

## Annex One: Euroculture Thesis Assessment Form



### Euroculture Thesis Assessment Form

Name of Student: **Kornelie Gronska**

Thesis Title: **"Inspiration and Cooperation between the European Court of Human Rights and the Inter-American Court of Human Rights"**

Home University: **University of Olomouc**

Host University: **University of Strasbourg**

Name of Supervisor: **Elisabeth Lambert Abdelgawad**

In this report, please consider the following, by answering the following questions. Please add a short explanation instead of simply answering yes, no or partly.

**1) Content: Problem statement, method and theory:**

- a) Is the topic of the thesis clearly presented and motivated? The author introduces the reader to the historical and political context of the topic.

**The topic of the thesis is sufficiently presented and motivated.**

- b) Are the aims and objectives of the thesis clearly identified and explained?

**The aims of the thesis are clearly formulated p.13.**

- c) Is there a well formulated problem statement and is it of sufficient complexity for an MA level? Briefly explain.

**The basic research questions are mainly whether and why there was a need for cooperation between both Courts, how this cooperation has evolved, what sort of interactions have taken place.**

- d) Has the student convincingly explained the relevance of the research?

**The relevance of the research is quite clear as the cooperation has taken new steps and as more interaction seems to exist.**

- e) Has a suitable methodology and theoretical frame been taken to solve the stated problems?

**The methodological framework is formulated in precise terms, combining an analysis of cases of both Courts, several interviews, a documentary research and the grounded theory. We would have liked more precise data on the grounded theory and its relevance for the current research.**

- f) In case where empirical research has been conducted: is there a suitable research design and has the research been conducted adequately?

**The issues have been adequately tested through empirical research. The interviews conducted offer a real added value and have been put in Appendix. However more references need to be done to these interviews during the developments.**

- g) Does the conclusion provide convincing answers/proof to the initial questions/hypotheses?

**The conclusions offer convincing answers to the initial hypotheses.**

- h) Does the research constitute a contribution to knowledge in this field or domain?

**The research provides a minimal contribution, notably as to staff exchanges put in place by both Courts.**

**2) Structure:**

- a) Is the thesis coherently structured in chapters and sections?

**Yes. The structure is progressive, coherent and clear. The chapters are divided into thematic sections which permit a more dynamic approach.**

- b) Are concepts clearly introduced and explained, and critically and consistently applied?

**The concepts are not sufficiently explained. For instance, there is no reference to theoretical approach and previous literature concerning the concepts of soft and hard cooperation.**

**3) Sources (primary and secondary):**

- a) Has (enough) relevant (primary and secondary) literature been adequately interpreted and integrated into the thesis?

**The bibliography on the issue is vast and can be scarcely mastered by a student.**

- b) Is the bibliography/list of references complete and accurate?

**See above.**

**4) Stylistics:**

- a) Is the use of language (English) acceptable and of the required standard (i.e. no spelling mistakes and typos, range of vocabulary, grammar)?

**Yes.**

- b) Are references in the text given in a coherent and consistent manner (either in-text or as footnotes)?

**Yes. But sometimes sources are missing.**

**5) Format:**

- a) How is the thesis presented (i.e. consistency in lay-out, choice of fonts, headings, tables and graphs)?

**The thesis has been properly presented.**

- b) Does the thesis contain all required elements (title page, declaration, table of contents, bibliography, etc.)?

**Yes. We appreciate in Appendix the transcripts of interviews.**

**6) Quality of writing process:**

- a) To what degree has the student been able to work independently?

**As far as I can see, the student worked independently, but took into account my remarks and suggestions. Some language assistance was also requested.**

- b) Have recommended revisions been executed to a satisfying degree?

**Yes, to my full satisfaction. The structure has evolved and the analysis has been improved so that it is less narrative and descriptive than what had been previously submitted.**

- c) Any other relevant comments (e.g. on planning and commitment of the student).

This was a new topic for the student who was not familiar with regional systems of human rights but she decided to work on this issue. So it was challenging to a certain extent and required a lot of efforts.

**7) Possible questions for thesis defence (only if this thesis is to be defended orally)**

**(National) Grade: 13/20**

Date and place: Strasbourg, 30 June 2016

Signature:

