



Department:	112 Management
Author:	Bc. Anita Beránková
Title:	Development of organic wine production and its trend in EU countries and the Czech Republic
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>The topic solved in this thesis is up-to-date. The industry has been developing during the last years and there might be many opportunities for Czech wine producers which could be used. Due to the fact that this kind of industry is developing in our conditions it was necessary to search a lot and it is time consuming to find all the required and necessary data.</p>	

6. Quality of the review of the literature	Points: 8
(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 used plenty of books, online sources as well as scientific papers to have a full overview of the problem. These sources contain cardinal sources that might be older due to the fact that the information and methods are still valid. These sources are completed by up-to-date literature that is discussed in this part. Both Czech and English written sources were used.</p>	

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, ...)	
<p>The author used mostly secondary data completed with primary information gained through questionnaire and personal interview. In the part of methodology the author should mention how the target group was selected and define it (was it distributed to everyone in the Czech Republic? Age group? Level of education etc. - it should be specified and reasoned).</p>	

8. Own research	Points: 2
(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 part of Porter's five competitive forces analysis should be more precise. There are some statements that are too general (e.g. there are "plenty" of companies - this is not a fact) and not as simple as the author thinks it is (the bargaining power of supplier is not so low - there are specific equipments that can't be provided by anyone else - bottling line is usually used from Austrian companies etc.). The results from this part might be misrepresented.</p> <p>As mentioned in the part of methodology I miss the specification of the target group. In case of quantitative questionnaire trying to figure out the awareness of population about the problem the number of respondents should be higher to be representative. I also miss the answer (in case of question "why consumers do not buy organic products/wine" - it can be spoiled very quickly in comparison to conventional products).</p>	

9. Conclusions and recommendations	Points: 2
(correctness of conclusions, explicit formulations, adequacy of suggestions, generalizing conclusions, applicability of recommendations, ...)	
<p>The author summed up the knowledge gained in the own research. The suggestions are adequate to the results and generalized. In case of a specific company it could be more concrete and better calculated (not only costs of each unit) but in this case it could be seen as a starting point and inspiration for those companies that want to produce organic wines. In the part of discussion the author should "discuss" and compare the results of her own work and research with other studies and researches. I miss this part of discussion.</p>	

10. Logical framework, formal requirements	Points: 8
(correct structure, logical coherence of text, correctness of terminology, explicitness and clarity of graphics, accurateness of language, ...)	
The structure of the thesis is correct and logical. the author proved good level of English language (except of some imperfections).	

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:

The author could avoid several imperfections if she was attending regular meetings with supervisor during the last semester - mainly in the part of own work and recommendations. Despite this fact I consider this work for good and I recommend it to be defended. I have following questions:

Questions:

1. How did you choose the target group for you questionnaire? Who were the respondents and how did you contact them?
2. Would you recommend organic farming to wine producers that are producing wine conventionally and would you recommend it to potential wine producers (that want to start their business in wine sector)?

Date: 17.1.2015

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

Date:

Name and signature of the head of the department: