A - Excellent    |
| <b>A4-A5</b>       | Excellent lower (2)                | 95 - 91    | A - Excellent    |
| <b>B1</b>          | Very good upper (1)                | 90 - 86    | B – Very Good    |
| <b>B2</b>          | Very good lower (2)                | 85 – 81    | B – Very Good    |
| <b>B3</b>          | Good upper (1)                     | 80 – 76    | C - Good         |
| <b>C1</b>          | Good lower (2)                     | 75 – 71    | C - Good         |
| <b>C2</b>          | Satisfactory upper (1)             | 70 – 66    | D - Satisfactory |
| <b>C3</b>          | Satisfactory lower (2)             | 65 – 61    | D - Satisfactory |
| <b>D1</b>          | Sufficient upper (1)               | 60 - 56    | E - Sufficient   |
| <b>D2-D3</b>       | Sufficient lower (2)               | 55 – 51    | E - Sufficient   |
| <b>E1-H</b>        |                                    | 50 – 0     | F - Fail         |

## SECINTEL Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

**Notes for Markers:** When grading the SECINTEL Dissertation markers are asked to reflect upon the aims and learning outcomes for the dissertation. Each dissertation should also adopt a clear security focus reflecting the relevant programme pathway

**Aims:** The course aims to provide students with independent research opportunities. It will include engagement with research methods training leading up to a period of independent research and the production of a substantial dissertation that builds upon themes and issues covered within the MSc International Security, Intelligence and Strategic Studies. Students will be encouraged to develop their own ideas and demonstrate their capacity for original thought and independent research. The dissertation element aims to enable students to identify and research particular issues or problems, linked to security, intelligence and strategy, at a deeper level than is possible within assessed essays and to develop a critical analysis of the existing body of academic work relating to their topic of choice. Students taking this course will be prepared for further research, study or professional careers through the development of their skills in data collection and analysis, use of original and secondary sources and the conducting and writing up of a detailed research project.

**Intended Learning outcomes:** By the end of the dissertation, students will be able to:

- > Devise a realistic programme of research on a topic reflecting the main themes of the programme;
- > Collect, select and critically analyse relevant background literature and arguments of a range of scholars;
- > Understand and select the appropriate methodology for dealing with information sources and data;
- > Apply these methods to gather and interrogate data in an open-minded, rigorous and undogmatic manner;
- > Be able to critically evaluate competing theories and apply relevant theoretical frameworks to guide the study
- > Organise the data collected and analyse the findings in a competent manner that allows for a fluid and logical argument to be presented;
- > Be reflexive and self-critical about findings and the limitations of analysis;
- > Work independently, organising and maintaining own programme of study to meet academic deadlines so as to produce work containing a substantial element of originality.

### **Word Count:**

Dissertations should be 20,000 words in length for students undertaking work-placement as part of the independent study portfolio and 22,000 words in length for standard dissertation students. Word counts exclude the title page, abstract, contents, bibliography and appendices). There is a 10% leeway for words above the upper limit, but no leeway for dissertation that fall under the word requirement. All dissertations must display an accurate word-count including the citations, footnotes/endnotes and chapter/section titles. One point (on the Glasgow 22-point scale) will be deducted for each 750 words under the minimum or over the 10% upper limit.

### **Language:**

The dissertation **must** be written in British English. A Czech Language cover page / abstract may be included

### **Late Submission Penalty:**

Dissertations that do not have an extension or are submitted after an extension deadline are subject to a penalty of 2 secondary bands per day (this includes weekends and holidays) on the Glasgow grading Scale.

### **Plagiarism:**

Dissertations which suffer from excessive (e.g. serious and/or deliberate) plagiarism will be subject to a grade of 0/Fail and be referred to the appropriate authorities at both universities. Dissertations that contain some elements of plagiarism, but which are deemed not to be excessive (e.g. minor instances that are not considered deliberate) based on consultation of both internal markers, should be graded accordingly and will be subject to scrutiny from the external examiner and could still result in a mark of 0 as well as referral to appropriate authorities for disciplinary action.

### **Consultation prior to final grading:**

First marking by both institutions should be completed blind with no prior consultation. Once both markers have graded the dissertation and provided written comments, they should consult on the grading and come to a joint final grade, taking into consideration any late submission or excessive word count penalty. It is the responsibility of the Glasgow marker to oversee this. Where markers cannot come to a joint agreement then the dissertation should be referred to the Programme Convenors at Glasgow and Charles (Dr. Eamonn Butler & Dr Vít Střítecký). The external examiner will be used to moderate any dissertation in this position and the comments referred back to the internal markers for confirmation.