

Posudek oponenta bakalářské práce

Autor práce (jméno a příjmení)	Ajmal SIDDIQUI
Název práce	Analýza finanční pomoci Afghánistánu
Název a typ studijního programu	Ekonomika a management / Bakalářský
Fakulta / katedra	Ekonomická fakulta / KMI
Vedoucí práce	Šulista Marek, PhDr. Ph.D.
Oponent	Martin Klicnar

Hodnocení práce

1. Význam a náročnost tématu **75 %**
2. Logická struktura práce **75 %**
3. Naplnění cíle práce **25 %**
4. Metodologický postup **50 %**
5. Hodnocení teoretického zobecnění a přínosu **25 %**
6. Praktický přínos práce **25 %**
7. Práce s literaturou **50 %**
8. Formální stránka **75 %**

Závěr

Výsledek: **46.25** bodů

Hodnocení práce známkou: **dobře**

Doporučuji práci k obhajobě: **ANO**

Otázky pro diskusi a poznámky

Kritické poznámky a celkový přínos, celková hodnota práce

- 1) Formal mistakes/findings – student was not careful in labeling of charts and tables and in references on them, e.g. :
 - A. When taking over Figure 1 (page 7) student forgot to explain a star above year “2012”, probably it means estimated values in the chart for this year
 - B. There are “Figure 1” on page 7 and also on page 9. The first one is followed by “Figure 7” on page 8, hence the numbering of figures is not correctly ordered.
 - C. On page 11, end of the 1st paragraph, the student used wrong reference “See[Figure 4]”, but related chart is “Figure 3”
- 2) English: relatively good English, only couple mistakes, e.g. page 2, the 2nd row “having been received” is wrong, it should be e.g. “was received”, or on page 4, section 1.3, the 4th row in “after which finally got independence”, the subject is missing
- 3) Calculation: it is not clear for referee, how the portions of international aid in page 11, the 2nd paragraph were calculated – based on reference on “Table 2”, there is visible that sum of European countries aid is bigger than Japan one, or the portion of US aid could not be 95% of total amount (10.406 billion from 12.930 billion is not definitely 95%).
- 4) Statistics, regression – there are biggest mistakes in the thesis, including

misunderstanding and misinterpretation of results:

A. Wrong model: the models are too simple, they omitted natural explanation of different values in response variables. For example number of people in regions, or size of area in regions are definitely important drivers for number of doctor, number of universities etc.

B. Outlier: for record "Kabul" are all values (dependent variable and responses) too high, hence this record should have been viewed as an outlier and have been removed from the model (may be replaced by another record(s)). The Kabul record dramatically influences the estimates including R square and leads to wrong results and conclusions. E.g. for public universities (Graph 3 on page 22) there is visible that without the "Kabul" outlier there is absolutely no dependency with amount of aid! But with this outlier the model "shows" very good result (R square almost 0.8).

C. Tests of normality. It is not clear, based on what in the charts is possible to decide, if the residuals are normally distributed, or not. E.g. in Graph 5 on page 25 in referee's opinion there is some dependency in values ("S" curve for points in the chart), hence no normality for residuals.

Otázky nebo témata pro diskusi před komisí

1) Based on referee's comments, how do you extend/adjust the model to be more adequate?

2) There are other variables described in Table 10 on page 29. Could they be used as other response variables? If yes, will they be better choice than e.g. number of universities? Why?

3) Please, explain, how to recognize normality of residuals in the used charts (page 25 and the following ones)

Datum: 19.05.2014

Podpis oponenta bakalářské
práce