

MASTER'S THESIS EXAMINER REPORT

IEPS – International Economic and Political Studies

Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Thesis title:	A Study of the Chinese Government's Approach in preventing Female Employment Discrimination in the Context of the Comprehensive Three Child Policy
Student's name:	Zhaoming Huang
Referee's name:	Hana Kubatova

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Contribution and argument (quality of research and analysis, originality)	50	25
	Research question (definition of objectives, plausibility of hypotheses)	15	8
	Theoretical framework (methods relevant to the research question)	15	12
Total		80	45
Minor Criteria			
	Sources, literature	10	9
	Presentation (language, style, cohesion)	5	3
	Manuscript form (structure, logical coherence, layout, tables, figures)	5	3
Total		20	15
TOTAL		100	60

Plagiarism-check (URKUND) match score: 2%

[NB:] If the plagiarism-check (URKUND) match score is above 15%, the reviewer has to include his/her assessment of the originality of the reviewed thesis in his/her review.

Reviewer's commentary according to the above criteria (min. 1800 characters including spaces when recommending a passing grade, min. 2500 characters including spaces when recommending a failing grade):

The herein reviewed master thesis—A Study of the Chinese Government's Approach in preventing Female Employment Discrimination in the Context of the Comprehensive Three Child Policy—promises an interesting and important reading into gender discrimination in employment for women in China. Unfortunately, it does not deliver on its promises.

There are two core reasons for this—and for my critical words here. First and foremost, the thesis needs a strong framework and a strong introduction. While building on a relatively large body of literature, which is examined in a separate section, reading the

introduction in its current stage does not tell the reader much of the puzzle driving this thesis. The thesis proposal actually did a much better job in outlining the thesis and working hypotheses. What I would suggest here is to rewrite the intro following the guidelines for the proposal: clearly indicating what is the scholarly debate the author is entering, why, what is the question, what is the hypothesis, how does the author propose to answer the research question, what are the limits of the thesis.

Second, the thesis needs a stronger methodology. Reading the outline first I got drawn into the proposed combination of statistical data analysis (questionnaire survey method) and a qualitative data analysis (interviews). The actual thesis speaks of a rather different methodology set, combining literature analysis method with what the author calls a comparative analysis method. There is not enough information in the thesis for me to understand how the “employment situation of women before and after the implementation of the two-child policy” (p. 15) was performed, that is beyond placing the different survey data alongside each other. This warrants an explanation, and I would have also preferred to know why the author has decided to stick to a different methodology. I would also suggest using tables for summarizing different survey data, as again, this would make it easier for the reader.

The thesis very much reads as a policy paper. In much of Chapter 8, the thesis makes numerous suggestions to the Chinese government on action it should take (“establish a responsible subject,” “establish a gender equality agency,” “mobilize social forces,” “guide market forces,” “improve related supporting policies,” “gender mainstreaming,” “build a childcare service system,” “establish male parental leave,” establish “compensation to enterprises,” “improve legislation,” “create an equal environment,” etc.”). While I understand built on Smith’s policy implementation theory, what I lacked was a much more critical interpretation whether any/all this is feasible and what might be some of the implementation obstacles the author expects.

Among the minor points I would raise is a need for a much more precise language (there are several expressions such as something being “fine” or a population being “huge”), which made me wonder how we measure that. At some point the font changes (p. 34) some of the titles (Chapter 7) were too long to serve as such.

Proposed grade (A-B-C-D-E-F):

Suggested questions for the defence are: E

I (do not) recommend the thesis for final defence.

Referee Signature

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:

TOTAL POINTS	GRADE	Quality standard
91 – 100	A	= outstanding (high honor)
81 – 90	B	= superior (honor)
71 – 80	C	= good
61 – 70	D	= satisfactory
51 – 60	E	= low pass at a margin of failure
0 – 50	F	= failing. The thesis is not recommended for defence.