

Review of: "An experience of global higher education and university autonomy in Viet Nam: A case study of Ton Duc Thang University in Ho Chi Minh City"

Jafred Muyaka¹

¹ University of Eldoret

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Review of: An experience of global higher education and university autonomy in Viet Nam: A case study of Ton Duc Thang University in Ho Chi Minh City.

Dear Author,

Thank you for your contribution to the field of higher education and particularly internationalization of higher education. My overall view is that the research article is an interesting reflection on the level of internationalization in Viet Nam using Ton Duc Thang University as a case study. This is of interest to international readers who would want to draw parallel comparisons with other regions and nations.

However, the following suggestions are given to improve the general technical content and flow.

- On the Title and generally the overall read, the authors engage with internationalization of higher education. The use of global higher education as a synonymous to internationalization of higher education is not clear. The two are concepts that are not the same. The relationship should either be drawn or consider internationalization of higher education as the title. Furthermore, the concept of university autonomy has not been investigated in the entire article other than a mention that TDTU is autonomous. The reader's expectation was reading about how internationalization has advanced autonomy of TDTU. If no data on university autonomy was collected, analyzed and reported, it will make sense for the authors to consider dropping autonomy in the title.
- The authors engage and report on components of internationalization of higher education without evidence (collaborations, partnerships, students and staff diversity etc). For instance, it is the quality of collaborations and partnerships that should highlight internationalization of Vietnam Higher Education, yet the authors only give us the figure of the number of relations and international conferences that have been organized as an indication of internationalization. It would make more sense to examine the worth of these relations in advancing the Viet- Nam or TDTU internationalization agenda. The authors assert that TDTU has 'a more international outlook in comparison with other university campuses in Vietnam'. However, the write up does not provide any evidence for this. Is it possible to examine the proportion of international staff/students of TDTU in reference to other universities so that readers can appreciate that indeed the University is more internationalized than others. On conferences, the question will be what makes a conference international? How many international researchers attended or presented papers, how many of

these papers were published in reputable international journals to help in visibility etc.

- On collaborations, consider a robust discussion on the outbound and inbound mobility for staff and students to help contextualize internationalization at home (IoH) as a key components of internationalization of higher education. In the discussion section, the authors attempt to allude to IoH. However, the reader is lost given that no data is provided on outbound and inbound mobility ratios yet in the discussion the authors conclude IoH is neglected. This conclusion would only make sense with some data in the results section.
- How are the 'salary, living conditions and research facilities for foreign-born academic staff' a challenge to internationalization of Vietnam Higher Education? This is not clear, it is not clearly indicated whether low salary or poor living conditions and evidence to that effect could help tie up these loose ends.
- I suggest some level of re-organization of the paper to help in the flow. For instance, why not handle motivations of international staff moving to Vietnam, then opportunities/prospects of internationalization of TDTU and then challenges facing TDTU on internationalization agenda etc. This would help address the mix up in the presentation.
- A very good attempt is made to present results of TDTU. However, methodology for this paper is not discussed for the reader to appreciate the strengths and weaknesses as is the case for such a good work. It would make sense to have a paragraph or so to discuss the approach.
- Could rethink on the citations particularly those of websites or URLs. Could consider footnotes to avoid breaking the flow. Table 1 and 2, I would have preferred a proportion/percentages rather than numbers. In internationalization literature we know proportion of international staff/students of over 10% is deemed appropriate. Therefore, proportions will help us make a judgment on the level of student and staff diversity in TDTU.
- We also know that presence of international staff and students including numbers of collaborations in itself does not advance internationalization. It is in the utilization of the diversity that inculcates the much needed multicultural skills under such environment. Unfortunately, the paper seems not to re-examine the utilization of internationalization components at TDTU. This would make the work more thrilling.

Discussion section

- This section in principle seems to be an extension of results section which should not be the case. I suggest that the authors stick to situating their results findings to the larger literature on internationalization of higher education. Do the findings relate to known trends in the region and globally? If not, any reasons.