

## IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

**Student Matriculation No.** **Glasgow** 2574650C **DCU** 20109831 **Charles**  
65540906 **Trento**

**Dissertation Title** The Securitisation of Migration: contradictory speeches and practices on migration management in Brazil

### INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

**Reviewer 1 Initial Grade** **Reviewer 2 Initial Grade** **Late Submission Penalty**  
B1 B1 n/a

**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:** 21.871 **Suggested Penalty:** NA

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

### DISSERTATION FEEDBACK

Assessment Criteria	Rating
<b>A. Structure and Development of Answer</b>	
This refers to your organisational skills and ability to construct an argument in a coherent and original manner	
• Originality of topic	Very good
• Coherent set of research questions and/or hypothesis identified	Very Good
• Appropriate methodology and evidence of effective organisation of work	Good
• Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions	Very good
• Application of theory and/or concepts	Very good
<b>B. Use of Source Material</b>	
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	Very good
• Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence	Very good
• Accuracy of factual data	Very good

## IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

### C. Academic Style

This refers to your ability to write in a formal academic manner

- |  |     |
|--|-----|
| • <i>Appropriate formal and clear writing style</i>                              | Yes |
| • <i>Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation</i>                              | Yes |
| • <i>Consistent and accurate referencing (including complete bibliography)</i>   | Yes |
| • <i>Is the dissertation free from plagiarism?</i>                               | Yes |
| • <i>Evidence of ethics approval included (if required based on methodology)</i> |     |
| • <i>Appropriate word count</i>  | Yes |

### ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

#### Reviewer 1

I enjoyed reading this thesis very much. I have appreciated the student's ability to choose an original topic and the student's ambition to contribute an original argument to the bulk of studies theorising and conceptualising security and securitisation. The thesis is well structured and the methodology adopted is appropriate. The argument made is logically constructed and in line with the argumentation chosen. The student has clearly engaged and read the relevant literature and scholarship. The selection of primary sources could have been, however, more accurate.

Overall, the argumentative line is clear and it is embedded in the scholarship of reference. Perhaps the abstract could have been better written and the argument better fleshed out in the abstract.

The introduction is clear in presenting the argument, which speaks to the contradiction between speech acts - which sideline securitization in favour of hospitality and solidarity - and the practical management of migration - which relies on securitization and criminalisation. The thesis argues that the reasons for such a contradiction are to be searched in history and long-term racialisation and post-colonial trajectories. Building on this, the student reverts back to the theory and a discussion of Copenhagen and Paris School and their theorisation of security and securitisation. While both schools are clearly important, a discussion of why these two schools were selected, would have been in order.

A thesis' point of strength is that the student had a different plan originally, whereby their thesis included interviews and fieldwork. As the student did not receive the REC's approval, the student was able to tweak the work otherwise, making it a successful more theoretically-gearred contribution to the theory and the many approaches to securitization with a case study. A point of weakness is that in chapter 2, the link between the discussion of CS and PS, and the case study, should have been better fleshed out - p. 18

Building on the empirics discussed, the concluding remarks could have been more nuanced. While the conclusion is interesting and speaks to the theory in a relevant and meaningful matter, it perhaps would have been better to argue that, in conclusion, the thesis's limited empirics reveal a contradiction that is worth exploring further. The conclusion that we do not need a speech act to see securitisation - and, by extension, that political rhetoric can be instrumental and not reflecting the real intents of policymakers - is too bold, I think. Limited empirics do not necessarily invalidate the correlation between speech acts and practices. Also, more context ought to be given about the relevance and meaningfulness of the speeches

## IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

selected. Perhaps, an investigation of speeches targeting regional audiences, from those regions most affected by the people's movements, might have revealed a different rhetoric and speech acts.

Overall, I would like to emphasise that this is a well-thought out and constructed thesis. It attains the intended learning outcomes, and it is clearly grounded on a close familiarity with a wide range of supporting scholarship and evidence, constructively utilised to reveal appreciable depth of understanding.

### **Reviewer 2**

This is a very good thesis and proved very enjoyable reading. The choice of the topic and its originality is well explained and consists in both a novel methodological approach, solidly grounded in the theoretical literature, and the geographic focus on a non-Western country, Brazil. The thesis sets out one clear research question 'To what extent do practices of securitisation reflect the content of political speeches?' (p. 8) and concludes that the contradictions between practices of securitisation and speeches are result of Brazil's migration history and (post)colonial past. The theoretical framework and discussion of empirical findings support this interpretation.

The thesis is very well written and well referenced throughout. It is also well structured, however, it could have balanced better theoretical and empirical components as the former is by far more extensive and convincing than the latter. Indeed, the empirical part is the weakest part of the thesis both in terms of the size of empirical data and analysis of it, which seems a bit rushed. But the fact that the student could not conduct interviews and fieldwork as planned and other Covid related research impediments which continued to exist during the student's period of work on the thesis, forcing the student to revise the initial research plans, should be taken into account.

The student demonstrates a very good knowledge and understanding of the relevant scholarship which is also selected and discussed in a very commendable way. There are, though, parts in which the thesis could have benefited from presenting better the selection of specific theoretical and interpretative approaches. In particular the thesis relies heavily on the Copenhagen School and Paris School but neither of those is explained. When, why and how these Schools were founded; in what they differed from each other; and what challenges utilisation of them poses; are questions which are not addressed in the thesis but which would have helped the reader to follow better the several references to these Schools which are found in the thesis. This could have been done in the introduction.

There is some vagueness and lack of explanations about the empirical data/period analysed. On page 8 it says the thesis will analyse 'three major events in Brazil's migration management policies' without further explaining what three major events. They are disclosed only on page 31 as: 1. Resettlement in solidarity programme; 2. Haitian Migration Flow; 3. Operation Welcome. There are no dates for these 'events' and it is not very clear why and how they are considered as events rather than phases, for example. On a related note, it is not explained and remains unclear why the period chosen is from 2000 to 2020 (without mention of months). The thesis refers to the importance of the 11/9/2001 as a turning point in migration and security policies and refers that the thesis analyses four governments beginning with that of Lula (2003-). Therefore the chronology 2000-2020 seems a bit arbitrary. Finally, the conclusion could have tried a bit harder to reflect on the broader implications of the thesis' findings for the debates about securitisation and migration in different geopolitical settings.



## **IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet**

Despite these minor flaws, the thesis is a very good piece of work which demonstrates the student has fully attained the intended learning outcomes. Very well done!