

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	Glasgow 2338230 DCU 17116422 Charles 45372863
Dissertation Title	Popular Culture Television Productions & Securitization Narratives: A Case Study of Turkey From 2016 Onwards

INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

Reviewer 1 Initial Grade <i>For internal use only</i>	Reviewer 2 Initial Grade <i>For internal use only</i>	Late Submission Penalty <i>no penalty</i>
Word Count Penalty (1 UofG grade point per 500 words below/above the min/max word limit +/- 10%)		
Word Count: 23553 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: B2 [16] **After Penalty:** B2 [16]

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>	Very Good
• <i>Appropriate methodology and evidence of effective organisation of work</i>	Satisfactory
• <i>Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions</i>	Very Good
• <i>Application of theory and/or concepts</i>	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>	Very Good
• <i>Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument</i>	Good
• <i>Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence</i>	Very Good
• <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>	Excellent
• <i>Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation</i>	Excellent
• <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
• <i>Appropriate word count</i>	Yes

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Reviewer 1

There is a general sense that this thesis could have benefited from a stronger set of data to substantiate the claims advanced by the candidate. The sighted draft looks at a rather original puzzle yet it required, in my views, some extra explanations as to how analytical focus on Turkey does actually facilitate addressing the wider conceptual points made here. It is the lack of analytical clarity and methodological rigour that prevent this dissertation to achieve the ambitious objectives stated in the introduction.

Reviewer 2

The thesis has a strong conceptual point and largely succeeds in validating to. The link between securitization and popular media content is refreshing and the author presents the importance of the connection aptly and persuasively. The author supports the claim by pointing to relevant historical examples of governments influencing (or outright manipulating) the content of popular TV series to support their specific agenda (though this reviewer would actually like to read a more careful explication of the link between TV stations and U.S. government in connection to the post-9/11 series that are mentioned). The conceptual acumen of the thesis is, however, partially undercut by two elements: Firstly, the explanatory ambition in case of Turkey goes simply too far. While the entertainment education-securitization theory link works well and can definitely be analyzed through discourse analysis, the same is not true about the purported analysis of the effects of the discourse(s) on actual policies. Here, the author evidently misses data (or methods) that could substantiate the alleged causal chain. The dissertation would have been better off had it focused more complexly and in a better structured way on the link between the government and TV discourses. Secondly, while the dissertation's intent and overall structure is clear, the details of the methodology and analytical framework are much less persuasively presented. An analysis of this kind would certainly benefit from a clearly identified dataset and an in-depth characterisation of the research and analytical method.