## **Assessment of the Bachelor's Thesis**

Author of thesis: Elena Semerikova Title of thesis: The Bauhaus in the Soviet Union

Assessment of the primary advisor  $\boxtimes$ 

Assessment of the opponent  $\square$ 

Author of the assessment (first name, last name, workplace): Michal Šimůnek, Faculty of Management, University of Economics in Prague

Evaluation of the content and final form of the thesis (A/excellent – B/very good – C/good – D/good with objections – E/satisfactory – F/unsatisfactory – not recommended for defence)

Suitability of the selected objective and work approachC
Relative completeness of the literature used for the selected topicD
Ability to critically evaluate and use professional literatureD
Logicality of the thesis structure, connection of its chaptersC
Language and stylistic level of the thesisC
Compliance with citation norms (should the text repeatedly contain adopted passages
without citing the source, the work cannot be recommended for defence)D
Sufficient extent of image attachments, justifiability and suitability of attachments,
graphic layoutB
Originality of the thesis, contribution to the development of the field of studyE
Overall evaluation of the thesisD

Verbal evaluation of the thesis including questions that the diplomate must address in his/her thesis defence:

Elena Semerikova's thesis is an attempt to describe and analyse relations between German architects from Bauhaus and the Soviet architectural community in the 1920s and 1930s. The topic of the thesis is interesting and relevant, its structure is logical, work objectives and tasks are satisfyingly formulated and it seems that the author has a keen interest in the history and current state of Bauhaus architectural heritage in contemporary Russia (the thesis is closely related to her photo documentary project). But despite these positive aspects, there are also several shortcomings which significantly degrade the quality of the thesis. My key objections are as follows:

- The information quality of the thesis is rather low, most of the chapters just repeat well known facts and provide elementary information available on for instance Wikipedia or http://www.bauhaus.de. The author's expertise and contribution is thus limited, the literature review is of a poor quality.
- It seems that author is not familiar with the basic citation norms (for example most of the literature sources listed in the final bibliography are not mentioned and quoted in the thesis).

- The thesis does not meet several other formal requirements: there are spelling mistakes, sources of illustrations are not mentioned, there are many paragraphs composed of just one sentence.
- The conclusions and findings are rather obvious (e.g. "I have found a connection in the professional and social aspects.")

Despite my objections mentioned above, I recommend Elena Semerikova's thesis for the defence and propose D as the final grade.

Questions for the defence:

Could you describe in more detail the focus and objectives of your photo documentary project "Bauhaus in Ural"? How do you employ your knowledge about Bauhaus influence on the Soviet architecture in your documentary project?

Michael Triminel

Date: 14/08/2017

Signature:....