

Review of Master work supervisor

Name and Surname of Student	Katrin MÜLLER
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 1.5

Note: Clear methodological framework. All the basic notions are well explained and integrated in the research. The construction of the guideline could have been explained in a more explicit way.

2. Fulfillment of objectives 1.0

Note: The objectives are fulfilled. The author is able to identify relevant difficulties concerning the multilingual and intercultural situation in a rural hospital in G. and the languaging practice and strategies of the concerned staff.

3. Methodological approach 2.0

Note: The deductive and inductive research is transparent and logic. The author has been very nervous while conducting the interviews. She could have gone deeper during the interviews.

4. Assessment of theoretical and/or practical contribution of the thesis 1.0

Note: Both, the theoretical and practical contributions are relevant to understand and approve the situation of multilingual staff in the field of health care.

5. Handling of literature 1.0

Note: Very good handling of up to date and relevant literature.

6. Formal aspects 2.0

Note: The pages 1-8 appear twice in the printed version. The graphical layout of the transcriptions and their translations within the text is well done.

7. Student's own contribution to the studied problems 1.0

Note: The student shows critical metareflexion, has been able to work independently and to deal with the difficulties of the Covid 19 restrictions.

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

Conclusion

Thesis evaluation (note): **excellent**

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

Questions and comments

Critical comments and overall contributions, total value of the thesis

The two physicians AA1 and AA2 are interviewed together. The author does not explain why she was proceeding in this way and does not discuss the methodological consequences.

Questions and topics for discussion before the commission

The two physicians AA1 and AA2 are interviewed together. Please explain this way to proceed.

Please explain the construction of your guideline in relation to your findings in the literature.

Explain the notion "error culture" in the context of your research.

p.55, you write that it would have been better to approach the patients view from a different angle.

Please explain.

Explain the consequences of thin communication in the field of your research.

Date: Sep 22, 2020

Signature of supervisor