

Review of Master work reviewer

Name and Surname of Student	Numa PARMENT
Qualification Work Title	Digitization in the territory and differences between selected rural areas: the example of Grand Est region, France
Name and Type of Study Programme	Regional and European Project Management / Navazující
Faculty / Department	Ekonomická fakulta / KRM
Supervisor	Pělucha Martin, prof. Ing. Ph.D.
Reviewer	Prof. Dr. Thomas Johnen

Thesis evaluation

1. Importance and difficulty of the topic 1.0

Note: The topic is very important, because it is one element of the urban rural divide in France with all its political implications.

2. Logical structure of the thesis 1.0

Note: The overall structure is excellent. The basic notions of the topic are well defined and discussed. The methodological framework is explained with the necessary details.

3. Fulfillment of objectives 1.0

4. Methodological approach 1.0

Note: See overall evaluation below

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

Note: See overall evaluation below

6. Handling of literature 1.0

Note: The bibliography is rich (national and European documents as well as research literature), up-to date, well-chosen and presented according to norms for academic publications.

7. Formal aspects 1.0

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

In an overall evaluation, this Master's thesis is an excellent case study. The author has shown, that she is able to plan and conduct a research project with practical relevance and to elaborate (based on the results of the research) practical recommendations in order to improve the practice.

The two combined methods (questionnaire survey and municipal website analysis) are theoretically well founded. The procedures of the data collection are well described and critically

reflected. The data collection itself has been well-conducted and are documented in a transparent way.

The problem of the digital divide in rural municipalities in the region Grand Est is very well developed from a regional, a national and an European perspective. This part in itself delivers a lot of very worthy insights. The results of the data collection are well presented and discussed. Drawing on this analysis, very convincing practical proposals are elaborated. The limitations of this study are well described. Interesting ideas for further research are developed.

Questions and topics for discussion before the commission

1. One of the results of your study is that small rural municipalities don't have enough resources to be able to overcome the digital divide. It seems according to your analysis that this is a disadvantage of the France territorial division, because most of the other EU-countries have greater municipalities. My question is, if, on the contrary, the French territorial division isn't rather an advantage in comparison to peripheral rural areas of greater municipalities in other countries, whose interest are hardly represented neither in the municipal administration nor city councils?
2. According to the size of the municipality, are there differences with regard to the utility for the local population of the digital offers you analyse in your website analysis ?
3. Why did you classify Doulevant-le-Petit as a municipality of type 3 (p. 131) in spite of the fact that it has only 22 inhabitants?

Date: Sep 17, 2022

Signature of reviewer