

# Review of Master work reviewer

<b>Name and Surname of Student</b>	Guillaume LE TALLEC
<b>Qualification Work Title</b>	Funding policies and funding programmes creation
<b>Name and Type of Study Programme</b>	Regional and European Project Management / Navazující
<b>Faculty / Department</b>	Ekonomická fakulta / KRM
<b>Supervisor</b>	Le Squere Roseline, Dr.
<b>Reviewer</b>	Prof. Dr. Thomas Johnen

## Thesis evaluation

1. Importance and difficulty of the topic 1.0

**Note:** The topic is highly important, as we need a lot of qualitative research on the subjective experiences students have during a mobility window during their studies.

2. Logical structure of the thesis 3.0

**Note:** The structure of the introductory part (p. 7-61) is too large in comparison to the methodological part (p. 62-66), analysis (p.66-73). The basic notions are defined, but not always in an academic manner.

3. Fulfillment of objectives 2.5

**Note:** The hypothesis could be verified, but this is not very astonishing as they were very general.

4. Methodological approach 3.0

**Note:** The chosen methodological approach is adequate, but there is no deeper reflection on qualitative research, interviews as research method, the methodology of transcription or the analysis of the results.

5. Assessment of theoretical and/or practical contribution of the thesis 3.0

**Note:** Besides some interesting details of the empirical part of the study, the theoretical and practical contribution of this thesis is relatively poor.

6. Handling of literature 4.0

**Note:** The presentation of the European Mobility Programs and the Bologna Process is based mainly on publications of the European Union. Scientific studies are rarely cited. There is no critical reflection.

7. Formal aspects 3.0

**Note:** There are a lot of grammatical mistakes (for instance infinitive instead of past participle). As in French the pronunciation of these forms often is the same, this may be seen as a lack of a rigorous revision of the text not a lack of knowledge

## Conclusion

Thesis evaluation (note): **good**

I recommend the thesis for defence: **YES**

## Questions and comments

**Critical comments and overall contributions, total value of the thesis**

The topic is highly important, as we need a lot of qualitative research on the subjective experiences students have during a mobility window during their studies in order to understand better the various factors that contribute to success or not, to personal growth or not etc. The subject is also complex as interviews had to be planned, executed, transcribed and analyzed.

The structure between the introductory part (Introduction, Definition of terms, presentation of European mobility programs; hypothesis: p. 7-61) is too large in comparison to the methodological part (p. 62-66), analysis (p.66-73). The basic notions are defined, but not always in an academic manner. The methodological framework is well chosen, but not well elaborated. The presentation of the European Mobility programs contains a lot of details which are not relevant, but doesn't explain others well (for example: ERASMUS MUNDUS). This presentation lacks a lot of critical reflection and is written more in the style of information brochures of the European Union than of an academic study.

The presentation of the European Mobility Programs and the Bologna Process is based mainly on publications of the European Union. Scientific studies are rarely cited. There is no critical reflection. The same is true for the methodological part. The citation system is mixed (Harvard and complete references in foot notes, which often aren't repeated in the bibliography. Sometimes scientific studies are mentioned, but without the bibliographical references. Not all data are up-to-date (mobility data from 2007).

Critical main points of formal aspects: There are a lot of grammatical mistakes (for instance infinitive instead of past participle). As in French the pronunciation of these forms often is the same, this may be seen as a lack of a rigorous revision of the text not a lack of knowledge. No list of abbreviations has been presented. The bibliography is incomplete and it is hardly recognizable which norms are followed.

Even if I have mentioned a lot of critical points, considering the thesis as a whole and seen the complexity of the research, I would evaluate it as "satis fecit".

### **Questions and topics for discussion before the commission**

The contextualization of the topic;

research design

analysis methods of qualitative interviews

ERASMUS MUNDUS within the European mobility programs

Date: Sep 23, 2017

Signature of reviewer