

REVIEW OF THE BACHELOR'S THESIS EXTERNAL REVIEWER

Student's name: Shabnami Mirzo

Thesis title: Influence on Household Decision Making on Income Inequality

Name of the thesis external reviewer: Ing. Lukas Augustin Maslo, 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:

Subsection 1.3:

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

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.

- | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:

Subsection 3.2:

Subsection 3.3:

Subsection 3.4:

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? | <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:

Subsection 4.2:

Other (as appropriate):

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 author has shown that she can formulate a scientific hypothesis, design a method to its verification and draw conclusions. The author has also demonstrated her ability to cope with methodological complications resulting from the absence of a direct method of a regression, as well as the presence of a reversed causality. The thesis is not missing a self-critical reflection of its own limitations. Last but not least, the author has set her scientific contribution into a broader framework of the existing research. The thesis meets the requirements of the Faculty of Economics for final theses and I recommend it for a defense before a commission.

6. Questions and remarks to the defense:

1. Why did the author break down the regression into five groups for each country, rather than including all the explanatory variables into one regression model for each country, respectively?
2. How does the author explain the positive correlation between the income inequality and female labor participation?

Proposed grade: excellent

<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>

Date: 06/03/2019Signature of the Thesis External Reviewer

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.

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.