

# Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

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

<b>Student:</b>	<b>Viktorija Pasichnyk</b>
<b>Advisor:</b>	<b>doc. Julie Chytilová</b>
<b>Title of the thesis:</b>	<b>Discrimination of Ukrainian Citizens in the Czech Labor Market: A Field Experiment</b>

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

## Short summary

The thesis investigates the level of discrimination faced by Ukrainians in the Czech labor market. The analysis is based on a correspondence experiment, where CVs of fictional applicants were sent to job offers posted online. The author distinguishes between university students who seek part-time jobs in Prague and high school graduates who seek full-time jobs in the Czech Republic. Moreover, the author distinguishes between two periods of time: 15.9.2022-20.12.2022 and 20.12.2022-31.3.2023.

The results show that Czech females have a more than 70% higher callback rate than Ukrainian females. Moreover, there is a decline in the Ukrainian callback rate between periods 1 and 2. The thesis concludes that discriminatory behavior against Ukrainians is present in the Czech Republic.

## Contribution

This topic is surely interesting and relevant these days. It provides an interesting insight into labor market discrimination in the Czech Republic. The author draws a clear conclusion that discriminatory behavior against Ukrainians is present in the Czech Republic and how it changes between the two periods.

Even though there is a huge limitation in self-collected experimental data, the contribution is still very meaningful. However, the author should stress more why is this important.

## Methods

The data was collected between September 1st, 2022 and March 31, 2023. In total, 875 resumes were sent out from which 847 responses were used. The names of the applicants were thoroughly picked based on the most common (sur)names in the respective country. Only females are considered in the thesis as the author wanted to avoid potential gender discrimination. In my opinion, this is a smart move, however, the potential discrimination between genders is still present as other applicants (real ones) could be males. So the low rate of callbacks may be also driven by gender discrimination against both Czechs and Ukrainians. The question is whether gender discrimination is proportionally the same between Czech females and males and Ukrainian females and males. However, this is not part of the thesis. The results are correctly commented as the percentage difference between Ukrainian and Czech females (so they are not affected by the low callback rates).

The author uses appropriate methods. The methodology is more than sufficient for the bachelor thesis. The author provides a clear randomization check which is necessary for this kind of analysis. The results are interpreted in average partial effects for better understanding. However, I would be more careful with the interpretation „over time“. It's more comparing two periods of time than observing „the trend over time“.

# Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

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

<b>Student:</b>	<b>Viktorija Pasichnyk</b>
<b>Advisor:</b>	<b>doc. Julie Chytilová</b>
<b>Title of the thesis:</b>	<b>Discrimination of Ukrainian Citizens in the Czech Labor Market: A Field Experiment</b>

## Literature

The author proved distinct knowledge of such a topic. The author presents a very helpful literature review for the reader. The second chapter combines the Methodology and the Bibliographic Review, where is clearly discussed both, the techniques and the existing literature concerning discrimination.

## Manuscript form

The thesis is well-structured, well-written, and easy to follow. Most of the tables are self-explanatory. Still, I have some minor points. In Table 2, I suggest specifying that university students are applying for part-time jobs and high school graduates for full-time jobs. Moreover, what is the language requirement? Is it English? All in general?

The titles of studies are in most cases in italics but somewhere not. The data described at the beginning of section 4 should be in a data description table for clarity. Moreover, descriptive statistics of the data would be very useful. I believe that the number of observations in Table 14 is not correct as in the text the author states there are not enough observations (only 30 in the first period and 10 in the second period for Ukrainians).

I also believe there is a misunderstanding on p. 13 in the interpretation of the language level: „The Czech language of each applicant is on level C1 and consistent with that of a university student in the Czech Republic, based on established standards.... The Ukrainian student is fluent in the Ukrainian language, and their level of Czech is stated as C2, whereas the Czech student is indicated as a “native speaker.”... Figure 3 is missing a title for the y-axis (it’s in the title of the figure but still it should be there as in Fig 1 and 2). Also, I suggest including the results of the tests (heteroskedasticity, autocorrelation, ...) in the Appendix.

## Overall evaluation and suggested questions for the discussion during the defense

One can see that the data collection was not easy and that the author made great work. The author is well aware of the limitations of the study and proposed nice points for further research. The author demonstrates a full understanding of the topic. The manuscript is well-written and easy to follow. In my view, the thesis fulfills the requirements for a bachelor's thesis at IES, Charles University. The results of the Turnitin analysis do not indicate significant text similarity with other available sources. I have only minor comments, therefore, I recommend it for the defense and suggest a grade A.

Suggestions for the discussion during the defense:

1. Even though there is a decrease in the probability of receiving a callback between 2022 and 2023 for Ukrainians, the time period is not as long to have this strong conclusion. Do you think that results are affected also by before Christmas vs after Christmas period? Why did you select 20.12.2022 as the breaking point? How do you think this „decrease over time “ evolves in the future?
2. The rejection from the recruiter side can be caused by a really brief general motivation letter (it’s quite straightforward that applicants with stronger motivation are preferred). Also, I see the limitation in a poor CV as the visual appearance is a very important part when considering an applicant for a job. Do you think that improving the CVs and the motivation letters will change the results (even though the conditions, i.e. CV and motivation letter, are the same for Czechs and Ukrainians)?

# Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

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

<b>Student:</b>	<b>Viktorija Pasichnyk</b>
<b>Advisor:</b>	<b>doc. Julie Chytilová</b>
<b>Title of the thesis:</b>	<b>Discrimination of Ukrainian Citizens in the Czech Labor Market: A Field Experiment</b>

3. The number of Ukrainians in the Czech Republic rose significantly last year. The author considers only Ukrainians who are in the Czech Republic since (at least) 2012 (University students) or since 2016 (high school graduates). It could be interesting to include also newcomers (and consider only English-speaking jobs as the language barrier would be significant for the newcomers). Have you considered it?
4. I am curious whether you think this is applicable also to males. Do you think the proportion of callback rate would be the same between Czech male and Ukrainian male applicants?
5. Why did you use the Average Partial Effects for the interpretation of the results and not the (Average) Marginal Effects?

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

<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
<i>Contribution</i> (max. 30 points)	26
<i>Methods</i> (max. 30 points)	30
<i>Literature</i> (max. 20 points)	20
<i>Manuscript Form</i> (max. 20 points)	17
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b> (max. 100 points)	<b>93</b>
<b>GRADE</b> (A – B – C – D – E – F)	<b>A</b>

**NAME OF THE REFEREE:**

**DATE OF EVALUATION: 31. 5. 2023**

*Digitálně podepsáno (31.5.2023):  
Klára Kantová*

---

**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