

Review of Master work supervisor

Name and Surname of Student	Anais Marie Christelle MICHELIN
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	Rentel Nadine, prof. Dr.
Review author	prof. Dr. Nadine Rentel

Thesis evaluation

1. Logical structure of the thesis 1.0

Note: The thesis is clearly structured, comprising a theoretical and a methodological part, followed by the data analysis.

2. Fulfillment of objectives 2.5

Note: As the author states herself in her thesis, she develops the categories of the analysis completely based on research literature, which does not allow her to identify new categories.

3. Methodological approach 1.5

Note: The data triangulation (literature revue completed by qualitative interviews) seems appropriate in order to answer the research question, but the author does not make clear how she categorized her data.

4. Assessment of theoretical and/or practical contribution of the thesis 2.0

Note: The theoretical concepts are not reflected critically and/or elaborated based on the empirical data. The interpretation of the interview data does not really go into depth.

5. Handling of literature 2.5

Note: A critical perspective concerning the literature used and a clear focus on the research question is missing.

6. Formal aspects 2.5

Note: The author does not make clear the difference between direct and indirect quotations on the formal level. Often, the page numbers for direct quotations are missing. The style corresponds to the expectations.

7. Student's own contribution to the studied problems 2.0

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

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 starts from a clearly defined research question, dealing with a topic which is not new, but the focus on the academic context (administration) - in contrast to the large number of studies dedicated to companies - is interesting, and the data would allow to draw relevant conclusions for the domain. The author thus focusses on the university context as she explores mechanism of intercultural and multilingual team work at the International Relations Department of the University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences (BOKU) in Vienna.

In the theoretical part, the author does not discuss the concepts critically, while different approaches should be put into contrast and the evaluated concerning their relevance for the own research question. The different subchapters are quite short and often lack a precise relationship to the research question. This concerns, for example, the subchapter concerning the benefits and the disadvantages of using a lingua franca in multilingual team communication and the subchapter dedicated to code-switching.

As the author states herself in her thesis, she develops the categories of the analysis completely based on research literature, which does not allow her to identify new categories. This would have been very interesting, regarding the specific character of her data. The interpretation of the data could have gone more into depth.

The author highlights the specificities and the limitations of her research, which shows a good critical meta-awareness.

Questions and topics for discussion before the commission

Do you think that your findings, concerning mechanisms and strategies of intercultural and multilingual team work in an academic-administrative context, can be confirmed by research focussed on companies?

Could you go a bit more into detail concerning the criticism of Hofstede's research? Are there perhaps some criteria that seem more appropriate to describe intercultural interactions than others?

Could you provide some examples for cultural elements that, with Jacob (2003), "are more common among many countries, while others are unique to a particular country"?

Can the concept of "Manager" 100% be adopted to the hierarchies of the specific academic-administrative context you investigate?

Why did you decide to conduct five semi-structured interview instead of a focus group interview?

Do you think that your results would vary significantly if you interviewed persons from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds?

Date: Aug 30, 2022

Signature of supervisor