



Department:	112 - Management
Author:	Veronika Malá
Title:	Small and medium sized wineries in the Czech Republic and Slovakia
Supervisor:	Ing. Adriana Válková

Part I – Basic requirements for bachelor thesis

Instructions:

1. 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.
2. 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?	NO
4. Does the thesis covers the clear conclusions, reasoned recommendations, justified suggestions, etc. that bring new knowledge or information?	NO

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

The author should deal with the small and medium sized enterprises in the wine industry. The author did only pure analysis of the general external environment. She used PESTE analysis that is done from the general point of view, it is not concreted on the specific - wine - industry. The industry analysis is also very general and poor. But the main problem is that there is no comment about small and medium sized enterprises and the aim to find the key success factors is not fulfilled at all. There are no specific recommendations and the identification of the key success factors is missing. The aim of this theses was not the comparison of the level of this branch in the two observed countries. The results should be only based on the knowledge gained from the analyses of both countries. The theoretical background to this thesis also does not correspond to the set objective and is very brief with no comparison of different approaches of several authors. The methodology does not correspond to the objective either. There is no added value.

The author did not consult the thesis. I read it for the first time when writing the review.

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)

5.	Contribution, originality, demandingness of the thesis	Points: 0
(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, ...)		

6.	Quality of the review of the literature	Points: 0
(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,...)		

7.	Methodology and its application	Points: 0
(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, ...)		

8.	Own research	Points: 0
(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, ...)		

9.	Conclusions and recommendations	Points: 0
(correctness of conclusions, explicit formulations, adequacy of suggestions, generalizing conclusions, applicability of recommendations, ...)		

10.	Logical framework, formal requirements	Points: 0
(correct structure, logical coherence of text, correctness of terminology, explicitness and clarity of graphics, accurateness of language, ...)		

Part III – Summary and final evaluation

Instructions:

- After summarizing the points the reviewer marks with a cross the appropriate final evaluation according to corresponding interval of points.
- 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.
- 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: 0 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
	37–48 points	accomplished fully without any reservations and in the exhausting way
	49–60 points	excellent, extraordinary, originative and completely correct accomplishment

Final decision: **I DO NOT RECOMMEND** thesis to be defended.

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

--

Date: 24.5.2014

Name and signature of the supervisor: Ing. Adriana Válová

Date:

Name and signature of the head of the department: