

## Posudek na bakalářskou diplomovou práci

Název práce:	Food, Family and Football: Discussing Selected Themes in Gurinder Chadha's <i>Bhaji on the Beach</i> and <i>Bend it Like Beckham</i>
Studijní obor:	Bc - Anglický jazyk a literatura
Autor/ka práce:	Soňa Šašinková
Vedoucí práce:	doc. Mgr. Milada Franková, CSc., M.A.
Oponent/ka:	Mgr. Zénó Vernyik

---

Předkládaná práce je hodnocena

1. Z hlediska obsahového záměru, naplnění zadání a zpracování předepsané literatury

C - dobře

2. Z hlediska požadavků na jazykovou správnost (pravopisné a jiné jazykové chyby)

B - velmi dobře

3. Z hlediska požadavků na formální úpravu, požadovaný rozsah, dodržování citačních norem, odkazy a bibliografii

A - výborně

4. Přípomínky, náměty, otázky k rozpravě:

The thesis in question analyzes two films by the director Gurinder Chadha: her early *Bhaji on the Beach* and the later blockbuster *Bend it Like Beckham*. It provides a historical overview of Indian migration to the British Isles, and briefly surveys how people of an Indian minority have been both seen by people in general, but also portrayed by and in the majority media and works of art. In addition, the work also summarizes the life and achievement of Ms Chadha. The work then proceeds to identify four key aspects or themes apparent in the two films under scrutiny, those four being food, the family, leading a double life and racism, and then duly analyzes the role and symbolic significance of them in the filmic text.

The strongest part of Ms Šašinková's thesis is chapter 5, where the actual analyses of the 4 themes are to be found. Here, she could prove that she has original ideas about the films, and that she could take a critical stance towards the analyzed texts, as well as engage a meaningful and productive dialogue with them, leading to a deeper understanding of their significance and symbolism.

While providing the reader with a historical overview of the situation of Indians and the stereotypes related to them is clearly useful for the purposes of the rest of the thesis, the chapter seems to be somewhat too casually related to the rest of the analysis. The thesis could have profited from a closer, more integrative approach, one that involves these aspects more directly in the subsequent reading.

The works also lacks a thesis statement, but only structurally. Hidden between the lines, in an implicit way, Ms Šašinková indeed channels her thoughts in a rather well-defined direction, but unfortunately never really tells the reader what that direction is. While, with an inquisitive reading, it is possible to deduct what her text is to prove, it would have been more advisable not to force readers into this extra work.

Related to this, is the paper's reluctance to actually choose one aspect, and one statement to make. Instead, it tries to tackle four aspects, and due to the limitations imposed on a Bc thesis, duely fails in covering any of the three in a way that would be detailed, meticulous and deep enough to do justie to any of the said aspects. In short, the thesis tries to do too much, and ends up doing too little. There are close readings in Ms Šašinková's work, but they just never seem to get close enough, because once she starts actual analyses, she has already passed on to the next aspect. It is also not exactly clear, what brings together these four aspects, and why the text tackles these specific four; a question she would not have to answer if she chose to concentrate on only one of them, but in detail.

Although the thesis analyzes two films, it refuses to treat them as films proper, and completely ignores film theory, as such. In a similar way, even though the issues tackled in the paper fall within the field of (post)colonial studies, there is little in the thesis that would prove familiarity with relevant theoretical works, except the appearance of some such titles in the bibliography; sources that nevertheless remain completely unabsorbed and unintegrated in the analyses. The problem of not defining key terms, as well as using several senses of the same term (sometimes oscillating between everyday meaning and scholarly meaning) might also spring from this lack of proper theoretical backing. The most serious case of this is on pages 37-9, where the text confuses class discrimination with racism.

The language of the paper is good in general, but not excellent. There are occasional cases of Czech word order imposed on English, at times missing or superfluous words, and there are places where these even hinder understanding. However, none of these instances are very serious.

All in all, the merits of the paper seem to be more numerous than its shortcomings, and it certainly qualifies as a work that can lead to being named "Bc." The thesis could show some original insights and is clearly the result of serious work. However, its lacks do not let it fulfil its promises.

### **Celkový návrh hodnocení<sup>1</sup>:**

**C - dobře**

V Brně dne 4. září 2007

Zénó Vernyik  
podpis

---

<sup>1</sup> Dílčí hodnocení nemají stejnou hodnotu, a celkové hodnocení tedy není jejich průměrem.