

# Supervisor Review of Bachelor Thesis

## 1. Identification

Title: **Accessibility of Information Systems in Czech Republic for Foreigners**  
Author: **Evelyn TOSEAFA**

## 2. Aim of the Work and its Fulfillment

The aim of this thesis is to test the accessibility of information systems in the Czech Republic for foreigners. The output of the thesis will be the proposal of technique of selecting common life situations for testing and technique of how to test it. Another output of the thesis will be the list of recommendations of how to improve information systems in the Czech Republic for foreigners.

Author partially fulfilled the given aim of the work and complied with the guidelines for the bachelor thesis.

## 3. The Content and Approach to the Solution

The author recommends universal and very general solution of the identified problems of information systems in Czech Republic. The problems are described briefly. Recommended solutions are shallow. The aim of the work was fulfilled but in a minimalist way.

Author used the possibility of consultations very often. Author worked according to instructions given by the supervisor. But author did not fulfill all the instructions.

## 4. Formalities and Finishing

Work is well formatted and mostly typographic correct. Some of the pictures could be in better quality (e.g. Figure 3, page 15).

## 5. Comments

- In the chapter 3.3 (page 27) there are described two types of user testing – formal and retrospective. These types of testing weren't used in the thesis, or their usage isn't obvious from the work.
- Output from the core part of this work was obtained by means of Multi Criteria Decision Making. It is described in the Table 12, page 41. The result is that criterion Accommodation is the most important one. But next chapters don't take into account this output.
- Author presents general recommendations how a usable interface should look. But there is no specific proposal of implementation to the at least in one of the tested information system or webpage.
- Insufficient design of flowcharts like different widths of boxes, arrows not in direct line (e.g. Figure 1 on page 13 or Figure 3 on page 15).
- In the flowcharts, there are sometimes multiple ways (three or two) to be chosen even the case of decision block is used (e.g. in Figure 1 third item or in Figure 3 last condition – output with “YES”, “NO” and the one without description).

- Bad references – see the figures (e.g. page 20, top, there is no figure 14 in appendix A, should be referenced to the figure 12 in appendix B).
- Bad descriptions of figures in the text (e.g. page 21, described as Tesco website only in Czech language).
- Repeated explanation of abbreviations (e.g. UX and UI on page 28 or MCDM and MCDA on page 29).
- Author does not use actual names of used programs – SPSS is now called “IBM SPSS Modeller” (page 29).
- Numbering of questions is shifted from question 3 to question 5 in the questionnaire (page 32).
- In the chapter 4, there are no question from questionnaire (or referred where the original questionnaire is present in the work), so interpretation of results is insufficient because it isn't obvious what the original question was.
- In Appendix B, there are showed problematic websites but there are no URLs of these websites.

I do recommend bachelor thesis to be defended and my evaluation of the thesis is  
**Very good minus**

Pardubice, 28 May 2014

Ing. Martin Novák