

IMESS DISSERTATION

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

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

Student:	
Dissertation title:	

	70+	69-65	60-61	59-55	54-50	<50
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Knowledge <i>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.</i>	85					
Analysis & Interpretation <i>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.</i>	90					
Structure & Argument <i>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's limitation or alternative views; Ability to use other evidence to support arguments and structure appropriately.</i>	90					
Presentation & Documentation <i>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.</i>	100					
Methodology <i>Understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research.</i>	100					

ECTS Mark:	A	Charles Mark:	A	Marker:	Daniela Kolenovská
<i>Deducted for late submission:</i>			No	Signed:	
<i>Deducted for inadequate referencing:</i>				Date:	

MARKING GUIDELINES

A (UCL mark 70+) = A (Charles mark 91-100 - excellent): *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 69-65) = B (Charles mark 81-90 – very good)
C (UCL mark 64-60) = C (Charles mark 71-80 – good): 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. 65 or over equates to a B grade.

D (UCL mark 59-55) = D (Charles mark 61-70 – satisfactory)
E (UCL mark 54-50) = E (Charles mark 51-60 – sufficient):
 Demonstration of a critical use of sources and ability to engage in systematic inquiry. An ability to engage in sustained research work, demonstrating methodological awareness. 55 or over equates to a D grade.

F (UCL mark less than 50) = F (Charles mark 0-50 - insufficient):
 Demonstrates failure to use sources and an inadequate ability to engage in systematic inquiry. Inadequate evidence of ability to engage in sustained research work and poor understanding of appropriate research techniques.

Please provide substantive and detailed feedback!

Comments, explaining strengths and weaknesses (at least 300 words):

The dissertation is very well anchored in theory. It is based on a wide range of relevant theoretical literature. The author systematically explained the relationship between different theoretical approaches to questions of politicization of language issues, clearly setting limits to his research field. I appreciate that the author knows the media discourses may not reflect the social reality accurately and approaches the topic with obvious caution. This allows him to reach clear conclusions as well as to draw attention to further research possibilities.

In matters of historical development, the author omitted to link the evolution of Slavic languages in Eastern Europe to religious life and the transfer of the centre of the Orthodox Church to Moscow. To certain extend, this limited the author's interpretation of Ukrainian nationalistic discourses. Nevertheless, the dissertation was able to point to the four main levels of current debates - both in pro-Ukrainian and pro-Russian media. These are language as a political tool, linguistic rights, and their protection in terms of legal framework (Ukrainian as well as international), security (social integrity) and finally preserving (or maintenance) of social identity in relation to the Other. Within this frame, the structure is clear, logical, and coherent.

In the defined field, the author tries to find a solution for the current polarized Ukrainian debate on languages. To the author, it is therefore a question of finding a solution within the state itself, not of trying to find out the external possibilities and obstacles.

Overall, the work has been able to design tools that could calm down Ukraine's currently relatively polarized media discourse. The question, however, remains whether it is possible to take advantage of these opportunities in the given war situation.

To conclude, this dissertation is excellent. It exceeds the usual standards, is highly competent and I recommend it for defence with grade A.

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

Between 2012 and 2019, there were serious steps taken to separate Orthodox believers in Ukraine from Moscow's patriarchy. How did this affect the media discourse?

What was the dynamics of possibilities to solve the four discursive topics over time? Why the language disputes in Ukraine were not solved before the Russian occupation of Crimea? Did it change the discourse?