

Review of Master work supervisor

Name and Surname of Student	Léa GOIZET
Qualification Work Title	Multilingualism and Interculturality in International or Interregional Projects and Work Environments
Name and Type of Study Programme	Regional and European Project Management / Navazující
Faculty / Department	Ekonomická fakulta / KRM
Supervisor	Fetscher Doris, prof. Dr.
Review author	prof. Dr. Doris Fetscher

Thesis evaluation

1. Logical structure of the thesis 2.5

Note: Basic notions are explained through relevant literature but not related to the empirical part of the work. There is no critical reflection on the basic notions as intercultural competence or social exclusion.

2. Fulfillment of objectives 1.5

Note: The research question is clear. The author answers the research question on the basis of her empirical research. This process is transparent. The theoretical background of the qualitative research should have been more explicit.

3. Methodological approach 2.5

Note: The data were collected in a transparent way. Unfortunately the original interview data are missing. The questionnaires are well structured. The transcription seems to be correct but can't be controlled.

4. Assessment of theoretical and/or practical contribution of the thesis 2.0

Note: The thesis documents the pedagogical background and the social, political and intercultural complexity of a very specific EU project. All important aspects are pointed out but are not discussed with critical distance.

5. Handling of literature 4.0

Note: Relevant and up to date literature has been cited but not discussed critically. There are only indirect citations without indications of the page. The findings in the theoretical part are not clearly integrated in the analysis of the data

6. Formal aspects 3.0

Note: The author uses a scientific style and is able to express herself clearly. There are no mistakes. The list of references is incomplete. Half of the cited literature can't be found in the list of references, where there are also some mistakes

7. Student's own contribution to the studied problems 2.0

Note: The author describes the various social, political and intercultural aspects of this specific EU project in a clear, sensitive, politically correct and autonomous way but I miss the critical reflexion of the literature.

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

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

La partie empirique du travail semble avoir été effectuée avec soin, sensibilité et à la base d'une compréhension profonde de la complexité du projet. Mais les enregistrements manquent. Malheureusement la partie théorique ne correspond pas aux normes d'une thèse de master, la bibliographie et les citations étant incomplètes.

Les notions et les problématiques discutées dans la partie théorique sont d'une grande importance pour le projet mais elles auraient dû être discutées de façon plus critique. Les résultats de cette discussion auraient dû être intégrés dans la partie empirique.

C'est vraiment dommage que le travail scientifique n'ait pas été exécuté avec plus de soin (citations, bibliographie).

Questions and topics for discussion before the commission

p.51 Est-ce que vous pensez que l'apprentissage que font les jeunes sera durable ? Quelles mesures pourraient être prises pour rendre ce succès durable.

p. 48 Est-ce qu'un volontariat obligatoire pour tous les jeunes serait souhaitable ?

Est-ce que vous connaissez d'autres modèles de compétence interculturelle ?

Date: Sep 09, 2018

Signature of supervisor