



# Report on the part of the final state examination Record of the thesis defence

Academic year: 2023/2024

<b>Student's name and surname:</b>	Kongyang Ji
<b>Student's ID:</b>	10592763
<b>Type of the study programme:</b>	Bachelor's
<b>Study programme:</b>	Social Sciences
<b>Study ID:</b>	713286
<b>Title of the thesis:</b>	Invisible Poverty: Understanding of Consumption Strategies among Chinese Migrants in Europe
<b>Thesis department:</b>	Department of Sociology (23-KS)
<b>Language of the thesis:</b>	English
<b>Language of defence:</b>	English
<b>Advisor:</b>	doc. Mgr. Martin Hájek, Ph.D.
<b>Reviewer(s):</b>	Mgr. Maksym Kolomoiets
<b>Date of defence:</b>	11.09.2024
<b>Venue of defence:</b>	Praha
<b>Attempt:</b>	1. resitting
<b>Course of the examination:</b>	<p>The chairman of the committee started the examination. The student then had 10 minutes to present his thesis. The supervisor's evaluation was read out, highlighting that the findings were in line with the research problem, although not as rich as one would expect from the theoretical part of the thesis. In addition, the sample was relatively small, especially when the length of the interview was 10-30 minutes. This was followed by the opponent's review, according to which the thesis does not meet the stated aim, but it does answer the research questions, which are however different from the research aim. The</p> <p>literature review is decoupled from the results of the qualitative analysis. The student then answered the supervisor's questions about the methodology and the development of consumption strategies. The student explained that the interviewees had given different accounts of consumption strategies and gave several examples. The interviewer then asked: 'Why didn't you focus the research on thrift as a consumption practice if your data is all about it?' and the student replied that he had concentrated on conspicuous consumption. The committee members then asked various questions, including possible avenues for future research, which the student answered satisfactorily. The committee discussed the assessment. It was agreed that both the thesis and the defence had some</p>

shortcomings, but that they met the requirements for the undergraduate degree.  
The grade D was agreed.

<b>Result of defence:</b>	very good (D)	
<b>Chair of the board:</b>	Balon Jan, PhDr. Mgr., Ph.D. (present)	.....
<b>Committee members:</b>	Hájek Martin, doc. Mgr., Ph.D. (present)	.....
	Kotherová Zuzana, Ing., Ph.D. (present)	.....
	Remr Jiří, Mgr., Ph.D. (present)	.....