



Department:	112 - Management
Author:	Bc. Veronika Fidrová
Title:	Evaluation of the level of the organic brewing industry in selected countries of the European Union
Supervisor:	Ing. Sylvie Formánková, Ph.D.

Part I – Basic requirements for master thesis

Instructions:

1. 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.
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 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:

1. 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.
2. 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)
3. 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, ...)	
<p>Czech Republic is still a leading country in beer consumption. On the other hand the consumption has been decreasing. Organic farming is developing and it could bring a competitive advantage to those companies that use it. That´s why this topic is up-to-date.</p> <p>Due to the decreasing consumption in Czech Republic it is necessary to look for other possibilities of selling beer - such as export. The results could be beneficial for all beer producers - but it has to be considered that the conditions will be different for micro, small and medium sized companies and for large companies with foreign capital investment.</p>	

6. Quality of the review of the literature	Points: 2
(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,...)	
<p>The author uses many up-to-date literature sources in Czech, English and German language. The literature overview is mainly focused on the description of terms. I miss the discussion of alternative approaches and analysis of citations and references. The author explains terms that are well known for students on the master level of studies. The methods used in the thesis should have been described in the methodology not in the literature review.</p>	

7. Methodology and its application	Points: 2
(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, ...)	
<p>The analyses used to evaluate the current situation in brewing industry were chosen correctly (PESTEL, Porter´s diamond). The author compares two countries - Czech Republic and Germany. As it is mentioned in the part "own research" - those two analyses (PESTEL and Porter´s diamond) should be more concrete.</p>	

8. Own research	Points: 5
(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, ...)	
<p>The author describes the current situation in selected countries. From the macro-environment point of view PESTEL analysis was used. The analysis is very general. It should be related more to the observed industry (unemployment rate in brewing industry, prices of hop, organic hop, beer etc. not just the inflation generally...etc.). The Porter´s diamond should be more concrete.</p>	

9. Conclusions and recommendations	Points: 2
(correctness of conclusions, explicit formulations, adequacy of suggestions, generalizing conclusions, applicability of recommendations, ...)	
<p>The recommendations for the entrance in the foreign market should be based on better explanation and deeper analysis. The author makes very general conclusions based on the results from the previous analyses. She is not considering the economic impact on the company - it is explained only by words, no concrete results of certain financial analyses, cost analyses etc. It is mainly based on some assumptions of the author. The conclusions are not backed up by concrete arguments. I also miss some comparison or discussion of alternative approaches, other author´s researches etc. in the part discussion.</p>	

10. Logical framework, formal requirements	Points: 5
(correct structure, logical coherence of text, correctness of terminology, explicitness and clarity of graphics, accurateness of language, ...)	
The structure is logical. Still, the author makes recommendations in the part discussion which is not meant for this purpose. Terminology used in the thesis is clear and correct. The author should use more "scientific" language. The "I form" is not suitable for the diploma thesis.	

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: 24 points

Final evaluation:

	0–12 points	accomplished at the level of minimum of requirements given in part I
X	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 RECOMMEND** thesis to be defended.

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

The author did not consult the thesis (she consulted only the selection of the topic and selection of methods). Despite this fact I recommend the thesis to be defended.

Question:

Which brewing companies are mainly focusing on the organic farming in the Czech Republic - micro, small, medium or large ones (according to the EU definition)? Which of them should use your suggested export strategies? Could your suggestions be generalized for all of them?

Date: 1.6.2014

Name and signature of the supervisor: Ing. Sylvie Formánková, Ph.D.

Date:

Name and signature of the head of the department: