CZECH UNIVERSITY OF LIFE SCIENCES PRAGUE

Faculty of Economics and Management

Evaluation of the Bachelor Thesis by Opponent

A SCIENCES D PR Thesis Title **Quality of Life at Work** Name of the student Ulyana Bocharova Thesis supervisor PhDr. Kristýna Krejčová, Ph.D. Department **Department of Psychology** PhDr. Daniel Heller Opponent Formulation of objectives and Choice of appropriatemethods and methodology 2 3 1 4 used Work with data and information 1 2 3 Δ Logical process being used 1 The structure of paragraphs and chapters 1 2 4 Work with scientific literature (quotations, norms) 1 2 3 4 Comprehensibility of the text and level of language 1 2 4 3 Clarity and professionalism of expression in the thesis 1 2 3 4 Formal presentation of the work, the overall impression 1 2 3 4 Fulfillment of objectives, formulation of conclusions 1 Summary and key-words comply with the content the thesis 4 1 3

Evaluation of the work by grade (1, 2, 3, 4)

Evaluation: 1 = the best

Date 14/01/2023

Signature of Opponent

Other comments or suggestions:

It is a bachelor thesis, but the author uses the formulation "article explains" in the abstract, and repeats several times "article analyses" in the introduction. Should be the text used as an article?

There are more definitions of "Quality of work life" – e.g. Harrison, Cohan, American Society of Training and Development, etc. No one of them can be found in References.

"The factors that influence and decide the Quality of work life" are listed on pages 11-14. One can ask: Who is the author of this list? According to which research results? In fact, this list on pages 11 – 14 is simply copied from: "https://www.whatishumanresource.com/quality-of-work-life" without mentioning it at all. This is unacceptable.

The quoting in the whole text of the thesis is rather very poor.

Just for example:

1. Page 15: "...according to a recent employee well-being survey by Alight" – there is no title of the study, no year of publication, no quotation, no reference.

2. Figure 1 – "The conflicts" – where does the figure come from?

3. What is the "Intention to Quit Model"? Who is the author of this model? Where can it be found?

4. Page 18: "Anon, 2019" is not in references.

The whole Literature review (pp. 9 -22) lacks any reasonable and useful conclusion.

The unanswered questions arise:

What is the source of data in Table 1 – "Evaluation of Quality of life at work" on page 23?

Regarding the methodology, the linear regression analysis of data is questionable. What was the format of data representing the independent variable – "support at work"? Number of cases presented in Table 2? What was the measure of dependent variable – "satisfaction with health condition"? It is not sufficiently explained.

The results are not convincing and conclusive, e.g. in both the points "food consumption during the week", and "engagement in sport activities".

One positive remark: The workplace health promotion in UniCredit (see Figure 12) is interesting and could be recommended in other companies.

Concerning the format of the text, there are different formats on p.10! The format should be 1,5.

Last but not least: References include 9 items only!

Nevertheless, I suggest the assessment 3 = good.

Questions for thesis defence:

1. How could you prove that the engagement in sport activities improves the health of the employees?

2. What would be your suggestions for the optimal harmonization of the interests of the employee and the organization?



Date 14/01/2023

Signature of Opponent