



MASTER THESIS REVIEW

Type of review:	supervisor's review
Author:	Lidija Milinković
Title:	Influence of Family Policy in Child Poverty: Cases of Czech Republic and Republic of Serbia
Author of review:	Ing. Mgr. Olga Angelovská

The master thesis presented by Lidija Milinković deals with a live **topic** of child poverty and it targets on actual situation in Serbia. I consider the mapping of the problem in Serbia as the main benefit of the work

Goal of the thesis is *“To find out if Europeanization aspect can be identified in applying new instruments to reduction of child poverty.”* (p.8) and it is divided into three subgoals, which were reached fully.

Regarding the topic, the author appropriately chose qualitative approach. The basic **methods** are document analysis, framing and comparison. The author could elaborate framing method more in her text theoretically as well as practically later in the analytical part. On the other hand, the choice of strategic documents is appropriate, and I also appreciate the author is aware of limits and differences in statistical data published by EU and by Serbian institutions.

The author used two core **theoretical** approaches. The first one is based on concept of poverty when author offers good definitions of poverty and describes different approaches to poverty measures. In chapter there is made distinction between poverty and child poverty that is actually the main topic of the thesis. The author demonstrated her ability to use the acquired knowledge of the field. The second concept builds on Europeanisation theory. Within Europeanization theory author discuss gaps, i.e. policy and institutional misfits, but she doesn't work with them in the further parts of her work. Besides those two concepts author included also welfare state concept and stressed family policy. In the case of these two approaches, I see the weakness of the text, where author didn't offer clear strong link to the issue of poverty. Although generally there is no doubt about both approaches and their link to poverty. Both areas are treated rather superficially. I also miss deeper discussions or reflection of two later concepts (for example of Esping-Andersen's family return on page 33). However, it is necessary to point out that the problem of child poverty is a complex and difficult problem to deal with (theoretically as well as practically).



The fifth chapter presents results of **research** and covers situation in EU and Serbia. The description and analysis of poverty in the chapter is supplemented by relevant statistical data. But some descriptive parts are rather shallow or redundant (e.g. in case of Europe 2020 there is no need to mention goals that have no link to poverty, page 49). Concerning structure, it is little bit misleading that information about Serbia already appears in the EU chapter (chapter 5.3) but just in few parts (5.3.1.3, 5.3.1.4, 5.3.2). I would recommend present them after chapter on Serbia (chapter 5.4). I am happy that author mentioned the critic of commission's approach (page 60). I have reservation to the fact that chapter on EU family policy is based just on one source especially when the newest data in the source are from 2007. It is necessary to use newer sources and verify the validity of such conclusions.

The fifth chapter includes also recommendations. I appreciate the author pays attention to reliability of Serbia's institutions in accepting the change (chapter 5.6.2)

In conclusion the author turns back to her goals and research questions. I have one comment. I agree with the author that Europeanisation plays an important role in Serbian policy. But I disagree with some arguments based on strategic documents, concretely Program reforms of Republic of Serbia (page 65) and Europe 2020 (page 54). Serbian document was finished before EU even started consult new strategy Europe 2020, so it can't be an argument for Europeanization.

Primary sources and secondary sources cited by the author are relevant to the chosen topic. The structure of the whole thesis is clear and rather logical, although in some parts the idea is a bit lost. I value the overall author's approach to the thesis.

For the reasons mentioned above, I recommend the thesis for defence and evaluate it by the grade "C"

Date: 8th June 2018

Signature: