# Report on Master Thesis

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

| | |
|---|---|
| **Student:** | **Tarekegn Mamo Legamo** |
| **Advisor:** | **Julie Chytilová, Ph.D.** |
| **Title of the thesis:** | **Determinants of Residential Water Demand in Hawasa, Ethiopia** |

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

The aim of this thesis is to study determinants of water demand by households in the Ethiopian town of Hawasa.

- This is an interesting topic with potentially important policy implications. The author has a clear idea about the research questions he wants to study.

- Tarekegn has also relatively good knowledge of the relevant literature.

- I especially appreciate his effort to collect original data in the field using a survey questionnaire among a random sample of 169 households – which is a difficult task.

There are also several drawbacks of the thesis:

- Tarekegn cites several studies which also focus on determinants of water demand in Ethiopia and it would be worth to spell out more clearly what is the contribution of his work relative to these studies.

- From the section about results it seems that the author was searching for such specification and model which would give him the most significant results, which is not the right approach how to deal with the data analysis (for example, on p. 43 it says: "But still the result was not satisfactory somehow an important variables are not yet to have significant predictions on dependent variable.")

- At some places the text is a bit uneasy to follow and the English could be tighter.

- It is not clear what the total number of observations was. The sample description says 169 but the text implies it was actually more (for example on p. 28 it says that 171 (86%) of respondents consider water price affordable).

However, I consider these drawbacks relatively minor compared to the merits listed above.

I am happy to recommend the thesis for the defence and suggest grade A (1) or B (2) depending on the defence of the thesis.

The defence committee might want to ask the following questions:

- What is the value added of the thesis relative to the existing literature studying determinants of water demand in Ethiopia?

- The results show that education is negatively correlated with water consumption and Tarekegn says that a possible explanation is that more educated households may have more knowledge about water conservation. How is this statement affected by the fact that in the regression one of the explanatory variables is awareness about water conservation? Can Tarekegn directly test whether this explanation is feasible?

# Report on **Master Thesis**

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

| | |
|---|---|
| **Student:** | **Tarekegn Mamo Legamo** |
| **Advisor:** | **Julie Chytilová, Ph.D.** |
| **Title of the thesis:** | **Determinants of Residential Water Demand in Hawasa, Ethiopia** |

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

| CATEGORY | | POINTS |
|---|---|---|
| *Literature* | *(max. 20 points)* | 20 |
| *Methods* | *(max. 30 points)* | 25 |
| *Contribution* | *(max. 30 points)* | 25 |
| *Manuscript Form* | *(max. 20 points)* | 10 |
| **TOTAL POINTS** | *(max. 100 points)* | **80** |
| **GRADE** | **(1 – 2 – 3 – 4)** | **1** |

*NAME OF THE REFEREE: Julie Chytilová*

*DATE OF EVALUATION:*    *June 8, 2014*

_____
*Referee Signature*

## *EXPLANATION OF CATEGORIES AND SCALE:*

*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*    |

*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*    |

*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*    |

*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 POINTS | GRADE |                  |                          |
|--------------|-------|------------------|--------------------------|
| 81 – 100     | 1     | = excellent      | = výborně                |
| 61 – 80      | 2     | = good           | = velmi dobře            |
| 41 – 60      | 3     | = satisfactory   | = dobře                  |
| 0 – 40       | 4     | = fail           | = nedoporučuji k obhajobě |