



## Opponent review

|             |  |
|-------------|--|
| Department: | Statistics and Operational Research  |
| Author:     | Iva Slezarová  |
| Title:      | Relationship between rates of unemployment and inflation in the Czech Republic |
| Supervisor: | Assoc. Prof. Ing. Václav Adamec, Ph.D.   |

### Part I – Basic requirements for bachelor thesis

**Instructions:**

- The first part of the review concentrates on critical parts of bachelor thesis that are required to recommend the thesis to be defended. These aspects could be evaluated only by answers yes-no.
- If at least one aspect is evaluated in the negative way, the thesis may not be recommended for defense. The reasons for the negative decisions should be specified and the second part of the review does not have to be completed.

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1. Does the thesis contain objective defined correctly and does the objective correspond to the common requirements for the bachelor thesis?    | YES |
| 2. Is the review of literature including the citations and references elaborated correctly from the methodological and formal point of view?    | YES |
| 3. Does the thesis include precise description of used methods and are these methods suitable for defined objective?                            | YES |
| 4. Does the thesis covers the clear conclusions, reasoned recommendations, justified suggestions, etc. that bring new knowledge or information? | YES |

Reasons for negative answers, specification of missing or unsatisfactory parts:

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|

### Part II – Quality of bachelor thesis

**Instructions:**

- The second part of the review regards with quality evaluation of selected aspect of the thesis. The thesis could obtain 0-60 points in total. Zero points correspond to thesis meeting only the minimal requirements, while thesis evaluated by 60 points is excellent and inventive in all evaluated aspects.
- The evaluation scale has five levels:
  - accomplished, at the level of minimum of requirements given in part I (0 points)
  - accomplished with significant but not critical imperfections (2 points)
  - accomplished, the imperfections do not influence the merit of the thesis and mainly the results (5 points)
  - accomplished fully without any reservations and in the exhausting way (8 points)
  - excellent, extraordinary, originative and completely correct accomplishment (10 points)

|  |                  |
|--|------------------|
| <b>5. Contribution, originality, demandingness of the thesis</b>   | <b>Points: 8</b> |
| (frequency of the issue, non-existence of conventional solution, unavailability of solution for researched conditions, expected and real contribution of the thesis, extent of the specific knowledge needed to meet the objective, ...) |                  |

|  |                  |
|--|------------------|
| <b>6. Quality of the review of the literature</b>  | <b>Points: 8</b> |
| (extent of surveyed literature and its up-to-dateness and representativeness, use of foreign and cardinal sources, suitability of survey for own research,, discussion of alternative approaches, analysis of citations and references, synthesis of theoretical knowledge for own research,...) |                  |

|   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| <b>7. Methodology and its application</b>   | <b>Points: 8</b> |
| (discussion of suitability of chosen method, comparison of alternative attitudes, possibility to verify the results, correctness of application of methods, suitability of data samples used, preventing errors and shortages of applied methods, comparison of results, variations reasoning, ...) |                  |
| <b>8. Own research</b>  | <b>Points: 8</b> |
| (depth and complexity of performed analysis, extent of use of knowledge from literature review, proving facts, suitability of samples and sources used, treatment of data errors, level of meeting the thesis objective, hypotheses answering, ...)   |                  |
| <b>9. Conclusions and recommendations</b>   | <b>Points: 5</b> |
| (correctness of conclusions, explicit formulations, adequacy of suggestions, generalizing conclusions, applicability of recommendations, ...)   |                  |
| <b>10. Logical framework, formal requirements</b>   | <b>Points: 5</b> |
| (correct structure, logical coherence of text, correctness of terminology, explicitness and clarity of graphics, accurateness of language, ...)   |                  |

### Part III – Summary and final evaluation

#### Instructions:

1. After summarizing the points the reviewer marks with a cross the appropriate final evaluation according to corresponding interval of points.
2. The clear final decision has to be stated in the conclusion. The thesis can be recommended to be defended only in the case, when there is no negative evaluation in the part I of this review.
3. In the following part the reviewer has the opportunity to give his/her opinion to thesis as a whole and give further suggestions and comments.

Total points: 42 points

Final evaluation:

|          |              |   |
|----------|--------------|---|
|          | 0–12 points  | accomplished at the level of minimum of requirements given in part I                            |
|          | 13–24 points | accomplished with significant but not critical imperfections                                    |
|          | 25–36 points | accomplished, the imperfections do not influence the merit of the thesis and mainly the results |
| <b>X</b> | 37–48 points | accomplished fully without any reservations and in the exhausting way                           |
|          | 49–60 points | excellent, extraordinary, originaive and completely correct accomplishment                      |

Final decision: **I RECOMMEND** thesis to be defended.

Further comments and suggestions the author should discuss within the defense of the thesis:

Descriptions of variables in formulas are often missing. There are also some formal errors, but the work is generally above standard. What are the fundamental differences between the data from the U.S. in the period 1961-1969 and modeled data?

Date: 29. 5. 2012

Name and signature: Mgr. David Hampel, Ph.D.

Position of reviewer in his/her institution (not required if from FBE Mendelu in Brno):