

## IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

<b>Student Matriculation No.</b>	<b>Glasgow</b> 2692995 <b>DCU</b> 21109036 <b>Charles</b> 67548478
<b>Dissertation Title</b>	Brexit's Echo: A Discursive Analysis of The Securitisation of Migration, 'the Hostile Environment' and Right-Wing Extremism

### INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

<b>Word Count Penalty</b> (1-15% over/under = 1 gr point; 15-20% over/under = 2 gr points; 20-25% over/under = 3 gr points; more than 25% over/under = 0 fail)		
<b>Word Count:</b> 2,193 <b>Suggested Penalty:</b> no penalty		

### JOINT GRADING (subject to agreement of the external examiner and approval at Joint Exam Board)

**Final Agreed Mark** : 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	
• <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>	Very Good
• <i>Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions</i>	Very Good
• <i>Application of theory and/or concepts</i>	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	
• <i>Evidence of reading and review of published literature</i>	Excellent
• <i>Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument</i>	Excellent
• <i>Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence</i>	Very Good
• <i>Accuracy of factual data</i>	Very Good
<b>C. Academic Style</b>	
This refers to your ability to write in a formal academic manner	
• <i>Appropriate formal and clear writing style</i>	Very Good
• <i>Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation</i>	Very Good
• <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>	Not required

## IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

- *Appropriate word count*

Yes

### ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

#### **Reviewer 1**

This dissertation shows that the student has engaged with a wide range of sources and has acquired a sound command of the key issues pertaining to her area of research. However, key ideas are not always expressed sufficiently clearly. As a result, it is difficult at times to follow the development of the arguments throughout the dissertation. The introduction is very similar to the abstract and fails to set the background for the dissertation. The literature review demonstrates a very sound engagement with the existing literature and identifies a suitable gap in knowledge. The theoretical framework is adequate, although its selection should have been further explained and more strongly justified (in more than one brief paragraph). The methodology could have been further explained and should have constituted the second half of chapter 3. The empirical part presents some interesting material, but more should have been said about the implications of the findings (the "so what?" question). The conclusion chapter is very brief. The reader is left with the impression that a lot of interesting empirical developments have been mentioned in this dissertation, but that the analysis has remained rather limited in Chapter 5, especially as the dissertation develops an argument about the justifications for the Hostile Environment, whilst also considering the extent to which it is effective. Those are two related, but distinct, questions. Only one research question should have been at the heart of the dissertation. A very good effort, nonetheless!

#### **Reviewer 2**

The dissertation identifies in the Securitisation of Migration an alleged consequence of (or a line of continuity with) Brexit. The underlying thesis is interesting and makes sense, considering how much 'borders control' had featured in the overall pro-Brexit discourse and the attached promises. The literature review is perhaps the best part of the dissertation, though the student could have explained more clearly that, also in the case of the UK, securitisation of migration is a longer trend that well pre-dates Brexit (and was also widely used within a pro- EU membership discourse, especially by Tony Blair). The weakest part is the one on methodology, which is rather underdeveloped. The empirical contribution is interesting, albeit it mixes considerations on discourse (which is the primary thread of analysis) with considerations on policy. Overall, the dissertation remains a good attempt to address a topical theme in post-Brexit UK politics and policy.