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 <u>not</u> required to use a particular set of methods (e.g. qualitative, quantitative, or comparative) in their dissertation.

Student:	Mikhail Gorodilov
Dissertation title:	

	Excellent		Satisfactory		Poor
Knowledge *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.*	V				
Analysis & Interpretation *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.*		V			
Structure & Argument *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.*	V				
Presentation & Documentation *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.*		V			

ECTS Mark:		**UCL Mark:**	72	**Marker:**	
Deducted for late submission:				**Signed:**	
Deducted for inadequate referencing:				**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 = neprospělúa): 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*):

This dissertation is investigating the trajectory of the Crimean peninsula and discussing the likely impact the Russian annexation had on it.

The dissertation presents a very impressive efforts to collect data, in some cases to validate the sources and information found, and to present them in a coherent fashion. There is also a clear analytical effort, both in the selection and validation of data, in the thorough presentation of the situation before annexation and in the comparison with a neighbouring region. As such this dissertation is adding value and will prove a valuable source for scholars interested in investigating the impact of the Russian annexation of Crimea further.

This dissertation is also somewhat unusual, as it does not focus on a narrow research question for which a "yes or no answer" can be provided. Instead, it is providing a very broad review of facts looking at economic development in Crimea through a large set of indicators. There is therefore no clear methodology section, instead the value is in the collection and validation of data and in the thorough effort to compare, contrast and analyse.

As such the section trying to put forward a conceptual framework and reviewing the relevant strand of literature is a little bit frustrating. A lot is reviewed in a very short section and the articles cited are summarised in very broad terms, only the essence of the arguments is presented. I do appreciate that a more detailed presentation would have been more clearly necessary if one framework had been applied to one narrower question, and that in the context of a broader analysis only the broad lines of theses strands of literature were needed, but I still feel that the presentation is weakened here because it is often vague, and imprecise. Prior knowledge of this literature is required to understand the points put forward by the student.

Overall, I still think this is a very impressive effort to collect robust primary data and to provide an interesting set of comparators to meaningfully analyse the situation.

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

You selected a set of indicators to evaluate the evolution or economic development of Crimea, how was this set of indicators selected? Do they provide a complete view of the situation? Are there other dimensions that you would have liked to discuss but could not find reliable information about?

How would you like to take this work further? Are you considering focusing on narrower issues yourself or continuing your collect of information in the future to complete the picture? Would you like others to use this information and if yes, how?