Joint Dissertation Review

Name of the student:	Katerina Halenka
Title of the thesis:	Why are women becoming more entrepreneurial than man? Case Study: Czech Republic
Reviewer:	Dr. Sarita Koendjbiharie

1. KNOWLEDGE AND CONNECTION TO THE FIELD
(relevance of the research question, research objective, literature review):

The author covers the academic relevance on p. 3, which gap in the literature this thesis will address. In terms of positioning the literature 66 sources were used of which around half seem to be academic journals. The discussion on self-employment factors (push and pull) is insightful and integrates perspectives, this style could have been followed more throughout the entire literature review, building claims with more than one reference). Overall more studies from (top-tier) management or economics journals such as ASQ on self-employment, entrepreneurship and gender could have been connected, studies from top economic journals seems to be underused in the literature review.

While the study combines multiple macro and micro factors simultaneously (and the comprehensive is its contribution), it would have been good to have a more elaborate literature review per concept and introduce variables and hypotheses in more detail e.g. p. 16 cultural factors, the review seems rushed (horizontal culture transmission not explained, no hypothesis formulated, same succinctness and lack of hypothesis formulation for most other factors). E.g. discussion on age for example is brief and could have been more clearly written so the conjectured effect is clear and for which age groups. For each of these effects of factors on self-employment and claims made, more than a single study should have been used to bolster the arguments made.

As an aside, concepts such as human and social capital are part of large debates in organizational behavior/sociology, but this literature is not connected to define the concepts and social capital is subsumed under human capital but these are separate concepts.

2. ANALYSIS
(methodology, argument, theoretical backing, appropriate work with sources):

The research design is a ok start, it says it is guided by 2 references, however what is missing is detail on the operationalization and justification for the choice in (proxy) variable (using more literature and explanation), explicit coverage of data sources and a reference to a statistics handbook with discussion of multilevel regression. Table with variables and their scales are missing so often difficult to interpret the analyses, also when looking at the operationalization of cultural factors and the DV (there is endogeneity). In the use of the correlation analyses and interpretation of results the terms influence or impact (e.g. Table 25) should have been avoided (more careful with these claims) since only linear correlation or its absence can be concluded.

The research objective would have been achieved better with a panel data or time series analysis, however at master's level probably this cannot be expected, however it was possible to introduce or consider/discuss any lagged effects of variables health, unemployment, corruption, social security policies etc. (or at least to discuss it).

It is not clear why the choice was made to use ANOVA instead of regression since many variables are not categorical (e.g. Transparency Corruption Perception Index, GDP per capita, fertility rates, household net income). The analyses seem to be have been written quite rushed with much data in the appendices that is not discussed enough in the main text.

ANOVA could have been used to compare the coefficients of the two regression models. The appendices contain models and results that are not linked to the discussion in the main text so this is quite inaccessible.

Moreover, it would be been interesting to discuss any gender differences in terms of industries of self-employment in more detail (data is in Table 18).

3. CONCLUSIONS
(persuasiveness, link between data and conclusions, achievement of research objectives):

> See above comment on correlation analyses
>
> The conclusions are clearly written but difficult to understand since the table of coefficients is not provided

4. FORMAL ASPECTS AND LANGUAGE
(appropriate language, adherence to academic standards, citation style, layout):

> In parts like the beginning clearly written and at points guiding the reader through the different parts of the research (with the exception of factors, discussion, research design, operationalization and analyses which are less accessible due to insufficient detail). Appendices are full of interesting data but not adequately connected or discussed, no Table headers of the type of analyses.
>
> What could have also benefited the thesis is a more thorough spelling and grammar check e.g. see title (than men), p. 2 it's → its, that said, p. 30 also i self-employment, also articles are sometimes missing e.g. the; in bibliography formatting often but not always consistent (e.g. p. 75 Journal of Labor Economics).
>
> As a sidenote, use of consistent (= same) terms aids the reader (individual, micro and collective, macro). Also the distinction between self-employed and entrepreneurship is made very clear on p. 7 but then perhaps the title should have been rephrased and also use of term entrepreneurship avoided after this explicit distinction/focus.

5. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT
(strong and weak point of the dissertation, other issues)

> Overall this is an interesting thesis on a relevant and promising topic, it attempts to produce a comprehensive study on the topic and provided analysis with numerous factors, compliment on the amount of data (variables) handled. The author acknowledges limitations at points such as data access and biases and justifies the case country selection and timeframe.
>
> There are however several large points from improvement in the overall exercise of academic research, ranging from the strength of the literature review (engaging with the extant literature, defining concepts and variables, hypothesis formulation), research design (operationalization and explanation of dataset and techniques) and analyses (motivation of using ANOVA instead of regression, interpretation of correlation results and drawing conclusions from these analyses conducted before.
>
> With the above in mind, I hope the author continue to build on this experience of writing this dissertation, also using the feedback provided above in a constructive manner and wish her good luck in the future.

Grade (A-F):	Grade E
Date: 10-9-2019	Signature:
10-9-2019	