

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>			x			
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>				x		
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>				x		
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>					x	
Methodology <i>Understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research.</i>				x		

ECTS Mark:	55	Charles Mark:	D	Marker:	Karel Svoboda
<i>Deducted for late submission:</i>			<i>No</i>	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 thesis deals with an unquestionably important topic that deserves much attention. The use and misuse of gender roles in the societies in some transition contributes to general understanding of these processes. However, from my point of view, this this thesis stopped somewhere halfway in analyzing this role.

Frankly, when I read the first three sentences, I was ready to reject the thesis completely. It was hard to understand with numerous misprints and illogical constructions. The text then improves somehow, although the quality is still only mediocre. For instance, the paper constantly mixes 'communist' and 'community'.

I have also some remarks towards comparability of the cases. China's reforms were conducted under the firm rule of the communist party, while this cannot be said about the Soviet/Russian experience. True, the authoress notes some of the differences, but she does not explain how she deals with these differences to make the comparison possible. The time range also seems to be strange. At least the first argument (page 6) that deeper contacts were established between the SU and PRC does not have anything in common with the topic of the thesis. The argument that 1980 is some intermediate point is also questionable. The same may be said about the upper side of the range (note, Putin did not come to power in 1998).

The structure of the paper is rather chaotic. On the page 16, the paper repeats what it is about, without any additional information. This is simply superficial. The methodology is explained on the page 24 (not in an exhausting way, mildly said). The methodology part is rather scattered throughout the text, which makes it hard to read and comprehend.

The authoress should better explain what articles were taken as suitable for an analysis and how they are comparable (If at all).

Furthermore, comparing general audience People's Daily with monthly and specialized Rabotnitsa does not make much sense. At least, the logic should be explained in depth.

There are many weaknesses in a formal side as well. For instance, figure no 1 is simply a graph with bars but no numbers etc. Some pages (pages explaining the development of political regime) are left completely without references. On the other hand, some titles from the list of references are not present in the text as references. Maybe, the authoress used them, but we do not see where...

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

1. Could you, please, make a comment on comparability of the sources?
2. You start your analysis in 1980. As a result, the analysis on the Russian part could be divided into three parts (Soviet orthodox rule, Perestroika, Yeltsin times). Does Rabotnitsa somehow reflect these changes?