

Review of Master work reviewer

Name and Surname of Student	Nelly Wendpanga COMPAORÉ
Qualification Work Title	Virtual Communication and project-work
Name and Type of Study Programme	Regional and European Project Management / Navazující
Faculty / Department	Ekonomická fakulta / KRM
Supervisor	Fetscher Doris, prof. Dr.
Reviewer	doc. Ing. Kamil Picha Ph.D., MBA.

Thesis evaluation

- 1. Importance and difficulty of the topic 1.0
Note: The importance of the topic raise with pandemic situation and a vital need to find solution for managing team work and team projects, especially those where the team was normally supposed to travel to meet together.
- 2. Logical structure of the thesis 1.5
Note: The structure is correct and suitable for dealing with the topic. Main notions are well explained. The notion of homeworking could be also mentioned.
- 3. Fulfillment of objectives 1.5
Note: The author did not explicitly stated hypotheses or research question in methodology. Particular hypotheses can be caught further in the text. The main research question concerned very probably the strategy of working at distance.
- 4. Methodological approach 1.5
Note: Description of the methodology is not clearly presented. However, it was obviously well thought and the qualitative reserch well prepared and done.
- 5. Assessment of theoretical and/or practical contribution of the thesis 1.5
Note: The thesis brings interesting findings that can be used in both theory and practice. Unfortunately, the theoretical implications are not explicitly concluded.
- 6. Handling of literature 2.5
Note: The theoretical background is presented quite shortly. The literature sources are up-to-date. The citations are very strange, some in-text citations have no item in the list of references and vice-versa. APA style is neglected
- 7. Formal aspects 2.0
Note: Tables and figures miss titles and numbering. Some titles of subchapter are on the last line of a page - e.g. 3.3, 5.3

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 broadly present her scientific project and wider context of the studied situation in quite a

long introduction. It makes a reader sure about what to expect from this thesis. The notions of teleworking and telecommuting were well known even earlier. The author did not use the possibility of seeing findings on the context of this mode of work in the scientific literature.

As the hypotheses or research questions were not clearly stated in the introduction or methodology, they are even not clearly handled in conclusions.

The objective has been fulfilled.

Citing of sources is quite confusing - e.g.:

- Hirigoyen 2007 is not listed among references

- the author is not cited in the reference "L. (2013, December 1). Chirurgie à distance : les exploits d'un médecin français. L'Obs. <https://www.nouvelobs.com/le-dossier-de-obs/20131129.OBS7645/chirurgie-a-distance-les-exploits-d-un-medecin-francais.html> retrieved on 18 July" - the author is Colette Mainguy.

- several other references have only an initial letter instead of author - those references are also hard to find cited in the text.

Questions and topics for discussion before the commission

What is the difference and the link among the notions telework and telecommuting? How the mode of work at distance has changed during the pandemic situation compared to the previous era?

Can the author explain and expand the idea mentioned in conclusions? (We now know that virtual communication is not enough to complete a project. Could the same be said of face-to-face work?).

What lesson can one take from these statements?

Date: Sep 19, 2021

Signature of reviewer