IMSISS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	**Glasgow** 2338864 **DCU** 17116520 **Charles** 65281550
Dissertation Title	The Global War on Terror and Macrosecuritisation: An Analysis of U.S. Discourse at the United Nations General Assembly Post-9/11

INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

Reviewer 1 Initial Grade *For internal use only*	*Reviewer 2 Initial Grade* *For internal use only*	*Late Submission Penalty* *no penalty*

Word Count Penalty *(1 UofG grade point per 500 words below/above the min/max word limit +/- 10%)*

Word Count: 20,607 **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: A5 [18]   **After Penalty:** A5 [18]

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	
• *Originality of topic*	Excellent
• *Coherent set of research questions and/or hypothesis identified*	Excellent
• *Appropriate methodology and evidence of effective organisation of work*	Excellent
• *Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions*	Very Good
• *Application of theory and/or concepts*	Excellent
B. Use of Source Material This refers to your skills to select and use relevant information and data in a correct manner	
• *Evidence of reading and review of published literature*	Excellent
• *Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument*	Very Good
• *Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence*	Very Good
• *Accuracy of factual data*	Very Good
C. Academic Style This refers to your ability to write in a formal academic manner	
• *Appropriate formal and clear writing style*	Excellent
• *Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation*	Excellent
• *Consistent and accurate referencing (including complete bibliography)*	Excellent
• *Is the dissertation free from plagiarism?*	Yes
• *Evidence of ethics approval included (if required based on methodology)*	Not required

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

• *Appropriate word count*	Yes

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Reviewer 1

The dissertation intends to investigate the discoursive macro-securitisation framework established by the U.S. officials after 9/11. From theoretical and methodological standpoint, the paper stands on sound foundations, both in terms of resources and their understanding. That said, there is, however, an incongruence between the aim and the empirical base entering the analysis. Although I understand the argument that the UNGA is a potentially appropriate location for undertaking a macro-level research, I would argue that to show the emergence of a global/universal securitisation effort more empirical material would be required. Additionally, the dissertation would benefit from incorporating other cases of the supposed macro-securitisation sourced from different contexts. This would seem to be an appropriate way of triangulating the phenomenon's existence. Both conceptually and methodologically, this is a sincere effort, however the overall macro argument is slightly less convincing.

Reviewer 2

This is a very interesting and rich dissertation, exploring how American political elites attempted to promote the macro-securitisation of the war on terror through the United Nations General Assembly. The topic is highly original, both substantially, with hardly any empirical investigations of a macro-securitisation which represents a gap in the literature, any theoretically, as a systematic attempt to study the mechanics of threat constructions through speech acts, in a more rigorous way than the Copenhangen School prescribes (relying on a basic form of discourse analysis). The execution is profeccient, the writing fluent and the overall narrative coherent, offering a convinving answer to the research question. Where the dissertation raises some questions has to do with the selection of empirical sources, with only two prominent elites and a handful of speeches coded for this attempt. The extent to which we can derive broader conclusions about the global war on terror through such a small sample is limited, particularly since the frames advocated in the UN forum are only a small part of a much bigger attempt to securitise terrorism and legitimise extraordinary responses. Some of these contextual factors are touched upon in the dissertation, indicating a recognition that both discursive and non-discursive (see Paris School) techniques combine to frame an issue. This requires some caveats about the empirical findings but does not take anything away from the value added in zooming in on one particular dimension of the securitisation process. Overall, the dissertation, despite limitations, is well crafted and indicative of a strong analytical mind.