# Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

**Institute of Economic Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University in Prague**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Student:** | **Kateřina Kinzlová** |
| **Advisor:** | **Barbara Pertold-Gebicka** |
| **Title of the thesis:** | The salary level of teachers in the Czech Republic and its impacts |

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

*Please provide your assessment of each of the following four categories, summary and suggested questions for the discussion. The minimum length of the report is 300 words.*

**Contribution**
The main value added of the thesis of Kateřina Kinzlová is to provide (a bit of back-of-the-envelope) estimates of the incidence of teacher atrition in the Czech Republic. While important for policy makers, data on teacher attrition are not recorded in the Czech Republic and till 2016 there was also no data on the number of entrants to the teaching profession.
The first part of the thesis provides large number of statistics documenting teacher remuneration, number of teachers, teacher-to-student ratios and other. These statistics are very important to illustrate the state of teacher profession, but their presentation is just a repetition of (and in some cases uptade to) recent studies by Daniel Műnich.

**Methods**
Kateřina departs from available statistics on the number of teachers in primary and secondary education and their age distribution to retrieve the number of teachers in each age group and school level. She next makes a set of assumptions allowing her to use these numbers to estimate the rate of attrition (dropout rate) of teachers. She provides two sets of estimates – one is based on the assumption that the age structure of entrants to the teaching profession was constant ofer the last 10 years – the other based on the assumption that the ratio of entrants to the number of teachers is constant. Both approaches lead to estimating very high levels of teacher attrition.
These are simple back-of-the-envelope or accounting exercises, but they provide useful information.

**Literature**
A decent, although not fully complete, literature review is provided in the thesis.

**Manuscript form**
The manuscript is wroten in a decent English with minor issues. Presentation is clear and tables in the empirical part are helping the reader to understand calculations. The thesis would benefit from a clearer flow of thoughts, though. While the first part of the thesis puts forward the issue of teacher remuneration, the main contrubution of the thesis is estimation of teacher dropout rates.

**Summary and suggested questions for the discussion during the defense**
The thesis by Kateřina Kinzlová touches a very important topic of the attractiveness of teacher profession. The student got very involved in the topic and she collected a lot of information and data relevant to this issue. However, while working on the thesis Kateřina found it hard to choose which information is relevant and what should be the main focus of the thesis. The final version of the thesis was prepared in some rush, but nevertheless it conveys a clear and important message – teachers in the Czech Republic often get discouraged from performing the profession!

Suggested question: What data should be collected to allow proper analysis of the status of teaching profession? Why?

# Report on **Bachelor / Master Thesis**

**Institute of Economic Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University in Prague**

| Student: | Kateřina Kinzlová |
|---|---|
| Advisor: | Barbara Pertold-Gebicka |
| Title of the thesis: | The salary level of teachers in the Czech Republic and its impacts |

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

| CATEGORY | | POINTS |
|---|---|---|
| *Contribution* | *(max. 30 points)* | 23 |
| *Methods* | *(max. 30 points)* | 20 |
| *Literature* | *(max. 20 points)* | 15 |
| *Manuscript Form* | *(max. 20 points)* | 15 |
| **TOTAL POINTS** | *(max. 100 points)* | **73** |
| **GRADE** | **(A – B – C – D – E – F)** | **C** |

*NAME OF THE REFEREE:* **Barbara Pertold-Gebicka**

*DATE OF EVALUATION:* **01.06.2018**

_____
*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.*

| *Strong* | *Average* | *Weak* |
|----------|-----------|--------|
| *30*     | *15*      | *0*    |

**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.*

| *Strong* | *Average* | *Weak* |
|----------|-----------|--------|
| *30*     | *15*      | *0*    |

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

| *Strong* | *Average* | *Weak* |
|----------|-----------|--------|
| *20*     | *10*      | *0*    |

**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.*

| *Strong* | *Average* | *Weak* |
|----------|-----------|--------|
| *20*     | *10*      | *0*    |

### Overall grading:

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