

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	Glasgow 2486486 DCU Charles 53108498 Trento 225125
Dissertation Title	What we keep in the Shadows: Sex Work in Germany during the COVID-19 Pandemic

INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

Reviewer 1 Initial Grade	Reviewer 2 Initial Grade	Late Submission Penalty no penalty
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: 20133 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: 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>	-Select from list- Very good
• <i>Coherent set of research questions and/or hypothesis identified</i>	-Select from list- Very good
• <i>Appropriate methodology and evidence of effective organisation of work</i>	-Select from list- Excellent
• <i>Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions</i>	-Select from list- Very good
• <i>Application of theory and/or concepts</i>	-Select from list- Excellent
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>	-Select from list- Excellent
• <i>Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument</i>	-Select from list- Very good
• <i>Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence</i>	-Select from list- Very good

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

• <i>Accuracy of factual data</i>	-Select from list- Very good
C. Academic Style	
This refers to your ability to write in a formal academic manner	
• <i>Appropriate formal and clear writing style</i>	-Select from list- Excellent
• <i>Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation</i>	-Select from list- Very good
• <i>Consistent and accurate referencing (including complete bibliography)</i>	-Select from list- Excellent
• <i>Is the dissertation free from plagiarism?</i>	-Select from list- Yes
• <i>Evidence of ethics approval included (if required based on methodology)</i>	-Select from list- Yes
• <i>Appropriate word count</i>	-Select from list- Yes

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Reviewer 1

This is a sound thesis. It is comprehensibly presented and professes an innovative argument. The analysis is grounded in a fine theoretical discussion that combines Goffman's influential scholarship on stigma with Crawford & Hutchinson's notion of everyday security. The key question – how political and security measures affect individuals who are members of marginalized social group – is of utmost relevance in contemporary debates. Empirical work is modest, but it is obvious that the student well understands fundamental features of qualitative social analysis. The results are comprehensive and skillfully tailored to research objectives and aims.

Reviewer 2

This is a well written and original dissertation which brings together insights from a relevant range of literature on both sex work and ideas about stigma/everyday security. It addresses an important and under-researched area. However, the work could have been developed with deeper and more nuanced analysis. There is quite a disconnect between the theoretical framework developed in the earlier chapters and the original empirical analysis presented in the second half. Although the potential links are there and are often implicit, these need to be drawn out more explicitly and explored in greater depth. For example, how do issues of financial, health, digital and personal security feature in the existing literature on everyday security? How are the intersections and junctures between them conceptualised in this literature, and what more could have been made in the analysis here of the overlaps and trade offs between different aspects of in/security?

Similarly in the earlier sections and methodology a number of fascinating issues were passed over in a somewhat superficial manner. Much more could have been said about the research design and the decision to interview 'experts' rather than sex workers themselves. This is not to suggest that the latter could or should have been undertaken, but rather that instead of simply that this was not possible on ethical grounds, those ethical and access issues could have been explored in greater depth and the challenges and advantages of using experts as a proxy also.

There was quite a lot of repetition in the narrative between chapters 5-7 and editing this out would have

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

made space to discuss the above issues in greater depth. The above points notwithstanding this is an ambitious and well executed piece of work and one that shows a good understanding of key areas in the study of both sex work and everyday insecurity in the context of the COVID 19 pandemic.