

Review of Master work supervisor

Name and Surname of Student	Natálie ŠKÁBOVÁ
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	Fetscher Doris, prof. Dr.
Review author	prof. Dr. Doris Fetscher

Thesis evaluation

1. Logical structure of the thesis 2.0

Note: The structure and the methodological framework are very clear. The basic notions are all defined but not discussed critically. I also miss an argumentation. The difference between international and intercultural is not clear

2. Fulfillment of objectives 1.0

Note: The student answers the research question and discusses the findings critically. The objective to give an inside view in important aspects of the project work within the organization is fulfilled.

3. Methodological approach 1.5

Note: The methods are explained and applied transparently. There are some ambiguities in the transcriptions: The use of capital letter e.g. Relevant categories are developed and integrated in the questionnaire.

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

Note: The thesis gives a relevant inside view in the project management within an international company. The author can derive suggestions for improvement of the project work from her research.

5. Handling of literature 2.0

Note: The author cites relevant literature which is also up to date. In the list of references there are some smaller inconsistencies. In most of the indirect citations the indication of the page is missing.

6. Formal aspects 1.5

Note: The thesis is written in a good scientific style with only very few mistakes. The layout is good and the annexe is nearly complete. Only the signed declarations of consent are missing.

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

Note: The students approach is clear and engaging. A more critical approach to the theorie would have been useful. However the independet elaboration of the categories and the careful analysis shows the mastering of the approach.

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

The work is complete and all parts have been carefully executed. A weakness of the work is that only three interviews could be conducted.

The well thought-out development of the questionnaire and the analysis and discussion of the results compensate for this weakness. In the theoretical part I miss a critical distance and the development of an argumentation which leads towards the research question. The definitions are juxtaposed rather than reflected in relation to each other.

Questions and topics for discussion before the commission

Why did you use the term “international project management” and not the term “intercultural project management” in your research question?

p.18 concerning the definition of interculturality of the UNESCO: Do cultures interact?

p.18 concerning the definition of interculture of Barmeyer 2021, p.71: Definitions should not be redundant. Consider this definition critically from this point of view.

You developed one questionnaire for three people with very different responsibility within the project – why?

Can you explain the theoretical background of the categorie “education”.

Date: Sep 17, 2023

Signature of supervisor