

# IMESS DISSERTATION



Note: Please email the completed mark sheet to Year 2 coordinator  
(cc Allan Sikk [a.sikk@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:a.sikk@ucl.ac.uk) and Louise Wassell [l.wassell@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:l.wassell@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.

<b>Student:</b>	Graham BUSH
<b>Dissertation title:</b>	Differences Between National Memory of Communism in Poland and the Czech Republic

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Poor
<b>Knowledge</b> <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	
<b>Analysis &amp; Interpretation</b> <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	
<b>Structure &amp; Argument</b> <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 arguments limitation or alternative views; Ability to use other evidence to support arguments and structure appropriately.</i>			X
<b>Presentation &amp; Documentation</b> <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

<b>ECTS Mark:</b>	D	<b>UCL Mark:</b>	56	<b>Marker:</b>	Jiří VYKOUKAL
<i>Deducted for late submission:</i>				<b>Signed:</b>	
<i>Deducted for inadequate referencing:</i>				<b>Date:</b>	12 June 2014

## 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/C (UCL mark 60-69):**

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. 65 or over equates to a B grade.

**D/E (UCL mark 50-59):**

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):**

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.

CONTINUES OVERLEAF  
**PLEASE PROVIDE SUBSTANTIVE AND  
 DETAILED FEEDBACK!**

**Constructive comments, explaining strengths and weaknesses (*at least 300 words*):**

There are several basic problems related to this dissertation. Graham has fallen in love with his (which causes a lack of distance), he knows a lot about it (but sources of his knowledge are pretty heterogeneous), he uses nice examples and quotations (without explaining their context), and above all – he has not decided if he is writing poetry, essay or academic work.

First problem is that there should be a precise treatment of contextualization and representation – details prevail here but the problem manner is that the work sometimes follows the path defined by national myths, symbols and signs which should have been a target of critical analysis: e.g. it's hard to use a highly ambivalent and unclear category of "national psyche" and describe the national psyche with the use of language derived from the same national psyche. It's a case of methodological "circulus vitiosus".

Research question does not exist, it's rather a set of questions and proposals, theories are not translated to working analytical tools, structure is rather very loose, and the survey does not have a strong substantiation and it serves more like an accidental illustration of author's opinions. There is no clear contextualization of the dissertation within an existing field of research (also no difference is made between primary and secondary sources).

At the end – an interesting melange-like approach, but also a feeling of an unfinished work.

**Specific questions you would like addressing at the oral defence (*at least 3 questions*):**

1. Which social factors can be identified behind the Czech and Polish perception and production of culture?
2. Which concept of (collective) memory could be used here? After presentation of several concepts it's not clear which one has been employed.
3. What's the difference (p. 14) between intelligentsia and elites?
3. What's the difference between intelligentsia and elites in Bohemia and Poland?