

IMESS DISSERTATION



Note: Please email the completed mark sheet to Year 2 coordinator
(cc Julia Korosteleva j.korosteleva@ucl.ac.uk and Marta Kotwas m.kotwas@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:	Mikhail Gorodiloff
Dissertation title:	Economic development of Crimea after March 2014

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Poor
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 arguments 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		

ECTS Mark:	B	UCL Mark:	67/2	Marker:	Karel Svoboda
<i>Deducted for late submission:</i>				Signed:	
<i>Deducted for inadequate referencing:</i>				Date:	

MARKING GUIDELINES

A (UCL mark 70+; Charles University mark = 1): 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; Charles University mark =2):

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; Charles University mark = 3):

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; Charles University mark = nepospělúa):

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*):

Mikhail wrote a detailed and comprehensive study of the Crimean economy before and after the annexation of the peninsula by Russia. Mikhail analyses the development under Ukraine in Crimea, then he proceeds to the situation after the annexation. He uses the examples of the most important branches of the Crimean economy for his analysis.

The main strength of the work lies in its empirical part, which describes in detail the developments in Crimea, especially the part dealing with the post-annexation period. Nevertheless, the weaker part is the theory, which seems to me as a "sacrifice to gods", and, largely, remains unused. Especially the explanation of the development of institutions vital for the functioning of the Crimean economy could be enriching and explain a lot. Furthermore, the research question is not fully explained. Therefore, the thesis itself is closer to a business report than to the academic paper.

Some of the topics of the paper seem to be unrelated to the main thesis. Comparisons with so many other states, despite it is unquestionably interesting, drags the attention from the main argument. The same may be said about the problem of Crimean Tatars. Although it is a topic unquestionably important for the Crimea itself, its relevance for the development of the Crimean economy is not clear to me. Some other claims may be challenged, such as that in 1991 Ukraine was in a better economic situation than Poland (42). This would need deeper explanation of the criteria.

It would be extremely hard to find any other work richer with the literature documentation, footnotes and examples (a significant part of Mikhail's writings had to be cut off from the thesis due to the word limit). Even in the side topics, such as the GDR and Western Bank comparisons, the documentation with available literature is enormously rich.

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

1. Crimea has been infamous for the existence of local mafias. How the situation developed under the Russian rule?
2. The thesis itself does not touch political questions. How would you characterize political incorporation of Crimea into the Russian Federation?