

Review of Master work supervisor

Name and Surname of Student	Johanna Maria PLEINTINGER
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 1.0

Note: The author provides explanations of key terms and concepts. One can highlight the well reflected definition of competitiveness and the selection of criteria that enable the author to measure the competitiveness.

2. Fulfillment of objectives 4.0

Note: The benefit of the thesis lies in the well reflected criteria for the measurability of competitiveness in cross-border cooperations. The interview data are not discussed at all, so the perspective of the persons involved is missing.

3. Methodological approach 4.0

Note: Broad methodological approach with the combination of qualitative (interviews) and quantitative methods (statistical data). The number of interviews is more than appropriate for a Master thesis, but the results are not discussed.

4. Assessment of theoretical and/or practical contribution of the thesis 3.0

Note: The interviews that have been conducted with persons having different functions and responsibilities can help to gain insight into the challenges of interregional cooperation. Unfortunately, the data are not discussed in depth.

5. Handling of literature 1.0

Note: The author takes into account the state of the art in the research domain and provides a good overview about the selected regions, underlining the specific requirements for interregional cooperation.

6. Formal aspects 2.0

Note: The style corresponds to the norms of an academic text. Some sources are not correctly linked in the text. The introduction as part of text is missing in the table of contents, but the relevant information is nevertheless provided.

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

Note: Based on the conducted interviews, the author could have provided a detailed presentation of the perspective of different actors working in the domain of interregional cooperation, but the data are neglected.

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 research question focusses on the comparison of two specific Euroregions in Lower Bavaria, close to the Czech border. The study is focused on the types of projects, of funding strategies and on the effects of the cross-border cooperation. The innovative and relevant research focus lies on the analysis of the competitiveness of the Euroregions, a key factor which has not yet been studied for these regions.

Concerning the definition and explanation of key terms and concepts of the thesis, one can highlight the well reflected definition of competitiveness and the selection of criteria that enable the author to measure the competitiveness.

The author provides a good overview about the selected regions and the specific requirements for interregional cooperation, identifying thus the research gap and the relevance of her own contribution. She also takes into account the state of the art in the research domain and clearly formulates the research question.

The study is based on a wide range of interviewees, according to their functions and responsibilities in the Euroregions, which would have allowed to gain insight into relevant fields of the specific cross-border cooperation.

The question is where the results of the interviews are discussed in the thesis. The author claims to present the data interpretation in chapter 6, but this chapter is more focused on the discussion of statistical data, with a single and very general reference to the interview data in chapter 6.1 where the author says that the fact that the population of the Euroregion is regionally rooted is in accordance with her interview data. The subjective perspective of the interviewees, as announced at the beginning of the thesis as well as of chapter 6, is not presented, although the conducted interviews would have allowed the author to gain deeper insight into the selected criteria concerning the competitiveness of the Euroregions. It does not become clear which aspects are based on the literature review, and if there are statements based on the interview data.

Questions and topics for discussion before the commission

Why did you chose a qualitative approach/ why do you think that is it appropriate for answering the research question? What could be the benefit of including quantitative methods?

The presentation and interpretation of the interview data in chapter 6 is missing. What is the reason for not discussing the interview data in detail, citing, for example, selected passages, and putting them in relation to the research literature?

Date: Sep 18, 2020

Signature of supervisor