

REVIEW OF THE BACHELOR'S THESIS SUPERVISOR

Student's name: Adham Mohamed Wahied Dahy

Thesis title: Determinants of the Sharing Economy Emergence; an experimental study

Name of the thesis supervisor: Ing. Tomáš Miklánek, M.A.

	1	2	3	4
Assessment of the topic itself (irrespectively of the student):				
1.1 To what extent is the topic current and significant?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2 How challenging is the topic in respect of theoretical knowledge?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3 How challenging it in respect of practical experience or fieldwork?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4 How difficult is it to get background materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:

Subsection 1.1: Sharing economy is a quite new phenomenon. Its increasing turnover requires further examination by economists. There have not been many studies looking at this emerging market structure yet. And if there have some, they tend to be too general. Therefore looking at the specific determinants and experimentally disentangling them is a novel approach to the topic.

2. Evaluation of the thesis structure and logical cohesion:

2.1 To what extent is the thesis structure logical and transparent?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.2 To what extent does the author use current / suitable sources?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.3 How properly did the author select methods in respect of the topic?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.4 How sufficiently and functionally did the author use in the thesis original charts, tables, data, annexes, etc.?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.5 What is the compatibility level for the thesis basic line elements: topic – thesis assignment – objective – structure - conclusions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:

Subsection 2.1: The thesis is well structured and organized.

Subsection 2.5: The parts of this thesis are compatible.

3. Assessment of the thesis text quality:

3.1 How well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author analyze the topic?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.2 Did the author formulate the thesis objective clearly and with logical structure?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.3 Did the author fulfill the defined thesis objective and approved assignment of the thesis that contains the objective?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.4 How well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author cover				

- | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| the theoretical part of the thesis? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3.5 How well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author cover the practical / analytical part of the thesis? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3.6 To what extent are the thesis conclusions logically structured and show quality, and what is their added value? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:

Subsection 3.2: The goal is precisely and clearly formulated

Subsection 3.3: The author fulfilled the goal stated at the beginning.

Subsection 3.4: The authors introduces the basic characteristics of the sharing economy with conditions allowing its development. In the end of the theoretical part he introduces relevant theories for the consequent experiment.

Subsection 3.5: The experiment tests the hypotheses about different speed of adaption to the change in environment (probability of high outcome) in three treatments. Each treatment relies on the different channel (or combination of them for non-control group). The results are surprising in a way that there is a significant effect of two treatments on the speed of adjustment even for such small number of experimental subjects.

Subsection 3.6: The conclusion answers the research question properly. The additional value of this can be described in two dimensions. The first, theoretical, summarizes development of sharing economy and tries to explain the channels which might have contributed to the spread of sharing economy. The second dimension, and in my opinion more important one, is the effort to disentangle those effect and quantify their relative contribution to the spread of the sharing economy. I do not know about any study examining the described problem.

4. Assessment of the thesis form and style:

- | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 4.1 What is the formal layout of the thesis? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4.2 What is the quality of citations and references? Are sources identifiable? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4.3 What is the stylistic level of the thesis, particularly the use of correct economic terminology? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:

Subsection 4.2: The author uses the current and relevant academic sources.

5. Overall assessment (*It is necessary to state, whether the thesis meets the requirements of the Methodology of the Faculty of Economics in terms of the quality of contents, scope and formal requirements, whether the thesis is/is not recommended for defense. It may also be nominated for a special award, etc.):*

The thesis satisfies the requirements for this type of the work. It is unusual to run the economics experiment at this stage of the studies. Even with the limited resources (and number of subjects) the results show some interesting patterns worth of further examination. The level of the thesis is above the standards at the University. I recommend it for defense.

6. Questions and remarks to the defense:

No questions or comments.

Proposed grade: exceptional

Date: 24.05.2016

.....
Signature of the Thesis Supervisor

<p><i>Instructions for the review: Author of the review must provide verbal assessment for the specified subsections, which are pivotal for the thesis assessment, particularly for the defense; therefore, the assessment must have reasonable explanatory power.</i></p> <p><i>Note: Classification method: 1 = exceptional, 2 = very good, 3 = good, 4 = failed.</i></p>

Instructions for the review: Author of the review must provide verbal assessment for the specified subsections, which are pivotal for the thesis assessment, particularly for the defense; therefore, the assessment must have reasonable explanatory power.

Note: Classification method: 1 = exceptional, 2 = very good, 3 = good, 4 = failed.