

IMESS dissertation						
Name/code:	Megan Ouellette					
Dissertation title:	A blip on the radar? Conceptualising the Czech Republic in the United States before and after the missile defence shift					
Scale: 5 - excellent, 4 - good, 3 - satisfactory, 2 - poor, 1 - very poor						
	5	4	3	2	1	
ARGUMENT:						
Clearly defined research question	X					No clearly defined research question
Answers research question	X					Does not answer research question
Well structured	X					Badly structured
Shows theoretical awareness	X					Shows no theoretical awareness
Conceptual clarity	X					Conceptual confusion
Empirically appropriate & robust	X					Full of empirical errors
Logical and coherent	X					Illogical and incoherent
Analytical	X					Descriptive
Critical	X					Uncritical
Shows independent thought	X					Does not show independent thought
SOURCES & USAGE:						
Evidence of reading/research	X					No evidence of reading/research
Effective use of sources/data	X					Ineffective use of sources/data
WRITING STYLE:						
Clear	X					Obscure
Good punctuation						Poor punctuation
Grammatically correct						Grammatically incorrect
PRESENTATION:						
Appropriate length	X					Too long/short
Good referencing	X					Poor/inconsistent referencing
Good spelling						Poor spelling
Good bibliography	X					Poor bibliography
Deducted for late submission:	Deducted for faulty referencing:				Mark*:	
					95	
Charles University marker: Tomáš Weiss	Signed: <i>Tomáš Weiss</i>				Date: 13 June 2012	

* Mark: A = 70+; B = 65-69; C = 60-64; D = 55-59; E = 50-54; F = fail, less than 50

Scheme of award (assessment criteria):

	Charles University**	IMESS
Excellent	Výborně [1]	A
Very Good	Velmi dobře [2]	B
Good	Velmi dobře [2.5]	C
Satisfactory	Dobře [3]	D
Sufficient	Dobře [3.5]	E
Fail	Neprospěl [4]	F

CONTINUES OVERLEAF

NOTE: Please provide substantive and detailed feedback

Comments (at least 300 words)

This is probably the best master thesis I have supervised so far. In my opinion, the author has proven academic skills beyond the master's level. The paper is an original piece of research, well connected to the current academic debate and offering a valuable contribution to it. It shows independent thought and original approach, yet well informed by the standards in the field, to a current topic that has not been covered by anybody in this form.

The structure serves well the purpose of the paper. The argument is well developed and the conclusions are original, even if they maybe turned out not to be anyhow surprising (however, it is not the author's fault that the reality proved not to hide anything unexpected).

The method used is appropriate, well chosen for the objectives of the paper. At the same time, the author has been aware of the method's limitations and has adjusted the results accordingly. The research is based on robust base of primary sources.

I do not feel authorized to evaluate a native speaker's use of language. Yet, my non-native eye has not noticed any irregularities.

Specific questions for oral defence (at least 100 words)

To what extent, do you think, is the extensive overlap between the official and media conceptualisation of the Czech Republic in the American discourse caused by the fact that there is little general knowledge of the Czech Republic in the U.S.? Should we expect different results in case of more familiar countries, such as Canada, France, or Mexico?

If different results should be expected for other countries, what does it mean for the paper's conclusions regarding the unity of geopolitics?