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“Negotiation and Hybridization: Constructing Immigrant Identities in Zadie Smith’s White Teeth and Swing Time”

The concept of hybridity has proved very important for diaspora peoples as a way of thinking beyond exclusionary, fixed, binary notions of identity based on ideas of rootedness and cultural, racial and national purity. Hybrid identities are never total and complete. Instead they remain perpetually in motion, pursuing unpredictable routes, open to change and re-inscription. Rethinking identity in such a way is not a solipsistic activity but is bound up in group identity, group formation and group hostilities.

This seems to be the starting premise of the Ms Araslanova’s submitted MA thesis, which indeed deals with the ways immigrants to Britain and their descendants negotiate their cultural identity in the metropolis as this is described in two novels by Zadie Smith. Ms Araslanova clearly outlines her methodological framework and tools when she defines her key terms and concepts (hybridity, identity). However, in the case of multiculturalism there seems to be a certain looseness of application (cp. pages 2 and 3). Can Ms Araslanova explain her use and perhaps attempt a definition (or a range of these)?

In spite of the author’s sincere work at editing and proof-reading of her text, problems persist in the final version, e.g. on stylistic and syntactic levels (awkward phrasing, very imprecise and unclear formulations, repetitions etc.), which spoil the argument, especially in the abstracts and in the latter parts of the thesis, which seems to testify to a rather rushed completing of the thesis. The text could certainly benefit from a more careful formal revision (the awkward misspelling of Ms Aralslanova’s name on the title page, the 1957! Indian Mutiny etc.).
Also, rather surprisingly, Bhabha’s texts are frequently not quoted directly, but only as quotes taken over from other secondary readings of Bhabha. This leads the reader to suspect that the analysis of Bhabha is derivative and based mainly on Zlobin and Ashcroft (see e.g. page 15); in the same manner, the explanation of hybridity too heavily draws on Voicu. Page 17 does not specify the reference to Gilroy but again is based on Voicu’s reading of him. Note 92 – reference to Hall is missing, and page 33 – Bhabha’s work should be referenced. Can Ms Araslanova explain these omissions?

Despite the above-mentioned comments, I find the MA thesis fully in compliance with all requirements for academic work on such level. I recommend the thesis for defence with the preliminary grade of very good (velmi dobře).
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