

Review of Master work supervisor

Name and Surname of Student	Ilane PACCAUT
Qualification Work Title	Regional development: a case study
Name and Type of Study Programme	Regional and European Project Management / Navazující
Faculty / Department	Ekonomická fakulta / KRM
Supervisor	Fetscher Doris, prof. Dr.
Review author	prof. Dr. Doris Fetscher

Thesis evaluation

1. Logical structure of the thesis 1.5

Note: The basic notions are well explained and discussed in relation to each other. the research subject "Ardenne Attractivity" could have been presented more in detail. (link to the webpage, important data, activities, goals reached ...)

2. Fulfillment of objectives 1.5

Note: The student gives detailed answers to her research question. In the conclusion she discusses her findings in relation to the results other studies with a focus on sustainable development and asks critical questions for further research

3. Methodological approach 3.0

Note: The way of coding and creating categories described is not at all transparent. The categories can already be found in the questionnaire. The Interviews were fully transcribed but the conventions are not clear. No line numbers.

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

Note: The work gives a differentiated insight into the attitudes of the interviewees with regard to the questions. This insight view could have been underpinned with the mention of data on the project (examples).

5. Handling of literature 1.5

Note: The author used relevant and up to date literature. The use of citations is correct. The author succeeds in establishing a coherent and transparent argumentation on the basis of the cited literature.

6. Formal aspects 2.0

Note: References, citations and the list of references are correct. Only few mistakes. No justification. The work is nearly complete. Heads of transcriptions are missing. No sequential analysis of the interviews.

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

Note: The student is able to develop a qualitative research setting even if the methodological approach contains weaknesses. The theoretical part shows that the student can discuss the problem comprehensively.

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

I solemnly declare that I have no affiliation with the author and opponent of the thesis/bachelor's thesis.

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

Despite the methodological weaknesses, the work provides a good insight into the possibility of the development of a crossborder regional identity from the point of view of employees in different positions in a crossborder project. The project itself should have been presented for a better understanding.

Questions and topics for discussion before the commission

page 23, please explain your way of coding (codage mixte)?

Which of the conventions of GAT2 did you use and why?

page 29, the interviewee in interview SD is obviously French. Does the origin of the interviewees influence their view of the project?

page 44, (Callois 2005) please explain the difference between "bridgin" an "bonding".

Date: Sep 19, 2023

Signature of supervisor