IMESS DISSERTATION

Note: Please email the completed mark sheet to Year 2 coordinator (jiri.vykoukal@post.cz)

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:	Giada Malugani
Dissertation title:	Technocratic populism in the context of contemporary Europe: Silvio Berlusconi and Andrej Babiš

	70+	69-65	64-60	59-55	54-50	<50
	A	B	C	D	E	F
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.*		69				
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.*			62			
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 argument´s limitation or alternative views; Ability to use other evidence to support arguments and structure appropriately.*			63			
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.*	72					
Methodology *Understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research.*		68				

ECTS Mark:	**B** (67)	**Charles Mark:**	84	**Marker:**	Martin Mejstřík
Deducted for late submission:	*No*			**Signed:**	
Deducted for inadequate referencing:				**Date:**	10 September 2024

MARKING GUIDELINES

A (UCL mark 70+) = A (Charles mark 91-100 - excellent): *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 (UCL mark 69-65) = B (Charles mark 81-90– very good)
C (UCL mark 64-60) = C (Charles mark 71-80 – good): 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 (UCL mark 59-55) = D (Charles mark 61-70 – satisfactory)
E (UCL mark 54-50) = E (Charles mark 51-60 – sufficient): 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) = F (Charles mark 0-50 - insufficient): 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.

Please provide substantive and detailed feedback!

Comments, explaining strengths and weaknesses (_at least 300 words_):

Dissertation of Giada Malugani is comparing the technocratic populism of Silvio Berlusconi and Andrej Babiš. The author chose an interesting topic and put together clear and coherent research question. She demonstrated good knowledge of the theory and was able to write a comprehensive state of the arts containing main discussion on populism and technocracy. She also identified a gap in the literature; however, it might be described more in detail. Also, the research question might be more explained.

Concerning the case studies, the author showed a good knowledge of the Italian case and slightly less on Andrej Babiš. The author explains thoroughly why both politicians should be considered technocratic populists. However, the main limitation in their comparison under this category is the different period of their main political activity. Thus, the author was able to demonstrate well the anti-establishment nature of both politicians but not fully their technocratic nature. Nevertheless, the author put together five criteria which help understand commonalities and differences between Berlusconi and Babiš. This comparison is clear and enabled answering the main research question. However, it might be even more valuable to fully explore technocratic aspects of both politician but there has been pre-set limitations (time framework, different political context etc.) which prevented it. Also, it is not fully clear what are differences between both politicians based on the theoretical framework – in other words how their technocratic nature influenced their political behaviour (in more interpretative way)

Overall, the dissertation is well-written with a clear language, good use of literature and referencing. The author proved to have a good both theoretical and practical knowledge of the topic. She also demonstrated the ability to write a coherent academic text with identified research gap, viable comparison and answered research question. The author tackled the above-mentioned limitation with a maximum effort. Only the conclusion might be done in more comprehensive way.

In conclusion, I consider the dissertation of Giada Malugani as a good and interesting text with only minor flaws and limitations.

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

1. How ca we distinguish technocratic populists from "classic" anti-establishment populist actors?

2. Are there any other cases of technocratic populism?

3. What would you identify as the main different in politics of Babiš and Berlusconi?

4. To what extend the differences between two case exist due to different time period and different political context?