

Evaluation on the master thesis **“Weaving two worlds: A Moroccan Narrative of Adaptation in Prague”** written by Firdaousse Boulghazi.

The thesis deals with a current topic of migration and adaptation to different culture. The research topic and research questions are well defined. It focuses on adaptation of Moroccans living in Prague. The interconnected research questions evolving around the concept of adaptation are as follows (page 8):

1. identifying challenges/obstacles (especially in terms of cultural differences) to adaptation,
2. exploring strategies to overcome them,
3. researching cultural identity negotiations (whether/to what extent the migrants have chosen to preserve their cultural identity, how they handled cultural differences),
4. evaluating the importance of social networks (support systems - role in the adaptation process).

I would like to highlight that the student did a lot of field research (running interviews, transcribing and analysing them). I would also like to highlight that the student worked hard and systematically on her master thesis.

I am quite satisfied with the chapter four, Data analyses and findings. On the contrary I consider literary review (chapter one), and the concluding chapter as the weakest parts of the thesis.

Chapter one, literary review. I miss an explanation of the decision making which scholars and theories about migration has been covered and why, and which has been excluded. The chapter starts straight on with a theory of a culture shock, not with explanation of the logic of the chapter. The reader needs clear guidance throughout the chapter. It seems a bit like a notes from reading, rather than a thesis chapter. Page 28 dealing with Moroccans in the Netherlands is repetitive (findings about those who choose to integrate versus assimilate reported in two paragraph). Page 29 referencing needed. Most importantly, I did not find much from the literature review as part of interpretations of the dates collected.

Conclusion. It does not sum up main findings. It rather seems to be a kind of very brief self-evaluation of the thesis. Also, too short (pages 134-135)

Formal remarks

Missing page numbers.

Quite often lack of referencing to particular literature.

No need to use titles while referring to particular scholars and their works (like Dr. Kalervo Oberg, page 11).

Questions for defence:

1. Could student explicitly and briefly sum up what are the main findings regarding the four research questions, including what were the most interesting/unexpected findings for her personally?

2. How would the student put her findings into the context of the existing literature (dealing with migration in general and with Moroccans in Europe in particular)? Is it consistent with it?

I propose mark 2 if the defence is convincing.

Karel Černý, Ph.D.

September 13, 2023