

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	Glasgow 2486672 DCU 19108222 Charles 46249444
Dissertation Title	The Securitization of Environmental Migration by the European Political Right

INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

Reviewer 1 Initial Grade <i>Select from drop down list</i>	Reviewer 2 Initial Grade <i>Select from drop down list</i>	Late Submission Penalty <i>no penalty</i>
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: 21796 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: A4 [19] **After Penalty:** A4 [19]

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>	Excellent
• <i>Coherent set of research questions and/or hypothesis identified</i>	Excellent
• <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>	Excellent
• <i>Application of theory and/or concepts</i>	Very 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>	Excellent
• <i>Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument</i>	Excellent
• <i>Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence</i>	Excellent
• <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>	Very Good
• <i>Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation</i>	Very Good
• <i>Consistent and accurate referencing (including complete bibliography)</i>	Excellent
• <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

This is an extremely high quality thesis which demonstrates an excellent capacity for primary research. The topic is original and timely and is, in my view also, one of the first systematic empirical studies of its kind (as noted by the author). The research question is clearly set out (p.7) and remains consistent throughout. The research design and methodology make sense and the limits in terms of sample size (two cases only - the British Conservative Party and French FN/RN) are acknowledged. While, due to the dearth of comparable empirical studies, it is not possible to generalise these findings in any way, this is noted and avenues for further research to complement this 'exploratory study' are proposed. The discussions and treatment of relevant theories and concepts (securitisation theory, including the Paris School; the non-homogeneity of the political right; the application of the concept of 'ecobordering') is insightful and well placed. The overall argument is very convincing and flows logically from the findings presented. The nuance provided in this regard, in the form of the 'caveats' provided to suggest reasons for the somewhat unexpected findings in relation to the FN/RN is a key strength and also points to fascinating avenues for further research.

Overall, the thesis demonstrates an excellent capacity for critical reflection and analysis, both in terms of theory and in terms of its application to the empirical findings. It is extremely well written in a clear and engaging style although there are some very minor typographical errors here and there which a careful final edit would have helped eliminate. It is correctly referenced throughout although the bibliography is a little incomplete in places (notably in relation to some of the journal articles cited).

Reviewer 2

This dissertation provides an analysis of the extent to which environmental migration has been a focus for securitisation by right wing parties, through a discourse analysis of manifestos, party programmes and websites and interventions in parliamentary debates by two right-wing parties - the British Conservative Party (mainstream right) and the French Rassemblement National (far right). The study is well conceived, timely and significant and set within an impressive review of the existing theoretical and thematic literatures. It is generally well written and easy to read, although a careful proof read could have dealt with a rather frequent set of grammatical errors and poorly selected terms.

The discussion of securitisation theories, their critique and extension through the work of the Copenhagen School, the Paris School and second-generation securitisation scholarship is one of the most thorough and clearly expressed that I have read, and makes good links to the topic and focus of the study at hand.

The introductory chapters make a good case for a narrower approach to securitisation moves and speech acts, via discourse analysis, as the focus of this study and a clear, manageable and relevant research question is identified.

The discussion of far-right politics and definition of conservatism versus far-right parties is helpful, although perhaps somewhat truncated. More could have been said here about the apparent contradiction between parties and actors which tend to profess a sceptical attitude to climate change and environmental emergency on the one hand and an assumption on the other

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

that these same actors would mobilise the prospect of an imminent and considerably increased migration driven by environmental change as a security threat. This contradiction is returned to in the conclusion of the dissertation and becomes a central argument differentiating between the two parties studied and also explaining the lower prevalence of securitising moves than had been hypothesised. However, I feel this could have been addressed more consistently and earlier in the work.

The research design and methodology is generally sound and discussed in some detail. However, I did wonder a little about the selection of cases. A clear justification is provided for the additional insight gained by including both a far right and a more mainstream conservative party, and it is also argued that a cross national comparison adds value to the study. However, since only one of each type of party is selected and there is no discussion of the different electoral and parliamentary systems of France and Great Britain, nor of their differing political histories and socio-political trends, then it is hard to see what the cross-national comparison brings. Instead it perhaps clouds the comparison between mainstream and far-right as we do not know how the different national contexts may influence the differences discussed and attributed primarily to the different positioning on a right-wing spectrum.

The explanation of the two time periods chosen for the study, also could have been a little more clear and convincing for me. The discussion on pp. 41-42 notes the importance of an extended time period in order to uncover whether there are particular trends and trajectories over time, and this is clear in the analysis. However, why the gap between 2014 and 2018. Was this just about gathering a manageable data set, before and after the events of 2015-17 which are seen as a catalyst for further increases in securitisation of migration/environment issues?

The empirical chapters are very interesting and present carefully gathered and analysed material from a wide range of sources. The student deals well with an unexpected finding, which appears to contradict their original thesis, namely that the securitisation of environmental migration has not been as prominent or extensive as expected, especially in the data from the RN.

The data analysis is quite thorough and throws up some fascinating insights, not least about the trend towards 'eco bordering' on the far right and the different ways in which environmental issues and migration are brought together for example through discourses on environmental degradation. Nonetheless, at points I found myself a little leary of claims that there was a clear trend towards securitisation in the discourses and data analysed. In some instances it did seem a little as though the analysis assumed rather than found this and data were slightly forced into a predetermined scheme. For example, where the issue of cross-party agreement on some aspects of environmental migration was discussed (pp. 74-5) I was not sure that this proved 'a securitising move and a receptive audience'. Are we to assume that the Green/Labour party politicians were the audience for conservative party speech acts, and that they took up a similar stance as a result of these? It seems likely that there are a variety of other influences involved.

The conclusions are very well written and convincing, with a nuanced discussion of both the expected and more unexpected findings. Overall then, and the more critical points above notwithstanding, this is an excellent piece of work, and one that is enjoyable and interesting to read.