# Review of Master work supervisor

Name and Surname of

Student

Ann-Charlotte COUSSI

**Qualification Work Title** 

The Influence of Cross-border Cooperation on the

competitiveness of Euroregions

Name and Type of Study

**Programme** 

Regional and European Project Management / Navazující

Faculty / Department Ekonomická fakulta / KRM

**Supervisor** Rentel Nadine, prof. Dr.

**Review author** prof. Dr. Nadine Rentel

## Thesis evaluation

1. Logical structure of the thesis 1.5

**Note:** The thesis is clearly structured, first providing relevant theoretical background information, then discussing the research methodology, and finally proceding to the presentation and discussion of results.

2. Fulfillment of objectives 2.5

**Note:** The thesis is based on existing studies as well as on official documentation of the activities of two Euroregions. The author does not make clear on which texts the comparison is based and why she has chosen the texts. Critical reflection?

3. Methodological approach 3.0

**Note:** As mentioned above, the small empirical database and the lack of critical distance makes it difficult to answer the research question. The discussion of the tertium comparation is could have been made in a more detailed way.

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

**Note:** The presentation as well as the comparison of the two selected Euroregions in the French-German context is relatively short. It is the same for the development of strategies. There is a lack of critical reflection by the author.

5. Handling of literature 3.0

**Note:** Relatively few citations in the text; some statements are not documented by sources. Lack of critical distance concerning the interpretation of authors.

6. Formal aspects 2.5

**Note:** The thesis contains some typing errors. The introduction is quite long, referring to the history of cross-border cooperation. Missing page numbers for direct citations. The form of the bibliography is problematic.

7. Student's own contribution to the studied problems 3.0

**Note:** The thesis is based on already existing literature and official documentation - which could be very interesting to discuss. The student's own contribution to the topic is relatively limited.

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

The chosen topic is of relevance for a peaceful cooperation in Europe, while the focus on the competitiveness of two selected regions in the French-German context highlights the question of the legitimation of this type of cross-border cooperation. The author provides relevant background information about cross-border cooperations in Euroregions and discusses key concepts of her study. The thesis is based on already existing literature and on official documentation concerning the two selected regions, but the author does not make really clear on which texts her study is based and why these texts have been chosen. Does the the database comprise the two annual reports that the reader finds in the appendix? If so, it would have been interesting to explain the choice of this text type. Throughout the thesis, there is a lack of critical reflection concerning the contributions of other authors. At some places, the author does not indicate where a statement comes from. On the formal level, there are different problems, such as missing page numbers for direct citations, the form of the bibliography or incomplete information on internet sources. The comparison of the two regions as well as the following discussion of strategies helping to overcome possible problems are relatively short. Altogether, the student's own contribution to the problem is relatively limited.

#### Questions and topics for discussion before the commission

What was the reason to compare the annual reports as text type? Which other sources could have a particular interest for the comparison of the two selected regions?

How did you exactly proceed when comparing the two regions?

In your opinion, are the results of your study applicable to Euroregions in another geographic context?

Date: Sep 15, 2019 Signature of supervisor