# CZECH UNIVERSITY OF LIFE SCIENCES PRAGUE

Faculty of Tropical AgriSciences

# Evaluation of the Diploma Thesis by supervisor

| | |
|---|---|
| Thesis Title | **Consumers' Attitudes Towards Functional Food in Turkey** |
| Name of the student | **Bc. Ismail Burak Karademir** |
| Thesis supervisor | **Ing. Petra Chaloupková, Ph.D., dr. h. c.** |
| Department | **Department of Economics and Development** |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Cooperation and communication with the supervisor** | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 |
| **Schedule and timing of the research process** | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 |
| **Engagement of the student** | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 |
| **Choice of suitable methods** | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 |
| **Fulfilment of the aims** | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 |
| **Scientific contribution of the thesis** | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** |
| **Theoretical background of the author** | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 |
| **Handling with data and information** | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** |
| **Handling with scientific literature (citations)** | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 |
| **Argumentation and critical thinking** | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** |
| **Abstract and keywords** | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 |
| **Structure of the chapters and paragraphs** | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 |
| **Comprehensibility of the text** | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** |
| **Accuracy of the terminology** | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 |
| **Quality of scientific language** | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 |
| **Formatting, layout and general impression** | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 |

**Evaluation of the work by grade (1, 2, 3, 4)** **4**

Evaluation: 1 = the best

Date 07/09/2021

.....

Supervisor signature

**Other comments or suggestions:**

The diploma thesis focused on the analysis of consumer attitudes towards functional foods could provide interesting insights into the current situation on the Turkish market. Although part of the literature review contains a large number of sources, there are several inaccuracies. E.g. Menrad (2003) does not classify functional foods as shown in Table 1. Given that the unique definition of functional foods is unclear worldwide, I would recommend harmonizing the terminology and use of categories of functional foods instead of individual products for evaluation. There are also some unclear aspects about the results. Figure 3 does not make a clear distinction between the categories ”functional food composition” and ”functional food additive”. Tables 3 and 4 have unclear designations and it is not clear what has been examined. Likewise, Table 5 does not provide a sufficient explanation and it is not clear how the variables were evaluated. At the same time, I recommend making language corrections, as some interpretations are unclear and misleading.

**Plagiarism control:** The system Theses.cz has not assessed the thesis as suspicious.

Date 07/09/2021

.....

Supervisor signature