

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	Glasgow 2573961F DCU 20109512 Charles 23632803 Trento
Dissertation Title	Elite Level Securitization of Migration and the 2016 EU-Turkey Statement

INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

Reviewer 1 Initial Grade	Reviewer 2 Initial Grade	Late Submission Penalty no penalty
<p>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)</p> <p>Word Count: 21881 Suggested Penalty: no penalty</p>		

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: A5 [18] **After Penalty:** A5 [18]

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>	Good
• <i>Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions</i>	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>	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

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

• <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>	Yes
• <i>Appropriate word count</i>	Yes

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Reviewer 1

This is a well written thesis on a substantively important and interesting topic. The literature review is comprehensive and shows a deep engagement with the debates around the issues of migration and security. Similarly the description of the methods and approach is well put together and demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of the controversies and strengths of securitization theory. Where the thesis is less successful is in the integration of these different parts into a single coherent piece of research. As a result the empirical section doesn't quite deliver either a full fledged discourse analysis or an account of leadership in the theoretical terms developed earlier in the thesis. The contribution is still interesting and important but there was potential here for an outstanding thesis.

Reviewer 2

The reviewed thesis aims to offer an analysis of elite level securitization of migration to the EU from Syria, focusing on the speeches of Presidents of the European Commission from the start of the Syrian civil war in 2011 to the formulation of the 2016 EU-Turkey Statement.

The thesis contains several reviews summarizing the different literatures relevant to the thesis topic, i.e. securitization, externalization of EU migration governance, internal-external blurring etc. This is complemented with a chapter introducing two theoretical frameworks, leadership theory and securitization. While these literature reviews do offer a good snapshot of the existing debates in the relevant fields, they are not all sufficiently interlinked with the primary topic of the thesis and with the discussion in the empirical chapters of the thesis. In a single thesis, the author has arguably attempted to cover too many complex phenomena, without really doing justice to all of them.

Most importantly, the discussion of securitization is not explicit enough as to which strand of securitization theory will be actually utilized in the thesis, how and why. As a consequence, albeit the research question is clearly about discourses (and thus more in line with the classical Copenhagen school of securitization), the thesis also frequently discusses practices (which is the focus of other strands, especially the Paris school). It also appears to assume the securitization has actually taken place but without a clearly spelled out operationalization of this process in line with a clearly specified school/approach/strand of securitization, it is difficult, if not impossible, to sustain this assumption.

On the positive side, the thesis is overall well-structured and quite well written. The empirical chapters offer interesting insights, albeit they do not really amount to a proper discourse analysis. The list of references is extensive for an MA thesis.