

CZECH UNIVERSITY OF LIFE SCIENCES PRAGUE

Faculty of Economics and Management

Evaluation of the Bachelor Thesis by Opponent

Thesis Title **Analysis of Diversity of Managerial Characteristics based on Gender and Cultural Background**

Name of the student **Kristýna Houšková**

Thesis supervisor **Ing. Richard Selby, Ph.D.**

Department **Department of Management**

Opponent **Ing. Lenka Platilová Vorlíčková**

Logical process being used	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
The structure of paragraphs and chapters	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Formal presentation of the work, the overall impression	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Formulation of objectives and Choice of appropriate methods and methodology used	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Work with data and information	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4
Work with scientific literature (quotations, norms)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4
Clarity and professionalism of expression in the thesis	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Summary and key-words comply with the content the thesis	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Fulfillment of objectives, formulation of conclusions	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4
Comprehensibility of the text and level of language	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Evaluation of the work by grade (1, 2, 3, 4)				4

Evaluation: 1 = the best

Date 29/04/2022

Signature of Opponent

Other comments or suggestions:

THE STRUCTURE OF PARAGRAPHS AND CHAPTERS

The structure of the thesis is confusing. The author tries to follow the main structure as recommended in the Instructions for Submitting a Bachelor Thesis and Rules for assigning, preparing, submitting, archiving and publishing Bachelor and Master theses at CULS.

Chapter 3. 3. which, by its numbering, corresponds to the headings of level 2, is displayed in the table of contents as it would have the numbering of level 1.

The table of content on page 6 does not contain a number of other subchapters, such as chapters: 3.1, 3.1.1; 3.2; 3.4 and 3.4.1. There are several chapters without any text in the assessed work (see pages 2 – Objectives and methodology, 9 – Literature review, 21 – Characteristics of a manager or 34 -Practical part).

There is a significant difference between the content of the thesis on page 6 and its real structure..

FORMULATION OF OBJECTIVES AND CHOICE OF APPROPRIATE METHODS AND METHODOLOGY USED

The thesis objective corresponds to the thesis assignment. The main objective should have been divided into several partial objectives that would have helped break the whole thesis into smaller logical blocks and set better controllable tasks determining individual milestones for the writing.

The Chapter "Methodology" is super-brief and contains no valuable information. The author describes the whole process needed to write the practical part in five lines. In the goals and objectives chapter, the author intends "additional hypothesis that is also tested" However, the methodology chapter does not describe any test applied to reject or accept the hypothesis. The main technique intended for the practical part are interviews with different participants and some observations. The simplified description explains neither the interview nor the observation method adequately, so it is unclear whether observations are done by participants or by the author of the thesis and whether the observations and interviews are somehow structured.

This chapter lets too many unanswered questions. How are interviews analyzed and interpreted? Is there some plan for the work, the order of analytical and other methods following each other to reach the given aim? What additional data is needed? What are the criteria for the selection of interviewees?

WORK WITH DATA AND INFORMATION

The work with data is absent in this thesis. The practical part begins on page 34 and ends on page 36, including large spacing between the end of chapter 4.1 and the beginning of chapter 4.2. The author declares that candidates for interviews come from different parts of the globe, but in fact, there are two people from western and two people from Eastern Europe without any detailed specifications, neither respondents nor interviews. It could be said that the practical part does not bring any new information for the thesis. There is practically nothing to evaluate in this criterion.

WORK WITH SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE (QUOTATIONS, NORMS)

The work with the professional and scientific literature does not meet even the basic expectations that are placed on this type of work.

The list of references contains 16 sources. The bibliographic citations contain only some of the essential information and do not keep a unified style, for example, in the size of letters or order of information. Although the bibliography is short, SIX authors from the list are not cited in the thesis. It represents 37,5% of all sources. As this exceeds the 10% thus concerning the Rector's Directive No. 5/2019, the thesis should be considered as DEFICIENT AND UNSATISFACTORY. Article 6 of this directive states that "As deficient and unsatisfactory is considered the thesis which does not contain proper citation (quotation) of more than 10 % of bibliographical recourses which are listed at the end of the thesis in the list of information (bibliographic) recourses". Missing are the following references: Idemobi, Ellis I., (2010), Armstrong, M. Stephens, T. (2008). Ebert RJ., Griffin RW. (2020), Higgs M, Hender J. (2004), Meyers E. (2015), and MULLINS, L.J. (2010).

On the other hand, many authors cited in the text are missing in bibliography records like HEATHFIELD, (2019), Stamp, (1986), Lederer, (1987), Lay & Schouwenburg, (1993), Team, (2021), Juneja, (2015), Stevens, (2016), Scott (1987), Le Guin, (1998), Covey, (1991), Spector, (1975), Satir, (1988), McClelland, (2008), McDermott, (2016), Jaques, (2001), Gomez-Perez, (2008), Yaffe, (2011). Harris, (2010), Schwalbe, (2009), Zoltners, (2013), Riad, (2011), Ward, (2007),

Kaushal, (2017), Sanderson, (2013), Bennis, (1989). Lindgreen, (2005), Zhao, 2016), Young, (2008), Betina Szkudlarek, (2013), CMI, (2015)

There is missing information about the Place of publication, page/s number, edition, ISBN, ISSN, or DOI.

The student is unlikely to process the references in the text accordingly. There are many paragraphs without proper reference to the primary source.

Questionable is so a meeting of the essential given requirement for the content of the bachelor thesis, "to comprehensively process, classify and critically analyze an overview of the knowledge of a serious professional issue using theoretical methods of knowledge."

Some paragraphs in the literature review are duplicated (pages 14 and 16).

CONCERNING THE ABOVE MENTIONED, THIS THESIS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED PLAGIARIZED..

COMPREHENSIBILITY OF THE TEXT AND LEVEL OF LANGUAGE

The plural opens the question of whether there is only one author or a writing team. A passive word form would be more appropriate for the academic style of writing.

It is expected that formal writing is written in the third person. The author of this thesis forgets the academic writing rule in his text and uses personal pronouns in the whole thesis.

FORMAL PRESENTATION OF THE WORK, THE OVERALL IMPRESSION

The work meets the requirements for the scope of work at the lowest level. The author doesn't refer the thesis to the correct department on the title page. There is no Department of Business Administration at the Faculty of Economics and Management CULS. Some figures or not titled, e.g. figure A on page 14 and figure B on page 15. The figure on page 19 is without a title. The author also uses two different numbering for figures one is ABC and the other 123. Main chapters do not begin on separate pages. Moreover, there are blanket parts on some pages; see pages 35, 37 and 40.

FULFILLMENT OF OBJECTIVES, FORMULATION OF CONCLUSIONS

The thesis objectives are not fulfilled.

I CANNOT RECOMMEND IT FOR DEFENCE

Questions for thesis defence:

1. What is the purpose of this thesis?
2. How does the environment shape managerial skills?

Date 29/04/2022

.....
Signature of Opponent