

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	Glasgow 2260982S DCU 2010990 Charles 29899650
Dissertation Title	Terrorists or trafficking victims? An analysis of how the UK Prevent policy frames those at risk of joining terror groups abroad

INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

Reviewer 1 Initial Grade C3	Reviewer 2 Initial Grade C3	Late Submission Penalty NA
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: 20487 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: Select from drop down list C3	After Penalty: Select from drop down list C3

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>	Good -Select from list-
• <i>Coherent set of research questions and/or hypothesis identified</i>	Good -Select from list-
• <i>Appropriate methodology and evidence of effective organisation of work</i>	Good -Select from list-
• <i>Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions</i>	Good -Select from list-
• <i>Application of theory and/or concepts</i>	Good -Select from list-
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>	Good -Select from list-
• <i>Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument</i>	Good -Select from list-
• <i>Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence</i>	Good -Select from list-

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Accuracy of factual data</i> 	<p><i>Good</i> -Select from list-</p>
<p>C. Academic Style This refers to your ability to write in a formal academic manner</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Appropriate formal and clear writing style</i> 	<p>Yes -Select from list-</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation</i> 	<p>Yes -Select from list-</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Consistent and accurate referencing (including complete bibliography)</i> 	<p>Yes -Select from list-</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Is the dissertation free from plagiarism?</i> 	<p>Yes -Select from list-</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Evidence of ethics approval included (if required based on methodology)</i> 	<p>-Select from list-</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Appropriate word count</i> 	<p>Yes -Select from list-</p>

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Reviewer 1

I am not altogether sure about this dissertation's final contribution to the extrication of the nexus between research puzzle, methods, and findings. It seemed to me that the candidate failed to think through a successful way to address the overly vague research questions they planned to engage with. There is also a disconnection between the thesis's focus and the literature addressed by this project. Rather than representing a wider reflection on the intersection between prevention and discrimination, this ended up being a study of UK cases with very little transportability beyond the English/Welsh context. This weakness was due to the selection of a strand of literature that confined the argument in a specific disciplinary niche and a narrow policy context. The methods are explained rather hurriedly and applied with some fluctuating consistency, particularly in their quantitative part. The presentation is generally adequate but never elegant.

Reviewer 2

The dissertation looks into an interesting phenomenon. Still, there are several caveats that need to be pointed out. First, my understanding is that the dissertation is somewhat misplaced when it comes to the research problem identified by the author. The author links the thesis to the case study literature; in itself, it's fine, but I think the author should rather have engaged with a more general (theoretical) literature on reporting/preventing. Why (and how) prevention works - and whether discrimination is widespread. If the focus is within-community, a more specific focus could have been taken. Anyway, connecting this case study to a general research problem that exceeds the empirical limits of the study is what the author has failed to do. Relatedly, there is little theoretical (general) engagement with the phenomenon; the author does engage with the suspect community theory, but it's a shallow engagement that is detached from the main body of research, theoretical and empirical. That's a pity given the author's contribution might have rested in this (or closely related) realm. In terms of the methods used, I like the qualitative part more than the quantitative part which is rather superficial. A more robust explication of RQ is missing, regrettably, which makes the author's task difficult: is the dissertation dealing with the discrimination of a British Muslim community, or rather communities, or with trying to understand whether the subjects engaged are victims rather than perpetrators? It's not entirely clear as the author pulls the dissertation in two distinct directions. Taken together, this makes the overall objective (and the message) of the thesis amorphous, with little

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

added value. A more fundamentally thought-through research design might have prevented this shortcoming, but as the thesis stands, it does little to enhance our understanding of an important phenomenon.