

BACHELOR'S THESIS EXAMINER REPORT
PPE – Bachelor's in Politics, Philosophy and Economics
Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Thesis title:	Britain in the European Communities under Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher
Student's name:	Ondřej Šebík
Referee's name:	Viera Martinková, Ph.D.

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Contribution and argument (quality of research and analysis, originality)	50	43
	Research question (definition of objectives, plausibility of hypotheses)	15	13
	Theoretical framework (methods relevant to the research question)	15	13
<i>Total</i>		80	69
Minor Criteria			
	Sources, literature	10	6
	Presentation (language, style, cohesion)	5	2
	Manuscript form (structure, logical coherence, layout, tables, figures)	5	2
<i>Total</i>		20	10
TOTAL		100	79

Plagiarism-check (URKUND) match score:

[NB:] If the plagiarism-check (URKUND) match score is above 15%, the reviewer has to include his/her assessment of the originality of the reviewed thesis in his/her review.

The Turnitin match score of 26% is due to the relatively high usage of direct citations, which are mostly justified, as they are direct quotes of conservative philosophers or Thatcher herself. There are some issues with referencing, further discussed below.

Reviewer's commentary according to the above criteria (*min. 1800 characters including spaces when recommending a passing grade, min. 2500 characters including spaces when recommending a failing grade*):

The thesis aimed to ascertain whether Thatcher's European policy conformed to conservative political ideology. Thus, the thesis consists of two major parts: defining conservative political thought and analysing Thatcher's European policy. The author does not use or present any transparent methodology. The clarity of the argument would also be improved by an explicit summarisation of aspects of conservatism, thus providing clear criteria for the empirical analysis. The thesis lacks any debate on the state of literature; surely, the author is not the first to debate the issue. This brings to question the relevancy of both the research question and the conclusions.

On the other hand, the argument is sound, and the conclusions summarise the conservative aspects of Thatcher's European policy very well.

However, issues with referencing, mainly in chapter 2 on Conservatism, and some parts of that chapter raise the question of how well the author understands the underlying political philosophy and how much of it is based on secondary sources. The author uses simplifying claims. For example, Hobbes does not claim that society needs to be kept in check by a biblical monster, as the author writes, but rather uses Leviathan as a metaphor for the state or, more specifically, state power.

The references within the text do not match the list of references provided at the end of the thesis (e.g., missing references (Hamilton 2020), sources not referred to in the text but listed in the list of references (Brock 1990, Campos&Coricelli 2011), not-matching dates of publication (Chesterton), or titles (Oakshott 1962).

The author also uses secondary referencing without giving information on the primary source other than the authors' surnames (see, e.g., the mention of Butterfield and Herz on p. 17).

The list of abbreviations missed a key and a less-known abbreviation of BBQ (the British Budget Question), which is used in the text without explanation.

There are also some linguistic issues, including vocabulary (e.g., shortcuts instead of abbreviations, creation instead of convening), spelling (Haywood instead of Heywood), and use of tenses (that leads to a somewhat confusing text on the 1975 referendum on p. 19).

To sum up, the structure of the thesis, presentation of arguments and the resulting analysis are of good quality. However, numerous formal shortcomings put it into question.

Nevertheless, despite the above reservations, I recommend the thesis for defence. During the defence, the author should prove his knowledge and understanding of primary sources on conservatism and explain the discrepancies in referencing.

Proposed grade: C

Suggested questions for the defence are:

I (do not) recommend the thesis for the final defence.

Referee Signature

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:

TOTAL POINTS	GRADE	Quality standard
91 – 100	A	= outstanding (high honor)
81 – 90	B	= superior (honor)
71 – 80	C	= good
61 – 70	D	= satisfactory
51 – 60	E	= low pass at a margin of failure
0 – 50	F	= failing. The thesis is not recommended for defence.