

## REPORT ON THE MASTER THESIS

IEPS – International Economic and Political Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

<b>Title of the thesis:</b>	<b>Internationalization of Higher Education in Kyrgyzstan</b>
<b>Author of the thesis:</b>	<b>Tolgonay Dogochieva</b>
<b>Referee (incl. titles):</b>	<b>Mgr. Michal Paulus</b>

**Remark:** It is a standard at the FSV UK that the Referee's Report is at least 500 words long. In case you will assess the thesis as "non-defendable", please explain the concrete reasons for that in detail.

### **SUMMARY OF POINTS AWARDED** (for details, see below):

<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
<i>Theoretical background (max. 20)</i>	15
<i>Contribution (max. 20)</i>	16
<i>Methods (max. 20)</i>	15
<i>Literature (max. 20)</i>	14
<i>Manuscript form (max. 20)</i>	10
<b>TOTAL POINTS (max. 100)</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>The proposed grade (1-2-3-4)</b>	

You can even use a decimal point (e.g. giving the grade of 2.5 for 60 points).

### **Comments of the referee on the thesis highlights and shortcomings (following the 5 numbered aspects of your assessment indicated below).**

#### **General comments**

The study presents a summary and description of the educational system and the related trend of internalization in Kyrgyzstan. Then the author interviews several respondents to ask about the rationales of the internalization in the Kyrgyz educational system.

The thesis suffers from several relevant problems which are described in each section below. Therefore I grade it as **good**.

#### **1) Theoretical background:**

- The thesis summarizes general aspects of the education internalization in the literature review section but it misses an extensive summary of papers doing similar type of analysis. Author should also discuss studies doing similar qualitative study and present the results and methodology of those papers. Then the author's methodology can be compared with the studies. However she mentions just few papers presenting the cornerstones of the used methodology (e.g. the work of Kalvermak and van der Wende) but no other applied papers.

#### **2) Contribution:**

- The thesis has one clear and one potential contribution. The key contribution of the thesis is the interview part. Unfortunately I would welcome much deeper methodological discussion of this part. The potential contribution stems from the descriptive part where the author presents a summary of the internalization in Kyrgyzstan and country's educational system.

#### **3) Methods:**

- The thesis summarizes relevant literature about the educational system and presents interviews. However the methodology behind the interviews is not discussed and properly presented.

- Why there are just 6 interviews? Is this number standard in that stream of literature or is it caused by the difficulties related to data collection? At least short discussion of the methodology of other applied papers is missing (my comment above in section 1).
- What do the last two columns in the Table 5 mean? They are not described...
- I do not understand the position of the Methodology chapter (2). I would expect that the methodology will follow descriptive sections like chapters 3 and 4. Then the methodology should be a chapter before the results of the interviews (chapter 5).
- Then chapter 2 is insufficiently small - just one page about the methodology of the key contributive part of the thesis. Author should describe how the respondents were chosen, regions of their origin, methodology of the related applied papers, discussion of the advantages and shortcomings of the author's approach compared to other studies, etc.
- Especially the whole process and theories behind the interviews should be discussed. Author should in details answer questions as: How did the author lead the interviews? Did the interview have a standardized structure? Is the interview based on approaches of other papers?
- The author just puts the interview questions into the appendix but she does not refer to them in the methodology section.
- Why are some answers in the table 9 in italics?

#### 4) Literature:

- The study summarizes a sufficient amount of literature except the note above in the 1) Theoretical background section.
- The bibliography style is strange for me. E.g. in the second sentence of the introduction section you put (Bohm et al, 2002, 3) and then you included full reference into the footnote. However you also insert the full reference into the Bibliography section (page 65). To have the full reference twice is really very uncommon and meaningless. There are styles where you have full reference of the web sources (like web pages) in the footnote, but then you DO NOT include them into the Bibliography section OR you do not have full references in footnotes and have all full references just in the bibliography section. The author mixes both styles which is inappropriate. It makes the work quite messy. So be more careful next time.
- In the footnotes there are also several sources which are not pure web sources. They are e.g. published reports available online or regular books – e.g. footnote 17.
- The chapters 1.2 and 1.3 about internalization are partly repeating each other. I would recommend to structure them better and shorter them.
- Author should explain why some rationales in the Table 1 are in italics. The text is unclear about that.

#### 5) Manuscript form:

- I would recommend skilled proofreading before the submission next time.
- Use dot instead of comma as a decimal point (p.18).
- Do not separate a figure or a table to two pages if not necessary and also name each graph, table etc. E.g. on page 22 there is unnamed graph where the source note is on another page...

#### 6) Other minor comments:

- Specify to which region you are referring in the first two sentences of the Introduction. 7.2 millions of students in the Europe, World?
- I do not understand the sense of the sentence on page 13: “Rationales at the national level for internationalization are Human Resources Development”. What does the term “Human Resources Development” stand for in your context?

- What is the reason for a repetition of the figure/graph of Kalvermak and van der Wende on page 61?

**DATE OF EVALUATION: 26.8.2015**



Referee Signature