

Dissertation Thesis Evaluation

Reviewer: Doc. RNDr. Zdena Lustigová, CSc.

Title: Smart web user interfaces for Course based and repository based systems

Author: Ing. Aneta Bartůšková

Critical parts of the work

In this review I focused mainly on critical parts of the dissertation work, namely on

- Complexity of the work required
e.g. definition of aims and objectives of the work, its appropriateness to the topic of the thesis, consistency with the hypothesis elaborated.
- Methodology used in data collection and analysis and its suitability pertaining to the objectives of the study
e.g. overview of the methodology and its suitability in relation to the issues under consideration and the defined objectives of the study.
- Information resources including citations and references to sources used.
- Depth of analysis, its scope, processing of results and their interpretation
e.g. analytical methods used, use of appropriate data sources and their analysis, documentation of facts presented, relation to the hypotheses.

And as the last but not the least also on

- Logical structure of the text, its structure, coherence, and linguistic and stylistic level.

Definition of aims and objectives is very short, basically done in the first two paragraphs of page 2. The main goal is specified as “the enhancement of web based interfaces regarding their organization and navigation”. The sub goals are not specified. This goal seems appropriate to the topic of the work “Smart web user interfaces for Course based and repository based systems”. Author herself has mentioned that the topic (titled) is too broad to be solved within one dissertation work, which is definitely true. No hypotheses were elaborated.

The Methodology part as a description of methodological approach to the whole work, or to its substantial parts, is completely missing. Not only the methodology of data collection, although a lot of data was collected with the purpose to evaluate redesigned solutions (e.g. pages 78-81), but also the methodology of literature review (e.g. meta-analysis, comparative analysis), the methodology of presented analyses, etc.

The little chunks of what is representing the author’s methodological approach, or at least the description of the testing tools used, are widespread all over the work (e.g. page 76) and mixed with literature review. This emphasizes the reader’s impression of chaos.

The more or less missing methodology thus represents the weakest part of the whole dissertation work.

Within the part of Information resources quality and judgment is necessary to mention, that the range of literature is very large, and to appreciate the formal correctness of citations. Unluckily quite often the citations are redundant and the

overuse of literature quotes outside the “State of art” part (chapter 3) makes the work confusing. Author seems to support herself by authorities at each single step of her work.

The topicality is mostly alright, but the choice of authors and sources, where preferably theorists and theoretical works are selected, evoked my hesitations. I would appreciate more frequent citation of the real projects authors and developers since the topic is more connected to the “D” part of the whole R&D area.

The work is missing the discussion of the literature surveyed and critical review. Twenty five (25) pages of the whole State of art (chapter 3) and the introduction to chapter 4 up to 4.2.3 do not contain **any single sentence representing the author’s point of view, or methodological approach to the literature review** (e.g. comparative analysis). Unluckily this whole part seems to be done just by copying and pasting. Even more, citation are often redundant, see p. 18, paragraph 5 “Peng et al...”

There are also little formal imperfections (e.g. Defining the key terms (adaptivity x adaptability, customization x personalization x individualization, p. 13) without any mark under the subtitle of third level “Learning object repositories”).

Concerning the Depth of analysis, its scope, processing of results and their interpretation is necessary **to emphasize the author’s own contribution, which is certainly beyond doubt**. Although this part of the work suffers from the above mentioned lack of structure, unclear methodology and the overuse of citations, analytical methods used, the use of appropriate data sources and their analysis, and the documentation of facts presented is, once you overcome the ballast of inappropriate structure and spread methodological excerpts, on a good level.

Logical structure of the text, its structure, coherence, division of the text into the recommended parts, balance between the various parts and chapters, logical sequence of text was mentioned above, and it’s the weakest part of the work.

Format of the text, linguistic and stylistic level is appropriate, terminology is also used mostly correctly and formal standards upheld.

Overall evaluation

My overall evaluation is based on the facts mentioned above. The work is acceptable as a dissertation work. I would call it satisfactory work. Reasonably fulfilled, but with significant deficiencies which influence the overall quality.

I do recommend the work for defense.

Prague, 13.12.2016

Name and signature of reviewer: Zdena Lustigová

