

Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

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

Student:	Ľubica Laslopová
Advisor:	Mgr. Barbara Pertold-Gebicka, M.A., Ph.D.
Title of the thesis:	Overeducation in the Czech Labour Market

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

The thesis submitted by the Ľubica Laslopová studies the overeducation in the Czech labour market. Overeducation represents a mismatch between the qualification of a worker and the qualification necessary for her job position. The author builds on previous studies describing this educational mismatch and extends their methods to the specifics of Czech labour market. By using advanced econometric tools she analyses the overeducation through two measurement methods, normative and statistical. Both methods provide several conclusions that are however mostly contradictory. The only result based on both statistical and normative measures of over-education seems to be that Prague residents were found less likely to be overeducated.

I find the topic of Ľubica's thesis quite interesting and well managed. She shows sufficient knowledge of both the topic of labour economics as well as the analytical methods. The thesis is formally correct. Although I do have several complaints to the thesis, I am pleased to summarize at the beginning of this report that the author managed all aspects of a bachelor thesis well. Therefore, based on the quality of the thesis I suggest the grade "1", i.e. "excellent."

The thesis first places the topic of overeducation within an existing literature. It describes labour market theories and overeducation, summarizes the results of past studies and introduces the consequences of overeducation. The author proves vast knowledge of labour market literature. However, I find this part of the thesis quite long and sometimes less comprehensible to the reader. For example, the author states on page 8 that: "*Later on, the research was extended by McGoldrick & J.Robst (1996) and Buchel & van Ham (2003).*" But she does not provide any information in which direction the research was extended. Either is that research not important and should not be included or its results should be described. The literature itself is clearly stated and well cited.

The thesis then continues with the focus on the Czech Republic. It describes Czech educational system, Czech labour market and previous evidence of overeducation in the Czech labour market. This chapter is basically a qualitative analysis of the situation in the Czech Republic. The hypotheses are clearly stated at the end of the chapter three.

The data and methodology used for the analysis are introduced in chapter four. The author gives numerous possibilities how to perform estimates but she does not make those estimates in her thesis. According to my opinion, such parts of the thesis considerably destroy the flow of the text. It is good that the author knows advanced econometrical methods, which sometimes even exceed bachelor-level econometrics, but it is questionable if their explanation belongs into the bachelor thesis.

The cornerstone of the thesis then lies in its fifth chapter in which the author provides results of her analyses. I believe that a lot of text could be omitted or left for appendix to increase quality of this thesis. Moreover, the author states (more than once) that her results are not surprising. Thus, she let the reader to wonder why she wrote the thesis in the first place. I would strongly advise not to write such things in an academic text.

In the case of a manuscript form I found a minority of deficiencies. Following points do not decrease the value of this thesis.

- Page 20 – There are still few researches dedicated to overeducation the Czech labour market.
- The author seems to mis-reference the tables in the text. She refers to Table 1 on page 17 (and other tables later on in the thesis respectively). However, there is no Table 1 in the thesis, we find the information in table 3.1 instead.

Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

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

Student:	Ľubica Laslopová
Advisor:	Mgr. Barbara Pertold-Gebicka, M.A., Ph.D.
Title of the thesis:	Overeducation in the Czech Labour Market

- In the Table 3.2.: *Relative Wages by Educational Attainment* on page 18, the author does not explain what are types A and B tertiary education. I would appreciate brief explanation in the footnote.

Despite everything I wrote above I am pleased I can recommend the thesis of Ľubica Laslopová to defense at the IES FSV UK. I suggest the grade "1", i.e. "excellent."

Suggested question for the defense: You give an exhaustive description of both normative and statistical measures of overeducation in the thesis. Why those two gives different (in your thesis even contradictory) results? Which one would you personally prefer and why?

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

CATEGORY	POINTS
Literature (max. 20 points)	20
Methods (max. 30 points)	28
Contribution (max. 30 points)	20
Manuscript Form (max. 20 points)	15
TOTAL POINTS (max. 100 points)	83
GRADE (1 – 2 – 3 – 4)	1

NAME OF THE REFEREE: Jindřich Matoušek

DATE OF EVALUATION: June 8, 2015


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

