

BACHELOR'S THESIS EXAMINER REPORT
PPE – Bachelor's in Politics, Philosophy and Economics
Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Thesis title:	Mechanisms of Securitization of Identities and Polarization in Turkey
Student's name:	Mehmet Emin Akyar
Referee's name:	Jonathan Collins

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Contribution and argument (quality of research and analysis, originality)	50	40
	Research question (definition of objectives, plausibility of hypotheses)	15	13
	Theoretical framework (methods relevant to the research question)	15	13
<i>Total</i>		80	66
Minor Criteria			
	Sources, literature	10	7
	Presentation (language, style, cohesion)	5	4
	Manuscript form (structure, logical coherence, layout, tables, figures)	5	4
<i>Total</i>		20	15
TOTAL		100	81

Plagiarism-check (URKUND) match score: 1%

Reviewer's commentary according to the above criteria:

This thesis explores the intricate dynamics of identity politics in Turkey, utilising securitisation theory to analyse the historical and contemporary narratives shaping Turkish identity. By employing thematic and discourse analysis, the work offers an interesting perspective on the polarisation and securitisation of identities within the (demonstrably complex) nation. The author does a great job of underscoring the construction of Turkish national identity through narratives of othering and intergroup demonisation. Unpacking these themes with two interconnected research questions boded well for the results and conclusions provided.

The combination of securitisation theory and identity/social identity theory offers a great perspective into the phenomenon, which the author does well to explain. Moreover, approaching the topic from the viewpoint of the Turkish minorities/populations most affected by the securitising speech against them is impressive and shows the powerful effects of language and discourse in politics.

I also do not find any problems with the selected methodologies, which are a mixed-methods qualitative approach combining thematic and discourse analysis. The author provides a good amount of detail on how they rationalised their selection and the analytical process that led to their discoveries.

The analysis presents a fascinating storyline and picture behind the fault lines in Turkish identity. The author does well to unpack the many different movements that fill into question, covering complex topics with a good amount of expertise. However, some analysis sections read more like personal opinions than deduced themes. It would have been advantageous for the author to include (cite) the secondary literature on which they were basing these themes. This process would have provided much greater salience to their arguments. When we get into section 4.2.3. the reader is offered a look into the controversial discourses fuelling these fault lines. Supplementing the secondary literature and thematic analysis with the prominent discourse offers a very interesting “realness” to the situation. I would have preferred to have seen this mixed-methods approach combined throughout (as in some parts it is missing). There also seem to be very few primary sources the author is working with.

Some minor criteria include the incorrect formatting of citations at the end of each sentence (the period should come after the brackets). At times, some very “chunky” paragraphs (See Literature Review) could have been broken down into two or three separate ones. This issue created some scenarios in which I struggled to catch the main argument from that part of the text.

Overall, I enjoyed the read, which combined the author’s expertise on a not-often-covered topic of Turkish identity and the theoretical perspective revolving around the fault lines concept. The author did their best to cover the contemporary and historical situation (in the short amount of text) of the affected population and did so to decent effect. I am more than happy to recommend that the author defend their text to the committee.

Proposed grade (A-B-C-D-E-F): B/C

Suggested questions for the defence are:

Could you be more specific on the amount of data that you used for your discourse analysis? I understand that you used speeches from the regime, but how many and which ones? Could there be selection bias based on the chosen data?

Can you talk about your own biases as a limitation to the thesis? How has your relation to the text influenced the selection of fault lines and your own experiences with the current regime?

I recommend the thesis for final defence.

Referee Signature

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:

TOTAL POINTS	GRADE	Quality standard
91 – 100	A	= outstanding (high honor)
81 – 90	B	= superior (honor)
71 – 80	C	= good
61 – 70	D	= satisfactory
51 – 60	E	= low pass at a margin of failure
0 – 50	F	= failing. The thesis is not recommended for defence.

