

Review of Master work reviewer

Name and Surname of Student	Anna ELLINGEROVÁ
Qualification Work Title	Cross-border cooperation in entrepreneurial activities based on business centres
Name and Type of Study Programme	Regional and European Project Management / Navazující
Faculty / Department	Ekonomická fakulta / KRM
Supervisor	Škodová Parmová Dagmar, doc. Dr. Ing.
Reviewer	Prof. Dr. Thomas Johnen

Thesis evaluation

1. Importance and difficulty of the topic 2.0

Note: The chosen topic has a practical relevance for the improvement of the work of CzechInvest, but hasn't a high complexity.

2. Logical structure of the thesis 3.0

Note: The overall structure is good. It seems strange that the transcriptions of the interviews are not placed in the annex, but in the main text of the thesis. In the thesis the basic notions and the contextualization are well illustrated by dia

3. Fulfillment of objectives 2.5

Note: The objective is fulfilled, even if the analysis of the results is superficial.

4. Methodological approach 3.0

Note: Large part of the methodological chapter deals with the difficulties to get answers of companies. This contributes to the transparency of the results. However it would have been fine if the author had explained the interest of every quest

5. Assessment of theoretical and/or practical contribution of the thesis 3.0

Note: The practical contribution is mainly restricted to the information that CzechInvest is known by the companies which participated at the survey. When it comes to details why the companies contacted CzechInvest no detailed information i

6. Handling of literature 4.0

Note: No evaluation is possible, because this part is not resumed in the compendium in English.

7. Formal aspects 1.0

Conclusion

Thesis evaluation (note): **good**

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

Questions and comments

Critical comments and overall contributions, total value of the thesis

In an overall evaluation, the author has shown that she is able to plan and conduct an own

research project and to resolve problems occurring during the data collection.

Questions and topics for discussion before the commission

1. In the introduction is stated (without any references) that the human being is naturally a competitive creature. Which is the ideological and philosophical background of this statement and is it possible to have even another anthropological point of view? How these anthropological views of the human being relate to the concept of cooperation which is central for this thesis?
2. In 4.3. you mention possibilities to carry out further and more specific mapping between CzechInvest and the companies. What could be concrete examples for further research?

Date: Sep 12, 2018

Signature of reviewer