IMSISS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	**Glasgow** 2683472 **DCU** **Charles** 96486937
Dissertation Title	Follow the Money: Financial Investigations Process in the European Union

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: 20,014   **Suggested Penalty:** no penalty

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

Final Agreed Mark 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	
• *Originality of topic*	Excellent
• *Coherent set of research questions and/or hypothesis identified*	Very Good
• *Appropriate methodology and evidence of effective organisation of work*	Excellent
• *Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions*	Very Good
• *Application of theory and/or concepts*	Good
B. Use of Source Material This refers to your skills to select and use relevant information and data in a correct manner	
• *Evidence of reading and review of published literature*	Very Good
• *Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument*	Very Good
• *Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence*	Very Good
• *Accuracy of factual data*	Very Good
C. Academic Style This refers to your ability to write in a formal academic manner	
• *Appropriate formal and clear writing style*	Excellent
• *Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation*	Excellent
• *Consistent and accurate referencing (including complete bibliography)*	Excellent
• *Is the dissertation free from plagiarism?*	Yes
• *Evidence of ethics approval included (if required based on methodology)*	Yes

IMSISS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

• *Appropriate word count*	Yes

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Reviewer 1

This thesis explores how financial intelligence (in the context of serious crime and terrorism financing) is generated, shared, and untilized, how cross-border financial investigations are conducted, what judicial cooperation instruments are used and what EU agencies are involved. The overarching research question is: How are financial investigations conducted in the EU in cases of serious organised crime, and terrorist financing? The topic selected by the student is highly relevant to the aims of the IMSISS programme and original (to my knowledge, the literature on counter terrorist and serious crime financing is very limited). The thesis is also logically structured while the arguments raised by the student clearly formulated. I very much enjoyed the detailed analysis of financial investigations, as well as the methodology employed by the student, which included discourse analysis, interviews and field research. I only have three points of critique that the student may want to take into consideration in future research:

1) In the Background section, I would like to see a bit more enagagement with the (limited) literature on financial investigations in security studies. The student refers briefly to that literature in the introduction of the thesis (page 8).

2) There is a slight mismatch between the theoretical elements of the thesis (field analysis inspired by Bourdieu) and the analytical chapters of the thesis. I would like to hear more, for example, about the "habitus" that characterises the field of security professionals engaged in financial investigations across the EU. The student also employes "critical" discourse analysis, but I did not really understand what form of critique they would like to develop. What is "critical" about critical discourse analysis?

3) This is a relatively "minor" point: I would like to see chapters numbered and clearly separated.

Reviewer 2

I concur with the above marker's comments and provisional grade. I think this is a strong dissertation on a highly relevant topic. The weaknesses are more in organisation--the introduction, at certain points, reads like an outline rather than as a final product--the mapping done in the introductory section(s) is helpful to the reader but moves from the very abstract to vague--occasionally and throughout the text, I thought there were points missing linking back to this.

On the positive side, I saw much thought put into document selection and discourse analysis. Sometimes, I felt a bir of summarising back to the key theoretical framework and maybe a more thorough section linking the framework (early figures) to analyses would have strengthened this dissertation.

It was nice to finally see a dissertaiton where the author was not reticient to list the limitations and potential shortcomings of the study. All criticism aside, the author should be proud of their project!

IMSISS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet