

BACHELOR'S THESIS EXAMINER REPORT
PPE – Bachelor's in Politics, Philosophy and Economics
Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Thesis title:	Caste System Reparations in India
Student's name:	Mahika Malik
Referee's name:	Hana Kubátová

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Contribution and argument (quality of research and analysis, originality)	50	40
	Research question (definition of objectives, plausibility of hypotheses)	15	10
	Theoretical framework (methods relevant to the research question)	15	7
<i>Total</i>		80	57
Minor Criteria			
	Sources, literature	10	8
	Presentation (language, style, cohesion)	5	4
	Manuscript form (structure, logical coherence, layout, tables, figures)	5	4
<i>Total</i>		20	16
TOTAL		100	73

Plagiarism-check (URKUND) match score:

[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.

The Turnitin check returned a 17% similarity score. Most of this similarity pertains to individual words, general statements, and other minor cases. However, there are instances where Mahika used more extensive sentences from the papers she referenced. These instances go beyond paraphrasing and should have been enclosed in quotation marks (see, for example, page 26 and the article by Basant and Sen, 2019).

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):

Mahika's thesis explores the role of affirmative action in advancing equality and fairness for minority castes and groups in India, particularly within educational institutions and the workforce. Her thesis is anchored in a multidisciplinary approach, drawing from legal, sociological, political science, and philosophical perspectives. Mahika employs John Rawls' theory of justice as her primary theoretical framework to assess the effectiveness and ethical justification of affirmative action policies in the Indian context. I find both the integration of

various disciplines and the central theoretical framework as two very strong aspects of Mahika's thesis.

There are weakness, though. Methodology is one of them. Her focus group, done at the last minute as I know, involved only ten individuals from diverse backgrounds. While these discussions offer valuable qualitative insights, the small sample size limits the generalizability of the findings especially as it is not complemented with other examinations. The use of purposive sampling, while ensuring diversity, may also introduce bias, as it is unclear whether the selected participants adequately represent the broader population affected by affirmative action policies. The comparative part is the second weakness her. Mahika's thesis attempts to draw comparisons between affirmative action in India and the United States but falls short in establishing a clear and consistent connection. While the U.S. serves as an interesting point of comparison, the differences in socio-political contexts, legal frameworks, and historical backgrounds between the two countries call for a more nuanced and detailed analysis. The current discussion leads to a somewhat superficial comparison.

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

Suggested questions for the defence are:

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.