

OPPONENT'S OPINION OF BACHELOR THESIS

Study programme: Regional development

Department: Department of Social Development

Author of thesis: Tomáš Gálik

Name of thesis: The process of adaptation to a foreign culture

Supervisor of thesis: Ing.Mgr.Jiří Čeněk

TYPE OF DIPLOMA WORK: applied

ASSESSMENT OF THESIS: (always add verbal comments)

1. COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIRED ASSIGNMENT:

The bachelor thesis does not meet all the requirements and aims stated in the assignment.

2. WORK WITH ACADEMIC LITERATURE:

The author uses 28 sources in four different languages. All topics covered in the theoretical part are relevant to the objective of the thesis. Nevertheless, I miss a chapter dealing with problematics of expatriates and immigrants that would enable to see the main objective in wider context. You could also use Berry as a reference since he is a well-known expert in the problematics of adaptation.

3. CONTENT LEVEL OF WORK:

My main objective is to the empirical part of the thesis. The author attempted to perform a case study of Czech immigrants living in Finland long-term. I think that what he really did is a qualitative study using (structured or semi-structured) interviews with his respondents. It is difficult to say, because the methodology of used technique (i.e. interviews) as well as of data analysis is missing. Also, another mistake can be found in tab. n.1. (p. 25) where the author compares the length of stay of his respondents and (probably) gives evidence in years not in months.

The whole analysis of the interviews is rather superficial and not suitable for academic text, the author does not analyse majority of questions from his own questionnaire, does not provide transcripts of his interviews. Finally, sometimes it is not clear whether the author presents his own ideas or the data based on his interviews. It would have been very beneficial if the author got more acquainted with the methodology of his research, and could approach a topic, that is very interesting and actual, in a more academic way.

4. FORMAL LAYOUT:

There is a number of formal mistakes in the whole thesis, such as missing summary in Czech, wrong numbering of chapters in table of content that does not correspond with the content itself (check ch. 2.5.: dimension pragmatism is left out), references are not in alphabetical order etc. Also, there is a number of spelling mistakes in the text.

SPECIFIC REMARKS AND COMMENTS ABOUT THE THESIS:

Based on the above mentioned comments I would strongly recommend the author to revise his thesis. There are further questions for discussion:

Did you use structured or semi-structured interviews? Can you give evidence of that?

How did you analyse the data?

Can you give evidence that there is a higher migration rate of men in general (p.25)?

DEFENSE OF THESIS: not recommended

FINAL CLASSIFICATION PROPOSAL: F

Date: 9.6.2014

.....
Signature of opponent