

REVIEW OF THE BACHELOR'S THESIS SUPERVISOR

Student's name: Daniil Kashkarov

Thesis title: Observing the Unobservable: Education and Signaling in Middle-Income

Countries

Name of the thesis supervisor: Petr Špecián

	1	2	3	4
Assessment of the topic itself (irrespectively of the student):				
1.1 To what extent is the topic current and significant?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2 How challenging is the topic in respect of theoretical knowledge?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3 How challenging it in respect of practical experience or fieldwork?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4 How difficult is it to get background materials?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:

Subsection 1.1: The topic is current and significant.

Other (as appropriate):

2. Evaluation of the thesis structure and logical cohesion:				
2.1 To what extent is the thesis structure logical and transparent?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.2 To what extent does the author use current / suitable sources?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.3 How properly did the author select methods in respect of the topic?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.4 How sufficiently and functionally did the author use in the thesis original charts, tables, data, annexes, etc.?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.5 What is the compatibility level for the thesis basic line elements: topic – thesis assignment – objective – structure - conclusions?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:

Subsection 2.1: See below.

Subsection 2.5: See below.

Other (as appropriate):

3. Assessment of the thesis text quality:				
3.1 How well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author analyze the topic?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.2 Did the author formulate the thesis objective clearly and with logical structure?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.3 Did the author fulfill the defined thesis objective and approved assignment of the thesis that contains the objective?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Instructions for the review: Author of the review must provide verbal assessment for the specified subsections, which are pivotal for the thesis assessment, particularly for the defense; therefore, the assessment must have reasonable explanatory power.

Note: Classification method: 1 = exceptional, 2 = very good, 3 = good, 4 = failed.

- | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 3.4 How well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author cover the theoretical part of the thesis? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3.5 How well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author cover the practical / analytical part of the thesis? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3.6 To what extent are the thesis conclusions logically structured and show quality, and what is their added value? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:

Subsection 3.2: See below.

Subsection 3.3: See below.

Subsection 3.4: See below.

Subsection 3.5: See below.

Subsection 3.6: See below.

Other (as appropriate):

Daniil Kashkarov's thesis is outstanding in many respects. The thesis is written in clear, systematic and very readable way. The author has studied an extensive range of literature and is able to provide its meaningful and informative synthesis. What's more, this literature informs the author's own research in many constructive ways. Mr. Kashkarov has avoided the pitfall of discontinuity between theoretical and empirical part of the thesis in which students stray so often. The empirical part is both rigorous and inventive with concentrated effort to make the best of the limited data available. I have enjoyed the author's clever interpretations of the results. They are cautious and aware of potential limitations, but informative and intellectually stimulating at the same time.

Both theoretical and empirical part are very persuasive regarding the author's competence in economics. In my view, the thesis reaches the levels of sophistication which are generally expected only on the level of a master's degree and even beyond. After shortening, the paper may well be submitted for publication, which I heartily recommend.

From the perspective of the supervisor, I must say that Mr. Kashkarov has been very independent in his research and my contributions to it were minimal. Where I have provided some recommendations for changes, they have been swiftly incorporated into the thesis to my satisfaction.

On the critical side, I can only repeat two minor remarks that I have already discussed with Mr. Kashkarov in the past: 1) It is not obvious why Armenia, Bolivia, Ghana and Vietnam were chosen for the research (the author's argument on p. 15 is not completely persuasive). 2) It could have been interesting to include country-specific dummies into the regression model.

4. Assessment of the thesis form and style:

- | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 4.1 What is the formal layout of the thesis? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4.2 What is the quality of citations and references? Are sources identifiable? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4.3 What is the stylistic level of the thesis, particularly the use of correct economic terminology? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

<p><i>Instructions for the review: Author of the review must provide verbal assessment for the specified subsections, which are pivotal for the thesis assessment, particularly for the defense; therefore, the assessment must have reasonable explanatory power.</i></p> <p><i>Note: Classification method: 1 = exceptional, 2 = very good, 3 = good, 4 = failed.</i></p>

Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:

Subsection 4.2: The quality of references is fully satisfactory.

Other (as appropriate):

5. Overall assessment *(It is necessary to state, whether the thesis meets the requirements of the Methodology of the Faculty of Economics in terms of the quality of contents, scope and formal requirements, whether the thesis is/is not recommended for defense. It may also be nominated for a special award, etc.):*

The thesis is exceptionally well done and fulfills all the requirements of the Faculty of Economics. I recommend it for defense and I would also like to propose its nomination for the special award of the Dean.

6. Questions and remarks to the defense:

If IQ tests and the like were good proxies for natural aptitude, wouldn't the employers just directly test the employees' IQ etc. instead of relying on a much costlier signal provided by education? Please discuss.

Proposed grade: exceptional

Date: 1. 6. 2017

.....
Signature of the Thesis Supervisor

Instructions for the review: Author of the review must provide verbal assessment for the specified subsections, which are pivotal for the thesis assessment, particularly for the defense; therefore, the assessment must have reasonable explanatory power.

Note: Classification method: 1 = exceptional, 2 = very good, 3 = good, 4 = failed.

Instructions for the review: Author of the review must provide verbal assessment for the specified subsections, which are pivotal for the thesis assessment, particularly for the defense; therefore, the assessment must have reasonable explanatory power.

Note: Classification method: 1 = exceptional, 2 = very good, 3 = good, 4 = failed.