

REVIEW OF THE BACHELOR'S THESIS SUPERVISOR

Student's name: Thao Nguyen Thi Phuong

Thesis title: The impacts of advertising on consumer and firms.....

Name of the thesis supervisor: Ing. Zuzana Dlouhá, Ph.D.

	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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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:

Other (as appropriate):

2. Evaluation of the thesis structure and logical cohesion:				
2.1 To what extent is the thesis structure logical and transparent?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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:

Subsection 2.5:

Other (as appropriate):

3. Assessment of the thesis text quality:				
3.1 How well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author analyze the topic?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.2 Did the author formulate the thesis objective clearly and with logical structure?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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? ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐
- 3.6 To what extent are the thesis conclusions logically structured and show quality, and what is their added value? ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:

Subsection 3.2:

Subsection 3.3:

Subsection 3.4: The theoretical part of the thesis was covered more than sufficiently.

Subsection 3.5:

Subsection 3.6:

Other (as appropriate):

4. Assessment of the thesis form and style:

- 4.1 What is the formal layout of the thesis? ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐
- 4.2 What is the quality of citations and references? Are sources identifiable? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐
- 4.3 What is the stylistic level of the thesis, particularly the use of correct economic terminology? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐

Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:

Subsection 4.2: I highly appreciate the overall quality of citations and references.

Other (as appropriate): I can see a huge improvement in clarity of formulations since the first version of the thesis in May of 2015, although there are still few typing errors in the thesis (e.g. p. 32 in definition of the Theoretical model “v□rious” instead of “various”, in Figure 13 Net income for Samsung in 2014 is missing etc.)

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 bachelor thesis meets the requirements of the Methodology of the faculty of Economics in terms of quality of contents, scope and formal requirements, therefore I recommend it for defense.

6. Questions and remarks to the defense:

Please, explain the difference in Net incomes (Figure 13) between Apple and Microsoft in 2011 and 2012.

Proposed grade: 2 – very good

Date: 04.09.2015

.....
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>



Faculty of Economics of the University of Economics in Prague, nám. Winstona Churchilla 4, 130 67 Prague 3
Tel: +420 224 095 521, Fax: +420 224 221 718, URL: <http://nf.vse.cz>

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.