SUPERVISOR´S OPINION OF BACHELOR THESIS

Study programme: Regional Development

Department: 312

Author of thesis: Helena Luknišová

Name of thesis: The process of cultural adaptation of AIESEC exchange
programme participants

Supervisor of thesis: Ing. Mgr. Jiří Čeněk , Ph. D.

ASSESSMENT OF THESIS: (always add verbal comments)

1. COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIRED ASSIGNMENT:

The thesis complies with the required assignment.

2. WORK WITH ACADEMIC LITERATURE:

The thesis is based on a sufficient number of scientific sources. The citations in text are correct and the level of citations in the thesis is generally very high. However, the author could use in some of the subchapters more sources (e.g. p. 28 - 31).

3. CONTENT LEVEL OF WORK:

The way of selecting aim of the thesis mentioned in abstract (p.4) - "The aim of this thesis is determined on the basis of questionnaires…" Is scientifically incorrect. One should never select an aim on the basis of method.

The theoretical part of the thesis is conducted relatively well covering all theoretical constructs relevant for the topic. In the empirical part the author formulated a goal of the thesis and two research questions, gathered data from 89 respondents and conducted a statistical analysis of the data.

Table 5 with the CCAI descriptives should be placed before the statistical tests. In the part with regression analyses, the author reports unstandardized beta coefficients (e.g. p. 50, first paragraph). Reporting unstandardized beta coefficients this way can be rather misleading.

Page 50, author states (and similarly for all regression analyses): "Therefore, we can say that the gender, age, place of origin or status do not influence the level of respondents Emotional Resilience in the beginning of the project." It is rather a strong statement - the observational design of the study doesnt allow us to make statements about causation. The correct verb should be "predict".

4. FORMAL LAYOUT:

The Czech abstract is formatted in two different ways - compare p. 4 and 5. There are no other major mistakes of the formal charater.

5. COOPERATION WITH SUPERVISOR:

The author consulted her thesis with the supervisor. The final draft of the thesis was sent to the supervisor only several days before the deadline.

SPECIFIC REMARKS AND COMMENTS ABOUT THE THESIS:

1) Could the author mention, where she was gathering the data and why does she think the response rate of the AIESEC programmes participants was so low?

2) Please discuss the correlation vs. causation problem (e. g. p. 50). What research design would allow as to make statements about causal relationships between variables?

3) How would the author interpret the values of adjusted R squared in the results of the regression analysis? Are they small or high? What do the values of adjusted R squared tell us about the regression model?

DEFENSE OF THESIS: recommended

FINAL CLASSIFICATION PROPOSAL: B

Date: 21.5.2018

....
Signature of supervisor