

Review of Master work supervisor

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.
Review author	doc. Ing. Kamil Pícha Ph.D.

Thesis evaluation

1. Logical structure of the thesis 2.0

Note: The author gets a reader confused with the meaning of the chapter 6 as the main reason for the chapter 6 is stated only in chapter 7

2. Fulfillment of objectives 2.5

Note: The verification of hypothesis has not been properly made. The objectives have been fulfilled more formally than factually.

3. Methodological approach 2.5

Note: Methods were properly selected and explained. The way of running interviews showed to be not appropriate enough. The analysis showed many problems

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

Note: The theoretical background is quite well approached, however the practical implications are poorer. The analysis is rather superficial

5. Handling of literature 2.0

Note: We can find some quite long passages that are written only based on one publication without any comparison or confrontation with any other authors' works, views or approaches. The Harvard style of citing is not always correctly used.

6. Formal aspects 2.0

Note: There are frequent typing errors or even grammatical errors.

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

Note: The student tried to solve most of problems herself. She set up the structure of the thesis and selected and adopted methodological approach.

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

The author elaborated a wide theoretical background (some sources are, however, out-of-date). Based on that, she formulated five research questions and two hypothesis. To be able to answer the research questions and verify the hypothesis, she created a questionnaire for in-depth

interviews. Later, she assessed the selection of a written form of interview to be not enough appropriate. It is a pity that the author did not use the written communication to ask additional questions in order to extend enough the volume of information from the survey.

The obtained data were analysed. However, the author did not use properly the transformig of qualitative data (coding the qualitative data).

Then the author even not enough exploited the obtained results when formulating conclusions, proposals and recommendations.

In conclusions, the authors state she "came across to significant amount of interesting information which could be studied even more in depth and thus it is possible to proceed with the research and even study other aspects of multinational projects. The topic is still changing and developing; therefore any other research would bring new and stimulating outcomes". Regrettably, nothing concrete has been suggested.

Questions and topics for discussion before the commission

What are the author's proposals for following studies? Which findings should be extended by other researchers?

The author concluded that the method has not been appropriately selected in this very case. What the author would make differently in her new research?

Why the author did not try to ask additional question to the written interviews?

Date: Sep 02, 2018

Signature of supervisor