

Printing problems notice

(The document you print follows this protocol.)

Documents with printing errors: 1

List of documents with printing errors

Ord. nr.	Document identification	Document	Specification
Description of the problem			
1.	B.Ed. Abdulmolik Owolabi Awwal, BSc	Final thesis review	Thesis assignment (ID 322837), Opponent's review (ID 170429)
Character <input type="checkbox"/> is missing in the document (hexadecimal code: ef83a0).			

CZECH UNIVERSITY OF LIFE SCIENCES PRAGUE

Faculty of Tropical AgriSciences

Evaluation of the Diploma Thesis by Opponent

Thesis Title **Effect of Education and Gender on Farm Productivity of Cocoa Farmers in Nigeria.**

Name of the student **B.Ed. Abdulmolik Owolabi Awwal, BSc**

Thesis supervisor **doc. Ing. Miroslava Bavorová, Ph.D.**

Department **Department of Economics and Development**

Opponent **Dr. Sven Gruener**

Institution **Martin Luther University Halle Wittenberg**

Position **Post-Doc**

Formulation of the aims	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Choice of suitable methods	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Fulfilment of the aims	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Scientific contribution of the thesis	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Originality of the thesis	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Theoretical background of the author	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Handling with data and information	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4
Handling with scientific literature (citations)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Argumentation and critical thinking	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Abstract and keywords	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Structure of the chapters and paragraphs	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Comprehensibility of the text	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Accuracy of the terminology	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Quality of scientific language	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Formatting, layout and general impression	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Evaluation of the work by grade (1, 2, 3, 4)				3

Evaluation: 1 = the best

Date 17/05/2022

Signature of Opponent

Other comments or suggestions:

The goal of analyzing the association between education/gender and productivity is important; the research questions are adequately motivated (but often with some outdated references). The choice of the overall model (OLS) is adequate. You also provide us with the questionnaire (which is good if someone wants to replicate the study). However, there are several drawbacks:

- A lot of typos / inadequate English (e.g. "3.0 Methodolog", Table of contents starts with page 18, "farmer education has significant positive effects of education", " $*p < 0.00$ ")
- Tables: The distinction between Table 2 and 3 is unclear (Table 2 contains age, for example; Table 3 is about socio-economic variables); Standard deviations for binary variables do not make sense
- Not well-structured (e.g. no results section for gender)
- Hypotheses are presented in an untypical manner (stat. significance vs no stat. significance)
- Data analysis: wrongly claimed that findings can be interpreted causally ("effect of education on"); no assumptions of OLS checked (heteroscedasticity; possible bias due to outliers of the Y-variables); since there are no specifications of the regressions, the reader can only speculate about the robustness: I have doubts. For example, you are controlling for "Access credit" – this is highly correlated with Gender \square you need more robustness checks (e.g. zero-order correlations) and not only 2 regressions to be sure that the correlations within your sample are "robust"
- In Table 3, you say that 43% of the subjects in your sample have non-formal education, In Table 2 you claim to interpret your findings "Tertiary=1, otherwise=0) – so you cannot say that "42 percent higher farm yield compare to than those the primary and secondary level of education" – the non-formal education category is missing
- Results in part only mentioned briefly: no interpretation given as well as no limitations and no further research requirements

Questions for thesis defence:

1. Small question for clarification: Table 1. In 2000, the harvested area seems rather low compared to the other years. Could you explain this?
2. Could you please interpret your findings on gender? (It is empirical work, some things might not be as good in practice as in theory – maybe you want to consider the sample size in your answer. As an aside, if you are saying that your goal was ex-ante to analyze gender but then it was more complicated to do this because the sample was not adequate to do this. Then, I would say: well done, it is honest to present the results anyway. But you must talk about it. But maybe you did not have enough time at the end of the thesis to do this...)
3. The thesis did not provide us with many critical words on limitations. Could you please tell us some limitations? Where do you see the need for further research?
4. To analyze to results causally, you implicitly claim to have no relevant other variables (so-called third variables). But this assumption might be wrong. For example, risk-attitude could be an important driver of farming activities and, as a consequence, productivity. Would you prefer to interpret your findings in terms of correlations or causality?
5. In the description of your study area, you are saying that the male/female ratio is approx. 1. Your sample, in contrast, consists of nearly only men with poor access to credit (the latter surprised me a bit). What are the implications of that for your policy implications?
6. The finding that education is helpful is quite obvious. But how would you implement this in practice? Would you prefer to provide women or men with human capacity building?

Date 17/05/2022

.....
Signature of Opponent