

Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

Institute of Economic Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Student:	Eliška Velková
Advisor:	doc. Ing. Tomáš Cahlík, CSc.
Title of the thesis:	Gender Index in the Czech Public Firms

OVERALL ASSESSMENT (provided in English, Czech, or Slovak):

Contribution

Eliska's thesis scrutinizes the problem of gender inequality in the Czech Republic. Specifically, under-representation of women on board positions in the Czech public firms is addressed using a method of Kohonen self-organizing maps. According to the author, her thesis is the first work that employs the Kohonen method in the context of the Czech labor market.

I personally miss a comprehensive interpretation of the results, that are presented in Chapter 3.3. Including a few sentences interpreting the main results would have been especially valuable for Introduction and Conclusion parts. Furthermore, it would have highlighted the contribution of the thesis as a whole.

At this point, I would like to draw the Committee's attention to the similarity of Eliska's and Pavla Mikulikova's thesis structure and content (Pavla wrote a thesis on SOMs under the supervision of doc. Cahlik year ago). From my perspective, it might be problematic that Eliska cites Pavla's work only on page 21, not admitting she follows Pavla's thesis structure (especially in Chapter 3). Nevertheless, as I am not familiar with the method of SOMs in detail, I am unable to assess objectively, to which extent Eliska follows Petra's work and to which extent it is an inevitable feature of this method. Therefore, I leave the assessment of the resemblance to the Committee and doc. Tomas Cahlik.

Methods

The author clearly explains the idea of Self-Organizing Maps in Chapter 2. In Chapter 3, Eliska runs her analysis, using the publicly available data collected at the Czech Statistical Office website and gender index data provided by the website of Otevrena společnost. First of all, she describes the data collection process in detail and presents descriptive statistics of variables of interest. Further, she explains the SOMs analysis and presents the results. I believe the author uses the SOMs correctly and appropriately given the research question of gender inequality.

In conclusion, the author mentions that the algorithm of SOMs is generally very sensitive to the choice of variables. I would suggest to include a sensitivity analysis in the thesis, to explore the robustness of the chosen model and variables.

Literature

The literature review is comprehensive and well structured. The author summarizes many relevant and up-to-date examples from the research of gender inequality and combines academic publications with technical documents of international organizations. Even though I like the literature review a lot, I find significant drawbacks in citation style. The papers are often cited inappropriately, which raises doubts about the author's awareness of this problematic. I mention only a few examples, to illustrate the problem, below:

p. 4 - (M Pilar Sanchez-Lopez and Liminana-Gras, 2017)

p. 7 - (Oecd.org, 2014).

p. 7 - Valentová, Šmídová and Katrňák, 2007)

p. 9 - (Laura D'Andrea Tyson and Parker, 2019)

Moreover, the Bibliography section is not alphabetically ordered.

Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

Institute of Economic Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Student:	Eliška Velková
Advisor:	doc. Ing. Tomáš Cahlík, CSc.
Title of the thesis:	Gender Index in the Czech Public Firms

Manuscript form

The thesis is well written, and the author uses appropriate language and style. The structure is standard and makes the manuscript easily readable and understandable. However, all the figures and tables in Chapter 3 lack explanatory notes and are of low quality (probably not stored in PDF). Figures 6 and 7 should also be referred to as Tables, and I would recommend including them as the Latex tables. Also, I do not see any point in presenting variables horizontally – it would make more sense to list them vertically in one table.

Summary and suggested questions for the discussion during the defense

In my view, the thesis fulfils the requirements for a bachelor thesis at IES, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University, I recommend it for the defense and suggest a grade C.

The results of the Urkund analysis do not indicate significant text similarity with other available sources.

Suggested questions:

How would you approach the sensitivity analysis, to overcome the sensitiveness of the SOMs' algorithm?

How would you interpret the results of the thesis? Are they in line with the results of other relevant publications?

SUMMARY OF POINTS AWARDED (for details, see below):

CATEGORY	POINTS
<i>Contribution (max. 30 points)</i>	22
<i>Methods (max. 30 points)</i>	22
<i>Literature (max. 20 points)</i>	16
<i>Manuscript Form (max. 20 points)</i>	13
TOTAL POINTS (max. 100 points)	73
GRADE (A – B – C – D – E – F)	C

NAME OF THE REFEREE: Mgr. Kateřina Chadimová

DATE OF EVALUATION: 18th January, 2021

Digitálně podepsáno (18.1.2021)
Kateřina Chadimová

Referee Signature

EXPLANATION OF CATEGORIES AND SCALE:

CONTRIBUTION: *The author presents original ideas on the topic demonstrating critical thinking and ability to draw conclusions based on the knowledge of relevant theory and empirics. There is a distinct value added of the thesis.*

METHODS: *The tools used are relevant to the research question being investigated, and adequate to the author's level of studies. The thesis topic is comprehensively analyzed.*

LITERATURE REVIEW: *The thesis demonstrates author's full understanding and command of recent literature. The author quotes relevant literature in a proper way.*

MANUSCRIPT FORM: *The thesis is well structured. The student uses appropriate language and style, including academic format for graphs and tables. The text effectively refers to graphs and tables and disposes with a complete bibliography.*

Overall grading:

TOTAL	GRADE
91 – 100	A
81 - 90	B
71 - 80	C
61 – 70	D
51 – 60	E
0 – 50	F