

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	Glasgow 2409263 DCU 18114156 Charles 13092509
Dissertation Title	The (ab)use of ontological insecurity as an instrument of political mobilization and power-consolidation/legitimization within the Visegrád countries since 2015

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: 22822 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: B1 [17] **After Penalty:** B1 [17]

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>	Very Good
• <i>Coherent set of research questions and/or hypothesis identified</i>	Very 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>	Very Good
• <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>	Very 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

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

- *Appropriate word count*

Yes

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Reviewer 1

This thesis examines the framing of migration issue by the V4 states. The contrast of this position with a 'Western European' framing is somewhat problematic given the variety of positions that these countries have taken on the issue - Austria, Italy, the Netherlands, Denmark and even at different times Germany. The literature review and discussion of methodology reflect a careful engagement with the relevant academic literature and consideration of both the strengths and limitations of the approach. Though from this reader's perspective the added value of 'ontological security' remains moot, could the RQ have been answered using conventional securitisation theory? The Hungary case study is comprehensive and well put together. Does the Fidesz government need to maintain the migrant crisis frame indefinitely or can it transfer it's securitisation onto other sources of ontological insecurity - irredentism? Europeanisation? etc The Polish case raises a different but related question, why, given the tiny numbers involved, was the securitisation of migration successful? In the Czech case, are there other factors that explain these shifts? What was the relative importance of the migration rhetoric. For Slovakia, the Roma population is very significant as part of both the popular and political discourse. Does the relative failure of migration rhetoric in Slovakia tell us something about the limits on governments ability to frame something as a threat? Indeed the evidence presented points to a much more nuanced and diverse set of responses and effects of the migration crisis that the framing of the question as V4 v the West suggests. Part of the story not told here is the interaction between the EU-V4 but also the broader media environment that exposed the publics in Poland, Czechia & Slovakia to a sense of crisis which in reality had little to do with their lived experience.

Reviewer 2

The dissertation explores how securitisation of migration has been used by the governments of the Visegrad region to consolidate of legitimise power and/or political mobilisation. It is a valid question and one that has not adequately been explored by non-region specific scholars or undertaken in a limited and misunderstood context where Visegrad attitudes towards migration is assumed to be driven by collective shared positions and attitudes. So, a study which looks at this issue on a individual level is welcomed. Although I say that the topic has been somewhat under-explored it does not mean however that a lack of attention is altogether missing. the Hungarian and Polish cases in particular have attracted significant attention by the international scholarly community, but often in the context of understanding populism. The central research question of this work is not a million miles away from falling in line with this approach. I find the use of ontological security very interesting, but it is not clear how the student can use this study to help us better understand the conceptual approach. A more advanced critical analysis might also have allowed you to really question claims such as the fact that Visegrad states adopted a securitization of the collective self through assimilation - it could be argued that yes there was a securitization of the collective self but that was done through a rejection of the other. Although there is a good literature review of the theoretical positions and concepts, there is a lack of a comprehensive state of the art discussion on Visegrad attitudes towards migration and while some of this gets picked up in the case study chapters, I would have expected a review of this to help establish the research angle and gap much more clearly than was done. Generally speaking the empirical chapters covering the 4 cases was well done, but the Hungarian case was clearly given more attention , although care needs to be taken with regard to making unsubstantiated claims such as "most Western leaders regard him [Orban] as 'the enemy within'". Understanding the drivers of

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

FIDESZ policy and leadership speech acts towards migration is highly complex and internal dynamics vis-à-vis the FIDESZvJobbik dynamic appear to have been overlooked. The other case studies do provide quality overviews of the situations, but critical analysis could have been stronger. There was scope to use the conclusion more effectively for this. The links with an idea of V4-West divide was also underexplored in part perhaps because it is actually quite difficult to confirm a divide in attitude. Migration is a contentious issue regardless of the country being examined. Overall though there was a lot of good research in this dissertation and the student certainly helps to illuminate the V4 countries' positions. But there was also scope for enhanced and more nuanced analysis and conceptual contribution.