

Review of Master work reviewer

Name and Surname of Student	Pavla ŠMIDOVÁ
Qualification Work Title	Preparing and running multinational collaborative projects
Name and Type of Study Programme	Regional and European Project Management / Navazující
Faculty / Department	Ekonomická fakulta / KOD
Supervisor	Pícha Kamil, doc. Ing. Ph.D.
Reviewer	prof. Dr. Nadine Rentel

Thesis evaluation

1. Importance and difficulty of the topic 3.0

Note: The topic seems quite general as it covers all types of intercultural cooperation. The research questions should have been more focused, which would also have improved the reader's understanding of the discussion of the methodology.

2. Logical structure of the thesis 3.0

Note: The structure of the thesis as it is presented in the table of contents seems very basic. It does not become clear which chapters are focused on the theoretical background and which chapters belong to the empirical part of the study.

3. Fulfillment of objectives 2.5

Note: The author does not present innovative research results. Her conclusion is limited to the repetition of the objectives of the different chapters. The verification of the hypothesis is not convincing.

4. Methodological approach 2.5

Note: The author explains why she has chosen her research method, but the application in the empirical study, especially concerning conducting an interview and the analysis of interview data, is problematic.

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

Note: The presentation of the theoretical background is sufficient. The practical outcome (developed guidelines for leading a team) is quite general. It does not become clear if the guidelines come from literature or from her own research.

6. Handling of literature 2.0

Note: The author should have made more references to research literature throughout her text, in order to avoid to make statements that cannot be proven. Some paragraphs are based on one single author. Lack of critical discussion.

7. Formal aspects 2.5

Note: My evaluation is only based on the English summary of the thesis. Here, one can state that there are some language mistakes. The figure used in the discussion of results is too complex and not readable.

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

The research question itself is interesting and relevant, but it should perhaps have been limited to a specific context. The author presents a wide theoretical background concerning the importance of intercultural issues in the context of project management; she then tries to implement the theory by conducting interviews with people involved in that type of project. Nevertheless, the handling of the data (concerning data coding as well as the interpretation) seems problematic and reduces the quality of the results she obtained. As a consequence, the author does not come to innovative results based on her own data, but mainly reproduces knowledge that can be found in literature on project management. Furthermore, it is not clear which of the recommendations are taken from literature and which ones have been deduced from her empirical data. A more in-depth analysis of the interview data would have allowed her to present more relevant and specific results and recommendations.

Questions and topics for discussion before the commission

In your opinion, is it possible to separate language and culture, as you suggest in your introduction?

Can you explain the choice of your research methodology? Why is it suitable for your research question?

Date: Sep 12, 2018

Signature of reviewer