

REPORT ON THE MASTER THESIS

IEPS – International Economic and Political Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Title of the thesis:	Effectiveness of human rights protection: Case study of Roma population in the Czech Republic
Author of the thesis:	Aidai Idinova
Referee (incl. titles):	Antonin Mikes Ph.D (<i>supervisor</i>)

Remark: It is a standard at the FSV UK that the Referee's Report is at least 500 words long. In case you will assess the thesis as "non-defendable", please explain the concrete reasons for that in detail.

SUMMARY OF POINTS AWARDED (for details, see below):

CATEGORY	POINTS
<i>Theoretical background (max. 20)</i>	10
<i>Contribution (max. 20)</i>	5
<i>Methods (max. 20)</i>	0
<i>Literature (max. 20)</i>	15
<i>Manuscript form (max. 20)</i>	10
TOTAL POINTS (max. 100)	40
The proposed grade (1-2-3-4)	4

You can even use a decimal point (e.g. giving the grade of 2.5 for 60 points).

Comments of the referee on the thesis highlights and shortcomings (following the 5 numbered aspects of your assessment indicated below).

1) Theoretical background: Although this work is non-theoretical in nature the student has made an attempt to cover to main foundation of this highly relevant issue, the issue of continued segregation within the educational sector within the Czech Republic. The inclusion of a variety of resources (both academic and non-governmental) is commendable and the literature used is adequate considering the breadth of the topic covered.

2) Contribution: This work provides little more than a generalized overview of the problematic, often repeating well known and commonly heard complaints, generalizations and recommendations coming out of international non-governmental organizations, schools, ministries and supranational bodies. The author did not even include mention of their own 'unique' data analysis presented in the section labeled Hypotheses (p.14) in the conclusion to the work. Additionally the aspect of Human Rights was barely touched upon in the work, with the first discussion of the importance of the right to education only being brought up on page 28 of the work.

3) Methods: The author of this work has taken on a gargantuan task, of analyzing the educational system and societal discrimination within the Czech Republic. It is clear that the author has bitten off more than can be chewed palatably. The author has several well written subsections which are weakly linked, with relevant sections buried within subchapters. The author has, in fact, embarked upon statistical analysis of data provided by the European Union. This analysis, however, is poorly executed and should be removed entirely from the work. The author has attempted to use statistics to provide a unique academic quality to the work. Yet, even if the data had been properly analyzed using SPSS (as the student has attempted) then it would most likely not provide the work with a substantial basis from which to proceed on. Looking at the data and methods employed there is no justification for their inclusion in any academic work. Basic statistical tests (standard deviation and error) are omitted, with the author referencing 'percentages who agreed with' as a basis for the analysis. See pages 13-26.

4) Literature: Coverage of the topic is adequate with a well referenced list of relevant authors (or bodies) used to support the work. As a descriptive work the thesis is adequately supported in terms of the literature used. Unfortunately, the author did not provide a comprehensive literature review in the section titled 'literature review' (p.11-13). However, the literature was comprehensively reviewed in the section entitled "Right to Education" (p31) and "Czech Legal Framework" (p.48). (see commentary below)

5) Manuscript form: The author of this work barely followed the recommended outline agreed upon during the early phases of the thesis preparation. As a supervisor I was not asked for commentary on the form or content of the work at any time after the original proposal was submitted! The author has loosely followed recommended guidelines and has prepared a thesis which is highly descriptive. The authors personal research is buried in the early pages of the work and then not referenced or discussed further during the remaining chapters of the work, and is not even noted in the conclusions.

DATE OF EVALUATION: 29.8.2016



**Antonin Mikes PhD
Supervisor**