Diploma Thesis Evaluation Form

Author: Jennet Gylychmyradova

Title: **The Europeanization of German Political Parties in the 21st Century**

Programme/year: MAIN/2024

Author of Evaluation (<u>**supervisor**</u>/external assessor): **Martin Jeřábek**

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Research question, definition of objectives	**10**	7
	Theoretical/conceptual framework	**30**	6
	Methodology, analysis, argument	**40**	8
Total		*80*	*21*
Minor Criteria			
	Sources	**10**	5
	Style	**5**	3
	Formal requirements	**5**	2
Total		*20*	*10*
TOTAL		*100*	*31*

Charles University, Faculty of Social Sciences, Institute of Political Studies / Smetanovo nabrezi 6, 110 01 Prague 1, Czech Republic, info@fsv.cuni.cz, tel: +420 222 112 111

www.fsv.cuni.cz

Evaluation

Major criteria:

I was pleased to see that the thesis addressed the interesting topic of the Europeanization of German political parties. However, the candidate, Jennet Gylychmyradova, did not follow some crucial advice regarding the theory and methodology of the topic since the initial stage of writing. Furthermore, the candidate finalized the thesis without any consultation with the supervisor since November 2023, so I did not review the final version of the text before submission.

Although the research question "How does Europeanization affect party behavior?" (p. 12) and the research objectives (defined on p. 14) are well-defined, the research design and methodological focus of the thesis <u>do not meet the basic criteria of a concise scientific study</u>. The text makes no real attempt to develop any sort of methodology and is not clearly connected back to the main arguments of the study. The theoretical approach of "Europeanization" outlined in the thesis project (p. 4), which could have been very beneficial to the topic, was not executed. Instead, the candidate describes (without real application) a "neorealist approach": defensive realism (chapter 2.7, p. 44) and offensive realism (chapter 2.9, p. 46). This theoretical framework is not suitable for this kind of analysis.

Additionally, the structure of the submitted thesis does not follow the proposed and well-done outline in the project (p. 6). The thesis structure is therefore not coherent. The necessary research methodology (chapter 3) is included not at the beginning (before the analysis), but in a later part of the thesis (pp. 52-63). Following the methodology is a final chapter (chapter 4) on the "Interpretation of Research Findings" (p. 63 onwards), which does not relate to the main research question or objectives. The subchapter 4.7 "Limitation of the Study" belongs in the methodology section. For example, the conclusion (pp. 70-71) provides a summary of chapter 4 only, rather than the entire study.

There are also obvious mistakes in the text. Some sections consist of inconsistent sentences on diverse topics. For example, on p. 35, the candidate discusses "Germany as an EU member state", "G. Sartori and the party system", and "the eastern development of the EU" without any logical coherence.

Charles University, Faculty of Social Sciences, Institute of Political Studies / Smetanovo nabrezi 6, 110 01 Prague 1, Czech Republic, info@fsv.cuni.cz, tel: +420 222 112 111

www.fsv.cuni.cz

Minor criteria:

From the perspective of formal requirements, the thesis suffers from serious shortcomings. Although the candidate listed some relevant sources, their use does not meet formal academic standards. The "Turnitin" protocol shows 18% similarity but is no sign of clear plagiarism. A detailed examination of the protocol and the text reveals a major issue: the lack of quotations in various sections of the thesis. Whole subchapters lack quotations (e.g., 2.12.3, pp. 51-52; chapter 4.3). On page 11 (regarding Basic Law and the Law on Political Parties from 1967) a citation is required, as well as on p. 35. Direct speech must be quoted (e.g., Ladrech on p. 32, 1st paragraph); p. 15 – Ladrech: "Journal of Common Market Studies" is in the main text, but the full citation is missing in the footnote; the same issue appears on p. 16, etc. Additionally, all tables lack citations (e.g., 3.6 election results, German Bundestag, pp. 57-61). The list of sources should be organized alphabetically (for instance, see sources No. 10 and 11 on p. 74 – there is an unacceptable mix of sources).

Overall evaluation:

The presented thesis lacks crucial components of a diploma thesis. The text consists of sentences and facts composed into paragraphs and subchapters, but it does not present relevant research focused on theoretical background and methodology. Furthermore, the candidate fails to present basic empirical research or adequate data presentation related to the topic of her MA thesis.

Regarding minor criteria, the thesis does not meet the expectations at this level of academic research. Overall, I must suggest evaluating the thesis with a grade of F.

Suggested grade: F (failing); the thesis is <u>not</u> recommended for defense.

Signature:

June 3rd , 2024

Charles University, Faculty of Social Sciences, Institute of Political Studies / Smetanovo nabrezi 6, 110 01 Prague 1, Czech Republic, info@fsv.cuni.cz, tel: +420 222 112 111

www.fsv.cuni.cz