IMSISS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	**Glasgow** 2401147 **DCU** 18114636 **Charles** 31882768
Dissertation Title	The 'Uploading' and 'Downloading' of the European Union's Counterterrorism 'Prevent' Policy 2005-2016: A British Case Study

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: 21,986 ***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: B3 [15] ***After Penalty:*** B3 [15]

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

IMSISS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

• *Appropriate word count*	Yes

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Reviewer 1

This dissertation aims to understand the degree to which UK and EU counter-terrorism policies mutually inform and shape one another, taking the UK's 'Prevent' strategy as a case study. Overall, the study is of good quality: the research topic begins from an interesting premise, exploring the scalar and interactive nature of policy formation and development between member states and multilateral institutions; and provides a reasonably clear overview of the proposed analysis. While the dissertation shows evidence of engagement with relevant material, there is an over-reliance throughout on extended direct quotations, presented at times with limited contextualisation or analytical development. This makes evidence of the author's own evaluation of competing theories or application of these ideas more difficult to discern. Although rich and detailed in parts, sections of the empirical analysis are presented episodically and in a highly descriptive way: stronger evidence of engagement with, and organisation of, this evidence and a clearer presentation of the central argument, would have added value. Analytically, the full potential of a longitudinal study is not entirely realised, as much of the discussion of findings and conclusion collapses the evidence into a single temporal period (despite the fact that the relationship between the UK and EU evolved in important ways between 2005 and 2016). Although generally clearly written, also a relatively higher number of errors in referencing throughout (no page numbers, inconsistencies in bibliography).

Reviewer 2

The dissertation explores the mutual influence of the UK and EU on their respective counter-terrorism strategies. There are many positive elements to the dissertation, but also some weaknesses which need to be acknowledged. The dissertation engages with appropriate literature in a positive and meaningful way; however, the literature is also somewhat dated. There is a substantial literature on UK and EU counter terrorism so identifying an original angle is not straightforward and as a result the dissertation does suffer from limitations of originality, despite claims to the contrary and the suggestion that the research questions warrant answering because of a lack of literature. The uploading and downloading of policy that underpins the two research questions adequately reinforces the use of Europeanisation as a theoretical approach. However, the student claims that the lack of a deep analysis using Europeanisation can be viewed in the literature and that this is reflected in the central literature gap and therefore justifies the research questions. Yet, it would also have been prudent to ask why, when Europeanisation is such a prevalent policy analysis theory has it not been adequately explored by other authors. We can see that Argomaniz 2009 is used to justify the ‘absence of theoretically informed analyses’ but this literature is more than 10 years old. Building on this by drawing upon more recent literature may have elicited different findings perhaps? On the positive side, the theoretical explanation of Europeanisation is well put together. The research design chapter is also well set out with clear explanation for why the UK makes a suitable if not important comparison case, although the way in which the documentation was analysed could have been explained more clearly. The main historical section of the dissertation is well written, although the empirical findings chapter adopts a structure that is highly repetitive and fails to pick up on a holistic review and often reflects more the early years of the case study timeline, rather than looking at some of the more recent developments closer to 2016. Although there was some reference to Julian King’s leadership of the EU conference in 2016, there is nothing to clearly evidence that King – the UK Commissioner was working to further UK government policy preferences. Of course this is not to

IMSISS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

say that this didn't happen, bearing in mind that King is a long term UK diplomat – but what is presented here is more speculation that evidenced findings. Overall, I would argue that despite ethe limitations of the dissertation in terms of use of literature and some structural challenges, there is sufficient evidence to warrant attainment of the main ILOS. A research topic has been identified, there has been critical engagement (though could have gone further) with the scholarship, a theoretical approach has been established and recognition of limitations of the research are set out. For the oral defence I would encourage the reviewer to question the student on what he/she feels is the main original contribution of their work and in what body of literature would it best sit - europeanisation/eu policy literature or security studies and why?