CZECH UNIVERSITY OF LIFE SCIENCES PRAGUE

Faculty of Economics and Management

Evaluation of the Diploma Thesis by Opponent

Thesis Title	Impact of Instagram Influencers on Brand Reput	ation & Brand Lovalty
Thesis True	A Property of the Control of the Con	\\C_\
Name of the student	Bc. Gaurav Ashok Pandit	CS BRAGUE
Thesis supervisor	Ing. Tereza Balcarová, Ph.D.	
Department	Department of Management and Marketing	
Opponent	Ing. Veronika Zajíčková	() []
Institution	Profinit EU, s.r.o.	
Position	СГО	
Evidence of a logical p	process being used	1 2 3 4
The structure of paragraphs and chapters		1 2 3 4
Formal presentation of the work, the overall impression		1 2 3 4
Formulation of objectives		1 2 3 4
Choice of appropriate methods and methodology used		1 2 3 4
Professional contribution of the work and its practical usage		1 2 3 4
Work with data and information		1 2 3 4
Work with scientific literature (quotations, norms)		1 2 3 4
Clarity and professionalism of expression in the thesis		1 2 3 4
Summary and key-words comply with the content of thesis		1 2 3 4
Fulfillment of objectives		1 2 3 4
Thesis topic and thesis significance (relevance)		1 2 3 4
Theoretical background of an author		1 2 3 4
Comprehensibility of the text and level of language		1 2 3 4
Formulation of conclusions		1 2 3 4
Evaluation of the wor	k by grade (1, 2, 3, 4)	4
		Evaluation: 1 = the best
Date 08/01/2024		Signature of Opponent
		Signature of Opponent

Other comments or suggestions:

The diploma thesis contains many factual, analytical, and formal deficiencies. A literary review does not take the form of a review. It is a form of notes after the initial reading of the resources. The sentences and paragraphs from individual authors are not adequately compared and synthesized.

The methodology does not sufficiently explain and defend the overall procedure applied in the practical part. It does not describe the meaningfulness of using individual statistical methods that the author used in the practical part. The questionnaire in the appendix is not properly referenced, and I miss any interpretation of the basic results of the questionnaire (frequency of responses to the scale) and their descriptive statistics (average, median, etc.). The result of the normality test (Table 4) was not further taken into account – it is only downplayed as unimportant. Also, using some statistical methods does not make much sense concerning the solved problem (e.g. factor analysis); with some others, the results are not understood/interpreted well (e.g. Pearson's Correlations Test). The author also compares his results with other studies whose authors he does not cite.

