Report on Master Thesis

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

Student:	**Bc. Martina Juračková**
Advisor:	**doc. PhDr. Zuzana Havránková, Ph.D.**
Title of the thesis:	**Standing Tall Pays Off: A Meta-Analysis of Height Premium**

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

Please provide a short summary of the thesis, your assessment of each of the four key categories, and an overall evaluation and suggested questions for the discussion. The minimum length of the report is 300 words.

Short summary
In her thesis, Martina Juračková collects 67 primary studies that investigate the height premium – i.e. the benefit of being tall on personal income. She founds that the empirical literature suffers from positive publication bias, hence the common known effects seem to be larger than in the reality. But even after accounting for publication bias, the relation remains positive.

Contribution
The studies is very original and it provides some insight into reasons why results differ in the primary literature.

Methods
The thesis follows a standard methodology of meta-analysis, including Bayesian Model Averaging method. The thesis also uses non-linear methods for testing publiction bias, which provided additional robustnessc check and added value.

Literature
All sources are well-referenced, the thesis follows academic standards when working with primary sources and the studies used belong to the core of the studied topic also from the methodology perspective.

Manuscript form
The thesis itself is very well written, using a standard template, which is highly appreciated. A reader can easily follow the structure. The layout is great, but some tables would benefit from a better formattting such as 4.1 and 4.2.

Overall evaluation and suggested questions for the discussion during the defense
The thesis deals with an interesting topic and follows standards procedure of meta-analysis, in a detail. The student also pays attention to labelling all tables and figures, so I have just a few minor comments/questions (below). Other then that, I am very happy with the work and I think it is an excellent thesis that sould be published and I beleive it will be.

- When focusing on publication bias and instrumental variable approach, why do you „try" different instruments, instead of testing for the best one? „The performed diagnostic tests confirm that we have strong instruments." – which, where?
- The BMA shows, that not controling for gender would render higher effects of the height premium. Since publication bias is also positive, could it be, that the publication bias is just an ommitted variable bias? Would the results of FAT test change if you would run in only on estimates from studies that control for gender?
- Further regarding quality of the estimates. The approach of the thesis very technical, but the literature about income differences is very sensitive to usage of control variables (like trying to explain wage differences between men and women). It is described in thesis (page 42), but I beleive, it should be discussed more also in the data analysis part. I belive, that splitting the sample into subsamples could provide more insight (e.g. run BMA/PB only on estimates that

Report on Master Thesis

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

Student:	**Bc. Martina Juračková**
Advisor:	**doc. PhDr. Zuzana Havránková, Ph.D.**
Title of the thesis:	**Standing Tall Pays Off: A Meta-Analysis of Height Premium**

are estimated for men only). If I get that correctly, 86 % of observations is on single gener dataset, and 9% observations controls for gender. But slso single gender dataset actually control for gender right?

- Estimates from Africa show, that the difference there is higher. Is there something mentioned in the primary studies that try to explain it? I mean Figure 3.2 implicitly get us the same result, but some further insight would be great.

The results of the Urkund analysis do not indicate significant text similarity with other available sources.

In my view, the thesis fulfills the requirements for a master thesis at IES, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University, I recommend it for the defense and suggest a grade A.

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

CATEGORY		POINTS
Contribution	*(max. 30 points)*	30
Methods	*(max. 30 points)*	25
Literature	*(max. 20 points)*	20
Manuscript Form	*(max. 20 points)*	18
TOTAL POINTS	*(max. 100 points)*	**93**
GRADE	**(A – B – C – D – E – F)**	**A**

NAME OF THE REFEREE: Petr Polák

DATE OF EVALUATION: 15. 9. 2023

Digitally signed (15. 9. 2023)
Petr Polák

_____

Referee Signature

EXPLANATION OF CATEGORIES AND SCALE:

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.*

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.*

LITERATURE REVIEW: *The thesis demonstrates author's full understanding and command of recent literature. The author quotes relevant literature in a proper way.*

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.*

Overall grading:

TOTAL	GRADE
91 – 100	A
81 - 90	B
71 - 80	C
61 – 70	D
51 – 60	E
0 – 50	F