

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:	Navraj Gata-Aura
Dissertation title:	The Czech Republic and the UK, a Eurosceptic comparison

	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:		UCL Mark:	E	Marker:	Petra Cibulková
<i>Deducted for late submission:</i>				Signed:	
<i>Deducted for inadequate referencing:</i>				Date:	12.6.2017

MARKING GUIDELINES

A (UCL mark 70+): Note: marks of over 80 are given rarely and only for truly exceptional pieces of work. (Charles mark = 1)

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. (Charles mark = 2)

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. (Charles mark = 3)

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

Comments, explaining strengths and weaknesses (at least 300 words):

The topic of this dissertation is interesting and timely – research on Euroscepticism among the EU-member states gained importance after the Brexit. The aim of the dissertation is to compare the way Eurosceptic political parties or politicians in the UK and the Czech Republic invoke democracy and economy-related arguments (p. 6).

Regrettably, it is not entirely clear what theoretical and methodological approach is used to achieve this aim. Although the author presents a good overview of the academic debate about conceptualization of the term Euroscepticism, the link to the following empirical analysis is missing and the author does not clarify which of the concepts he applied and why.

The title of the thesis promises a comparative approach. The problem is that the author does not specify any criteria for a comparison. The text is rather descriptive and in some parts quite dependent on paraphrasing a few secondary resources (e.g. Sean Hanley's papers in chapter 1). The author works with primary sources as well but again without concretizing how (criteria for the choice of the documents, categorization of the arguments, discourse or content analysis, ...). Author's identification of the two particular time periods for the comparison is explained very briefly without clarifying differences in the length of the periods (2002-2004 vs. 1970-1975), the position of the countries (CZ just before the accession whereby the UK before and after EU accession), and the general context (2000's vs. 1970's).

Conclusions of the analysis regarding the possible similarities in eurosceptic discourses in the UK and the CZ seem to me rather vague and obvious – e.g. sovereignty being the core of the debate, the relevance of the "character, context, and national tradition of the respective countries" (without further specification), ... (p. 49).

Unfortunately, the overall impression from the dissertation is negatively influenced by the language which is frequently confusing and author's arguments might be lost because of that.

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

1. Why do you consider the two cases being comparable in the time periods you have chosen for the comparison? (2002 – 2004 the CZ and 1970-1975 the UK)?
2. Are any other issues than "democracy and economy" relevant for the Eurosceptic debate (p. 48)?
3. Please, categorize economic and democracy-related arguments used by Eurosceptic political actors in both countries. Are there similarities/specifics with respect to their hierarchy or strength?