

**Master's thesis evaluation by the opponent**

**Title of the Master's thesis:**

International agile teams in digital and virtual environment

**Author of the Master's thesis:**

Bc. Radek Liška

**Objectives of the Master's thesis:**

To examine the way how actual employees employed in distributed and cross-cultural teams perceive their work environment, their colleagues with different cultural backgrounds, and the tools they use for their usual interaction.

EVALUATION OF THE MASTER'S THESIS	
Criteria (max. 10 points per category)	Points awarded
1. The objectives of the thesis are evident and accomplished	10
2. Demands on the acquisition of additional knowledge or skills	10
3. Adequacy and the way of the methods used	10
4. Depth and relevance of the analysis in relation to objectives	5
5. Making use of literature/other resources, citing	6
6. The thesis is a well-organised logical whole	8
7. Linguistic and terminological level	10
8. Formal layout and requirements, extent	10
9. Originality, i.e. it is produced by the student	10
10. Practical/theoretical relevance/applicability	9
<b>Total score in points (max 100)</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>Final grading</b>	<b>Very good (2)</b>

**Overall evaluation and questions to be answered in the course of the defense:**

There are positive points that I would like to mention. Although I don't want to over-emphasize negative points, I can explain only reductions due to the set space limitation.

Minor issue: It would be more appropriate to present one main research question and consequently main objectives. The rationale is that achievement of single objective leads to competent answer of the research question. I do not consider the laundry list of questions as reasonable.

Major issues:

The author suggests to use the correlation analysis (p. 17). However, then he states that it would exceed the selected research scope. Correlation would have significantly increased the added value as the quantitative analysis constitutes from trivial descriptive statistics only. Hence, I consider it as insufficient.

The SOA section is very short. Briefness is an advantage to some extent only. The purpose of this section is to provide the context. Detail information associated with main topics should have been stated.

Many items from the list of references are not used in text. Thus, it is not clear if and how they influenced the author. In fact, presentation of selected ideas from unused resources would have sufficiently extended the SOA section.

**Name of the Master's thesis opponent:**

doc. Ing. Vladimír Bureš, Ph.D.

**Occupation of the Master's thesis opponent:**

Fakulta informatiky a managementu, Univerzita Hradec Králové

*I honestly declare that I am not in any allied relationship with the author of this Master's thesis.*

May 31, 2017

  
Signature of the Master's thesis opponent