IMESS DISSERTATION

Note: Please email the completed mark sheet to Year 2 coordinator
(cc Chiara Amini chiara.amini@ucl.ac.uk **and** ssees-imess@ucl.ac.uk**)**

Please note that IMESS students are <u>not</u> required to use a particular set of methods (e.g. qualitative, quantitative, or comparative) in their dissertation.

Student:	Qianrui Hu
Dissertation title:	The Politicization of the Language Issue in Ukraine: the Discursive Construction of the Language, Nationalism, and Identity in Ukrainian Media

	70+	69-65	64-60	59-55	54-50	<50
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Knowledge *Knowledge of problems involved, e.g. historical and social context, specialist literature on the topic. Evidence of capacity to gather information through a wide and appropriate range of reading, and to digest and process knowledge.*	X					
Analysis & Interpretation *Demonstrates a clear grasp of concepts. Application of appropriate methodology and understanding; willingness to apply an independent approach or interpretation recognition of alternative interpretations; Use of precise terminology and avoidance of ambiguity; avoidance of excessive generalisations or gross oversimplifications.*	X					
Structure & Argument *Demonstrates ability to structure work with clarity, relevance and coherence. Ability to argue a case; clear evidence of analysis and logical thought; recognition of an argument limitation or alternative views; Ability to use other evidence to support arguments and structure appropriately.*	x					
Presentation & Documentation *Accurate and consistently presented footnotes and bibliographic references; accuracy of grammar and spelling; correct and clear presentation of charts/graphs/tables or other data. Appropriate and correct referencing throughout. Correct and contextually correct handling of quotations.*	x					
Methodology *Understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research.*	x					

ECTS Mark:	A	**UCL Mark:**	A/72	**Marker:**	Andrew Wilson
Deducted for late submission:				**Signed:**	
Deducted for inadequate referencing:				**Date:**	30 August 2021

MARKING GUIDELINES

A (UCL mark 70+): *Note: marks of over 80 are given rarely and only for truly exceptional pieces of work.*
Distinctively sophisticated and focused analysis, critical use of sources and insightful interpretation. Comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research.

B(UCL mark 65-69):
A high level of analysis, critical use of sources and insightful interpretation. Good understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research.

C (UCL mark 60-61):
Some evidence of critical analysis, knowledgeable interpretation. Wide range of sources used to develop a logic and coherent argument. Good understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, the extent of independent research could have improved.

Comments, explaining strengths and weaknesses (_at least 300 words_):

Avoid terminology like 'vivid', 'battle', that assumes language is a salient issue. This is to be proven. As also with statements like language 'is the most tangible cleavage' (page 8).

Some of the footnoting could be clearer: for example, Vakulenko is not a sole author.

On the whole, the history section is good.

Galicia was indeed more amenable to the development of Ukrainian, but only after the 1860s.

Pages 5-6: Khrushchev's 1959 education reform was key to the reversal of Ukrainisation.

The theory and methodology sections are also good. The section on nationalism theory could be punchier.

There should be more explanation of how media articles were chosen from the Eastview search; and how they were grouped into the sections: Language as a Political Tool, Linguistic Rights and Protection, Security and Victimisation, Self and Other.

The main areas to improve were the following.

Balance. There should be more on the case studies, and less on theory and methodology.

Pages 47-9: there is too much general historiography on the Holodomor and OUN. The subject is language; so it is relevant if it is claimed that Ukrainian speakers were targeted, but other historical claims are not central to the language story.

There could be more on how discourses changed or did not change over the study period, 2012-19.

The dissertation promises to look at 'the polarisation in media discourses between Ukrainian government-controlled and non-Ukrainian government-controlled territories' (page 56 inter alia). It is not clear that pre-2014 pro-Russian examples all come from Crimea, or areas of the Donbas about to fall under separatist control.

But these points do not detract excessively from the strengths of the work. Historical background, methodology, case studies and conclusions are all dealt with in careful and well-matched sequence. Nationalism theory is often covered by students in the same way; but this is necessary and in this case well-done. The case studies clearly show securitising and identity discourse. The overall aim of showing the instrumentalisation of language disputes in public discourse is achieved. The primary empirical material is rich.

Specific questions you would like addressing at the oral defence (_at least 2 questions_):

Explain how you decided on the four categories for discourse analysis: Language as a Political Tool, Linguistic Rights and Protection, Security and Victimisation, Self and Other.

Explain how you think discourse changed in your time period, 2012-19.

To what extent are your examples representative of 'government controlled areas' and 'non government controlled areas' (since 2014), or of Ukraine as a whole?