

# Review of Master work supervisor

<b>Name and Surname of Student</b>	Cédric JESTIN
<b>Qualification Work Title</b>	Multilingualism and Interculturality in international or interregional projects and work environments
<b>Name and Type of Study Programme</b>	Regional and European Project Management / Navazující
<b>Faculty / Department</b>	Ekonomická fakulta / KRM
<b>Supervisor</b>	Rosenstock Rachel, prof. Dr.
<b>Review author</b>	Prof. Dr. Rachel Rosenstock

## Thesis evaluation

1. Logical structure of the thesis 1.5

**Note:** See Comments, contributions No.1

2. Fulfillment of objectives 2.0

**Note:** See Comments, contributions No.2

3. Methodological approach 1.0

**Note:** See Comments, contributions No.3

4. Assessment of theoretical and/or practical contribution of the thesis 2.5

**Note:** See Comments, contributions No.4

5. Handling of literature 1.5

**Note:** See Comments, contributions No.5

6. Formal aspects 1.5

**Note:** See Comments, contributions No.6

7. Student's own contribution to the studied problems 1.5

**Note:** See Comments, contributions No.7

8. Monitoring for plagiarism (result) **negative**

## Conclusion

Thesis evaluation (note): **very good**

I recommend the thesis for defence: **YES**

## Questions and comments

### Critical comments and overall contributions, total value of the thesis

1. Generally well-structured thesis; RQ should be stated explicitly in the introductory section and should more clearly define the choice of interview partners (why use foreigners in Germany to report on the comportment of Germans in the workplace? - not explained well). Chapters 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 in the literature review could have been collated and integrated into one chapter, drawing both on Hofstede's (2011, inter alia) and Schroll-Machl's (2016) work - this might have revealed similarities and would have helped in applying Hofstede's framework to workplace interaction (also applies to subchapters of 2.2.3).

Basic notions are introduced and used throughout. Methods, analysis and discussion are well-structured, although discussion (Ch.5) is slightly less strong.

2. The aim described in the introductory section does not exactly match the RQs stated in Ch. 3 ("Method"). It would have been important to introduce these early on in order to make the structure of the literature review more transparent.

While the general structure of the literature review is logical and follows the objectives of the RQ, some points should have been more focused toward the designated topic of the study. In particular, this is evident in the section on communication (ch. 2.3.2 "Les comportements dans la communication"), where very general definitions of verbal and non-verbal communication are provided without linking these explicitly to workplace interaction and/or intercultural communication. With regard to the interview data, it would have been informative and helpful to also consider the significance of foreign workers using an L2 in the workplace, something that should have been discussed in this section as well.

Introduction and conclusion both reference the Germans' expectation of foreign workers/expatriates as part of the purpose/result of this study. In my opinion, the RQs stated in Ch.3, as well as the analysis/discussion appropriately focus on the view of expatriates on the German work environment, not vice versa. The statements in the conclusion should be weakened slightly in order to reflect the qualitative perspective as well as the experientially based evidence provided by the interviews conducted.

3. Methodology is explained well, draws on accepted tools (ELAN, GAT2-Minimaltranskript) and uses common software (Excel) in an appropriate manner to structure interview data. Use of expert interview as a preliminary study to focus the subsequent interviews is noted as a positive strategy. Data is referenced throughout Ch.4 (analysis) and tools for analysis and transcripts are provided in the annex.

4. Weakest part of the thesis - discussion is structured by drawing on data and literature in each section; however, it goes little beyond summarizing the findings of the analysis and comparing these with findings quoted in the literature sections, in particular referencing Schroll-Machl (2016). Stronger usage of the different areas of literature (notion of 'role', 'cultural dimensions') would have revealed interesting findings going beyond the already known. Conclusion suggests some further research.

5. Draws on 51 sources, of which eight are internet sites of variable scientific quality. Formatting of references in list is not consistent (place of publication/publisher is missing in some cases such as Day&Wagner 2002; Heidrun 2010; Maletzke 1996; edited volumes are formatted inconsistently); citations in texts are correct throughout; sources are current, relevant, suitable. Citations in the text are mostly correct; some minor mistakes (e.g. mentioning names of researchers without mention of year of publication; embedding citations from German/English literature in French sentences; adding "et al." to abbreviated groups of authors).

6. Register and style generally adhere to scientific standards; some inconsistencies in capitalization and spelling (e.g. chapter heading for 2.3.3.1 not capitalized); generally, formal aspects such as page numbers, annexes, abstract, layout are done according to scientific standards.

References to interview data is oddly formatted (time code, participant, quote), but suffices to ensure access to transcription.

7. General concept, search for literature and design of the interview study were largely accomplished independently. Student sought out help on particular sources for literature review (also beyond advisors) and developed his own instruments for analysis. Some advice on general scientific conventions and design of interview questions.

## Questions and topics for discussion before the commission

"Communication verbale" (p.24) is defined as face-to-face communication in your thesis. Would it not make sense to apply the widely accepted definition of verbal (as opposed to non-verbal) communication as any communicative behavior involving language, thus also applying to written communication, in particular as you focus on email communication in the work place both in the literature review as well as the interviews?

*Dans les jours qui suivirent la publication de l'annonce, des personnes se sont manifestées afin de participer et de soutenir mon travail. Après avoir obtenu de nombreux messages d'aide, cinq personnes ont été retenues pour les interviews. (p.36): How many people volunteered and how did you make your final selection of five participants? Why did you select them and how could this selection have influenced your data?*

*Enfin, la recherche révèle certaines attentes souhaitées au travail par les Allemands vis-à-vis des expatriés et de celles des expatriés vis-à-vis de leurs collègues allemands. (p.86): In which way do you reveal the Germans' expectations of their expatriate colleagues? Your data draws on the direct knowledge of expatriates in German work environments, not vice-versa. What kind of data would have been necessary to reveal more about the Germans' view on these matters?*

*Concernant la manière de travailler en Allemagne, il semble nécessaire d'adapter certains aspects et d'apporter plus de flexibilité, en donnant notamment plus de marges de manoeuvre aux employées dans leurs actions. Cette flexibilité pourrait passer par une communication participative réalisée en amont. (p.89): How are you envisioning to change the flexibility? What kind of program/training would this require? What would be advantages?*

Date: Sep 20, 2017

Signature of supervisor