



Department:	Of Management
Author:	Bc. Monika Malátková
Title:	Free Movement of Services - Case Study of Mystery Shopping in Poland
Supervisor:	Ing. Sylvie Formánková Ph.D.

Part I – Basic requirements for master thesis

Instructions:

- The first part of the review concentrates on critical parts of master 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 master 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 master 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)
- Points assigned in evaluation of individual aspect have to be briefly justified; the extraordinary solutions have to be considered.

5. Contribution, originality, demandingness of the thesis	Points: 8
(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, ...)	
There are many general recommendations related to the issue solved, but the particular decision making is always situation specific.	

6. Quality of the review of the literature	Points: 5
(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,...)	
The author comes from a very good basis of literature sources (about 60), but their potential does not seem to be fully exploited in the literature review.	

7. Methodology and its application	Points: 5
(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, ...)	
Methodology is rather aimed on describing the contents of particular chapters than on showing specific aspects of particular methods and their application. Although, the basic idea on methods used is also provided.	

8. Own research	Points: 8
(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, ...)	
Analysis is done focusing on the key influences of the external environment, and it is summarized in the form of EFE matrix elaborated in consideration of the two possible strategies.	

9. Conclusions and recommendations	Points: 5
(correctness of conclusions, explicit formulations, adequacy of suggestions, generalizing conclusions, applicability of recommendations, ...)	
Conclusions are based on economic evaluation, and are explicitly formulated, even though the link to the number of projects seems to be rather questionable.	

10. Logical framework, formal requirements	Points: 2
(correct structure, logical coherence of text, correctness of terminology, explicitness and clarity of graphics, accurateness of language, ...)	
The formulations are not always precise (e.g. using the word "posting" managers instead of "sending"), but it is still understandable.	

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: 33 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
X	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 RECOMMEND** thesis to be defended.

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

1. How did you do the particular evaluations within the EFE matrix (p. 78)?
2. What do you consider to be the main obstacle for a mystery-shopping agency when entering a foreign market?

Date: June 5, 2014

Name and signature: Pavel Žufan

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