

Bachelor's Thesis Judgement - Opponent

Name of student: Polina Petreko

Thesis title: Motivation and commitment of foreigners in Czech ice hockey

Thesis goal: The main goal of this bachelor thesis is to determine the motivation and level of commitment of athletes and extent of care of athletes who have come to play ice hockey in the Czech Republic.

Overall thesis difficulty:

Below average

Average

Above average

(Highlight)

Thesis evaluation criteria – evaluation scale:

Excellent

-

Very good

-

Good

-

Unsatisfactory (specify)

Thesis goal fulfilment	
Independence in processing the thesis	
Logical construction of the thesis	
Work with literature – citations, personal commentary	
Adequacy of chosen methodology	
Depth of thematic analysis, personal interpretation by the student	
Thesis appearance: text, graphs, tables	
Spelling, grammar, language style	

Practical or theoretical usability of the thesis:

Below average

Average

Above average

(Highlight)

Thesis evaluation:

The thesis topic on the topic of motivation and commitment of foreigners in Czech ice hockey meets the requirements for final theses written at FTVS UK.

In the theoretical part, the student conducts an average search of literature on various topics. The question is whether or not she chose all the topics correctly in this section and, due to the analytical part, this is not the case. In the comments I present several chapters that are only marginally related to the topic and should not be in the work at all. On the contrary, there is no description of studies that deal with the motivation of players to play sports in a foreign country.

The methodological part is not processed correctly. There is no descriptive analysis, which the author then uses in the analytical part. Furthermore, the selection of the research sample is not precisely described here and the operationalization of the survey is completely missing. This is why the reader is confused in the analytical part when interpreting the results of the interviews. the analytical part is processed correctly in the context of the above-mentioned shortcomings. Interpretation of results is very simple and deeper reflection is missing. However, this is also influenced by a very small research sample.

The recommendations themselves are very generally written and there is no obvious specific benefit for either foreign players or the Czech Extraliga.

The discussion is quite interestingly written, but the inaccurately elaborated theoretical part is shown here. The author would like to return to the literature in her comments, but she does not have that in theory. Nevertheless, the author presents a comparison with other research, which she at least partially comments on in the discussion.

The conclusion of the work is processed too generally.

Major mistakes: None.

Comments:

1. In some parts of the text, the author incorrectly uses subchapters, where the chapters are illogically divided into only one part (chapter 2.1.1, 2.1).
2. According to the contents, the author uses chapter 2.1 twice (pages 13 and 19)
3. The author divides the chapters without prior explanation, which again complicates the reader's orientation in the text.
4. The author does not follow the typographic rules for writing texts. For example, when creating paragraphs, she combines the offset first line and the space between paragraphs
5. The names of the figures are given without a time reference.
6. For figure 1, the author duplicates the title.
7. Figures 6 and 7 are blurry.
8. Chapter 2.4.1 (History of Hockey) is not relevant to the work and does not help in any way to meet the goal of the work.
9. Figure 8 has an inaccurate resource
10. Most of chapter 2.4.3 (Ice hockey in the Czech Republic) is not relevant to the work and does not help in any way to meet the goal of the work.
11. The division at the beginning of chapter 2.5.1 has no resource.
12. The student confuses the terms methodology and methodics.
13. The aim of the work is inaccurate; the author does not state in what period she will conduct the survey.
14. General interviews (questions) mentioned in the methodology belong to the appendices. The author does not explain the choice of questions here. The operationalization of the survey is therefore unclear.
15. To give percentage results in the context of the basic sample 58 is irrelevant
16. The survey is based on an insufficient research sample; the results cannot be generalized. and their interpretation is very complicated. The data represent only the attitudes of the respondents.
17. Chapter 5.1 is supposed to be in the theoretical part.
18. Several typos appear in the text
19. It is not clear from the text on the basis of which analysis the author elaborated chapter 5.2; it is probably a descriptive analysis, which, however, is not described in the methodics part of the work.
20. In the introductory part of the analytical part, the author deals with several criteria (Benefits of recruitment, Preferences in nationalities, Requirements, Recruiting, Finances and benefits, Communication and Players), which she evaluates. It is not clear from the text how the author got to these criteria or what they are based on.
21. Chapter 5.2.7 is not mentioned in the table of contents.
22. Due to the detailed description of the respondents, it is illogical to anonymize them in the work. The names of the players are easy to find according to the information provided.
23. Figure 13 is blurry.

24. The display of interview results is confusing.
25. For figure 13, the author duplicates the title.
26. The evaluation of interviews with players is the same problem as for managers. It is not clear from the question why the student is researching the criteria she is researching. She neglected this aspect both in the theoretical and methodic part.
27. The author's recommendations are very flat, they are based on the trial/error method
28. In the discussion the student uses publications that she did not comment on in the theoretical part of the work.
29. The conclusion is written very generally. The author does not comment on her specific results here.

Questions for the thesis defense:

1. What are the main benefits of foreign players for Czech hockey?
2. Should more or fewer foreign players join the Czech Extraliga in the future? Justify your answer.

Proposed classification level: Good

I declare that I do not have a familial or other private relationship with the student.

In Prague on: June 11th, 2021

.....