The review of the dissertation of Ainur Karzhaubayeva: "Frontier migration between Kazakhstan and Russia: the case of the west Kazakhstan".

Dissertation thesis has 243 pages, including list of abbreviations, list of tables, list of figures, list of maps, list of pictures, list of appendices, references (105 items), glossaries and appendices (21 items). The theses has bilingual (Russian and English) abstract.

The dissertation structure consists of 11 chapters (why author is stated 12 on the page 25?) and is focused on the research of border migration between Kazakhstan and Russia after split up the Soviet Union and set up of new frontier. The author has chosen an important topic because the character of migration flows has significantly changed and new migration analyses are relevant in order to develop practical policy recommendations. Moreover the study of transnational communities on the both sites of the borders is important and actual issue in contemporary migration studies.

The submitted dissertation is not unique by its elaboration but it is clear that the content of the work contributes to the migration studies in all post Soviet zone. There are all appropriate chapters starting with literature overview, methodology and methods, data sources and theories till case study and conclusions. The reader can be acquaint step by step with the history of formation Kazakhstan-Russia border, cross-border cooperation and demographic development in this frontier area. There has been much done in the field of collection of information about Kazakhstan-Russia border.

The dissertation has mostly descriptive nature of the work with some attempt at critical evaluation of the stated problems summarized especially in chapter 11.

Overall, the work would benefit from its brevity, better work with the language of the text and by showing only the most important milestones and characteristics of the borders.

In the following passages I would like to highlight some selected issues, the removal of which could lead to the improvement of the whole work.

The theoretical part:

The author relays particularly on sources written in Russian language but in the chapter of concept and theories I would recommend to pay attention more on other authors, especially in the part of transnationalism: A.Portes, S.Vertovec, P.Landolt, L.E.Guarnizo. They also describing problems at the borders and have many articles and books on it!!!!

Where did find the author concept of self-identification? I miss citing any sources!

I am not sure about stating of the hypotheses. There are rather affirmations than hypotheses.

In the chapter 6.2."used methods" is explained provided sample survey from 2009 on which bases is done generalized linear model. I miss more detailed description of the sample: which way were the respondents asked and found? Who actually has done that survey and when?

For better orientation would be better to add a map with the places of survey.

The practical part:

More I would mapped out the issue of case study (chapters 9 and 10), which are the key ones in this work. Shorten it and refer more to previous chapters. Chapter 10 starting directly with summarizing the respondents. It is necessary to repeat again the information about the sample survey or to refer it to the page 60!!Further in text it is unclear, if the author describes the entire sample, the Kazakh or Orenburg one. The most important summary of the used statistical method is described only on the page 178!

Of course in the conclusion is everything mentioned again including the answering the research questions. I would moreover expect linking on cited works in the text.
I am aware that some recommendation for data collection at the border crossing points will not work. For example I cannot imagine how the people crossing the border could trust to the interviewer?

The formal aspect of the work:
Formal site of the theses is of lower standard.
Why is not the dissertation summary written also in Czech? Including the abstract?
The author, unfortunately, did not avoid many mistakes in the text: in references – citing of the sources is somewhere doubled (Castles 2007, Jenissen 2007, Paasi 1996). When the author cites internet sources, I am not always sure which one she means (e.g. Internet – zhurnal), moreover there are not mentioned dates of download. There are many titles cited, especially English writing in the text but not in references (e.g. Kritz et al (1992), Pries (1996....) but on the other hand some of them are cited in Summary theses. It doesn't make a sense.
There are not right appendices counting (I miss appendix 21 and 22), which is confusing. Why did the author repeat the questionnaire (app 21 and 22) when they are identical for both citizens - Kazakhs and Russians???

The qualities of cartographic images are not sufficient. As well as figures which are coloured in variety shadows of blue - it is hard to make an orientation, which answer belongs to the particular part of figure.

Another point relates to the length of the text. Some information are repeated twice and more, simple idea is intricately described. I would suggest that if the work would be about 1/3 shorter nothing would happened and the message will be more or less the same! On the other hand there must be said that it must be difficult to write scientific work for non English speaker.

In spite of my comments I recommend the dissertation for defend provided that all the formal comments will be integrated.

I have for the author following questions which I suppose will be answered at the defend:
"Can you please explain the usage of transnational concept in the case of Kazakh-Russia migration situation?"
How did author provide the survey - how did contact the respondents and where they filled the questionnaires?

Prague, 21th of May, 2013
RNDr. Eva Janská, Ph.D.