

# Review of Master work supervisor

<b>Name and Surname of Student</b>	Christelle MIRAMON
<b>Qualification Work Title</b>	Multilingualism and interculturality in international or interregional projects and work environments
<b>Name and Type of Study Programme</b>	Regional and European Project Management / Navazující
<b>Faculty / Department</b>	Ekonomická fakulta / KRM
<b>Supervisor</b>	Fetscher Doris, prof. Dr.
<b>Review author</b>	prof. Dr. Doris Fetscher

## Thesis evaluation

### 1. Logical structure of the thesis 1.5

**Note:** The basic notions “communication”, “intercultural communication”, “virtual communication”, “face” are discussed critically on the basis of relevant literature. The methodological framework corresponds to the needs of a case study.

### 2. Fulfillment of objectives 1.0

**Note:** The author is able to give a complex inside view into the case. The target to better understand the specific needs for a successful intercultural and virtual cooperation within a project was fully reached.

### 3. Methodological approach 1.0

**Note:** The author masters all the techniques applied. The transcriptions and sequential analysis of the interviews are complete. The sequential analysis of the focus group is very complex. The author is aware to reflect critically on her dual r

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

**Note:** The practical contribution is very useful for further intercultural learning. Especially because the author does not only concentrate on cultural categories but also on categories of virtual and interspersed communication and how they interfere.

### 5. Handling of literature 1.5

**Note:** Citations and references are applied correctly. The author refers often on “classical” literature and is able to use these categories for her analyses in a critical and nuanced way. In the field “communication” the literature is not up to date.

### 6. Formal aspects 1.0

**Note:** The thesis is written in an excellent scientific style. Only very few mistakes. The formal apparatus is correct and all the annexes are complete. The empirical materials are well documented.

### 7. Student’s own contribution to the studied problems 2.0

**Note:** The student was able to access the complex empirical material independently and to solve problems self-reliantly. In contrast the student has problems with her own time management and risks to be lost in details.

### 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 thesis is written in an excellent scientific style and shows the nuanced capacities of the author to carry out such a complex analysis. The author is fully aware of her dual role as a participant in the examined case. She is able to show how such key factors as interculturality, virtuality, personal and organisational factors interfere in this specific "case".

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

1. In your thesis you do not so much focus on the institutional aspects of the "case". Can you better explain the role of the participating institutions for the course of the project.
2. Today communication is primarily seen as a two-way process of negotiating meaning. What distinguishes this definition from earlier definitions?

Date: Sep 20, 2022

Signature of supervisor