IMSISS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	**Glasgow** 2395241 **DCU** 18114199 **Charles** 23868276
Dissertation Title	The puzzle in the Turkish Foreign Policy decision-making process: Beyond the nexus of continuities and changes

INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

Reviewer 1 Initial Grade	*Reviewer 2 Initial Grade*	*Late Submission Penalty*
Select from drop down list	*Select from drop down list*	*Select from drop down list*

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: 21057 **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:** Select from drop down list

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*	Very Good
• *Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions*	Very Good
• *Application of theory and/or concepts*	Very Good
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*	Excellent
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*	Very Good
• *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

• *Appropriate word count*	Yes

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Reviewer 1

This was a well-theorised and elaborately constructed piece, showing a high level of analytical sophistication. The introduction delineated the research conundrum: visible continuities and changes in Turkish foreign policy since the end of the Cold War and factors contributing to change. Chapter 2 was a viable literature review. Chapter 3 explained the research design and theoretical approach. It argued that, using Putnam's 'Two-Level-Games' and Mintz's Poliheuristic theory, the dissertation could account holistically for different aspects of continuity and change in Turkish foreign policy. These theories were then tested using three case-studies: Operation Peace Spring, the S-400 deal, and the TurkStream Agreement. They were chosen because the theories concerned claim to be able to deal with issues of greater and smaller significance, and testing different political, economic and other factors in decision-making. The theory is visibly applied in all the cases. Whether because of the choice of case-studies or for other reasons, there was more focus on explaining change - and the type of change - than reasons for continuity. There was more adjustment than radical change, we are told. Therefore, one would expect that the relatively high levels of continuity would need to be explained. They are not, but are rather assumed. Furthermore, empirical evidence was obviously hit by the coronavirus crisis. Good amounts of newspaper or other media articles, and expert secondary sources, were used. Possibly, lack of Turkish-language materials could have been highlighted as a drawback to the analysis. Please also, in future, use page numbers in the dissertation.

Reviewer 2

The dissertation presents a competently constructed analysis of Turkish foreign policy. It poses two research questions. First one asks whether the recent changes in Turkey's foreign policy are radical changes or merely adjustment changes. The second question deals with factors contributing to the formation of Turkey's foreign policy. The major advantage of this work is its professionally advanced structure. The research puzzle is identified in an extensive literature review. The chapter covering research design and theory justifies the use of exploratory case studies, describes in great detail the analytical framework of Putnam's two-level game and Mintz's poliheuristic theory, and identifies limitations of this approaches. The analytical frameworks are subsequently applied in case studies.

Weaker parts of the dissertation are in the relationship between the research questions and the theoretical approaches and in dealing with the empirical cases. As for the former, the theoretical approaches are directly related to the second research question (contributing factors); however, it is not sufficiently clear how the theory can be used to address the first question about continuity and change. The author's argument about adjustment changes in Turkey's foreign policy lacks persuasiveness due to missing comparison with the previous era. Moreover, the case studies could be more generous in providing empirical substantiation for the theoretical claims.