

REVIEW OF THE MASTER'S THESIS SUPERVISOR

Student's name: Samuel Ryckenberg

Thesis title: The Impact of Socioeconomic Status and Social Exclusion in Higher Education....

Name of the thesis supervisor: Kristýna Vltavská

Assessment of the topic itself (irrespectively of the student): 1.1 To what extent is the topic current and significant? 1.2 How challenging is the topic in respect of theoretical knowledge? 1.3 How challenging is it in respect of practical experience or fieldwork? 1.4 How difficult is it to get background materials? 2. Evaluation of the thesis structure and logical cohesion: 2.1 To what extent is the thesis structure logical and transparent? 2.2 To what extent does the author use current/ suitable sources? 2.3 How properly did the author select methods in respect of the topic? 2.4 How sufficiently and functionally did the author use in the thesis original charts, tables, data, annexes, etc.? 2.5 What is the compatibility level for the thesis basic line elements: topic – thesis assignment – objective – structure – conclusions? 3.1 How well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author analyze the topic? 3.2 Did the author formulate the thesis objective clearly and with logical structure? 3.3 Did the author fulfill the defined thesis objective and approved assignment of the thesis that contains the objective? 3.4 How well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author cover the theoretical part of the thesis? 3.5 How well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author cover			1	2	3	4
 2.1 To what extent is the thesis structure logical and transparent? 2.2 To what extent does the author use current/ suitable sources? 2.3 How properly did the author select methods in respect of the topic? 2.4 How sufficiently and functionally did the author use in the thesis original charts, tables, data, annexes, etc.? 2.5 What is the compatibility level for the thesis basic line elements: topic – thesis assignment – objective – structure – conclusions? 3. Assessment of the thesis text quality: 3.1 How well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author analyze the topic? 3.2 Did the author formulate the thesis objective clearly and with logical structure? 3.3 Did the author fulfill the defined thesis objective and approved assignment of the thesis that contains the objective? 3.4 How well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author cover the theoretical part of the thesis? 	1.1 T 1.2 F 1.3 F	o what extent is the topic current and significant? ow challenging is the topic in respect of theoretical knowledge? ow challenging is it in respect of practical experience or fieldwork?				
 3.1 How well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author analyze the topic? 3.2 Did the author formulate the thesis objective clearly and with logical structure? 3.3 Did the author fulfill the defined thesis objective and approved assignment of the thesis that contains the objective? 3.4 How well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author cover the theoretical part of the thesis? 	2.1 1 2.2 1 2.3 F 2.4 F 0 2.5 N	o what extent is the thesis structure logical and transparent? o what extent does the author use current/ suitable sources? ow properly did the author select methods in respect of the topic? ow sufficiently and functionally did the author use in the thesis riginal charts, tables, data, annexes, etc.? /hat is the compatibility level for the thesis basic line elements:				
the practical/ analytical part of the thesis? 3.6 To what extent are the thesis conclusions logically structured and show quality, and what is their added value?	3.1 F 3.2 [3.3 [3.4] 3.5] 1 3.6]	ow well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author nalyze the topic? id the author formulate the thesis objective clearly and with logical tructure? id the author fulfill the defined thesis objective and approved ssignment of the thesis that contains the objective? low well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author cover ne theoretical part of the thesis? low well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author cover ne practical/ analytical part of the thesis?				

1

4. Assessment of the thesis form and style:			
4.1 What is the formal layout of the thesis?	\boxtimes		
4.2 What is the quality of citations and references? Are sources			
identifiable?	\boxtimes		
4.3 What is the stylistic level of the thesis, particularly the use of correct	-		
economic terminology?	\boxtimes		

5. Overall assessment:

The thesis covers an important issue of the education sector visible in the European Union. Social selectivity of the tertiary education is a topic which is – in a basic way – covered in the EUROSTUDENT survey. This thesis goes a bit deeper into the subject using individual data from the harmonized EU-SILC survey. The author used data from three countries with different educational system and student family background. The results gained using appropriate statistical tools proved differences in the socioeconomic status and social exclusion of students from different family backgrounds. The author described these differences and confronted them with the literature review.

I highly appreciate the choice topic itself as well as the author's involvement in the project at the University of Economics, Prague that preceded the thesis. I also acknowledge the thorough literature review that gave the author the background for the final discussion. I only have one comment towards lack literature concerning Czech family background. However, this is not the author's fault as most papers covering this topic are published in Czech language. I also appreciate the author's enthusiasm for the topic and reliability and responsibility when writing the thesis.

6. Questions and remarks to the defense:

None

Proposed grade: 1

Date: 3rd June 2018

.....

Kristýna Vltavská