# Diploma Thesis Evaluation Form

Author: Marlene Breier

Title: HONG KONGERS ADDING OIL A Critical Analysis of the SAR's Pro-Democracy Movements

Programme/year: MISS 2016

Author of Evaluation (supervisor/external assessor):

| Criteria | Definition | Maximm | Points |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Major Criteria** | | | |
| | Research question, definition of objectives | **10** | 7 |
| | Theoretical/conceptual framework | **30** | 22 |
| | Methodology, analysis, argument | **40** | 33 |
| *Total* | | *80* | 62 |
| **Minor Criteria** | | | |
| | Sources | **10** | |
| | Style | **5** | |
| | Formal requirements | **5** | |
| *Total* | | *20* | 20 |
| | | | |
| **TOTAL** | | *100* | 82 |

# Evaluation

Major criteria:

The thesis intends to critically assess the umbrella movement as the latest manifestation of HK´s social and political movement usually associated with pro-democratic tendencies. I highly evaluate this goal as it goes against the shallow Manichean perception of HK – China relations.

The conceptual background is appropriate as the concept of new social movement appears to be relevant for the diverse "umbrella" movement. That said, I would say that the author could be a bit more specific in introducing the concept and creating analytical links with HK´s empirics.

From the methodological perspective the thesis rather intuitively analyses the movement and satisfactorily answers the questions targeting its (interest) diversity – and it is a valuable conclusion in my eyes, especially given the rich empirical material upon which the analysis is based. Personally, I would skip the perception-focused part as it would require 1) deeper conceptual discussion and 2) more appropriate methodological approach (I understand that the author has a tendency to relativize the results as well).

All in all, the thesis reads well, it is empirically relevant and interesting. On the hand it suffers from some theoretical deficiencies.

Minor criteria:

I appreciate the rich empirical resource base; the style and other formal aspects are fine.

Overall evaluation:

All in all, the thesis reads well, it is empirically relevant and interesting. On the hand it suffers from some theoretical deficiencies. It is a solid *very good (2)* thesis.

Suggested grade: very good/2


Signature: