

CHARLES UNIVERSITY – FACULTY OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

REVIEW OF THE DIPLOMA THESIS BY ASSESSOR

Author of the thesis	<i>Monserrat Sanchez Martinez</i>
Title of the thesis	<i>Educational implications of the multi-age school in rural Mexico: the case of an elementary school</i>
Author of the review	<i>PhDr. Ondrej Papajoanu, Ph.D.</i>

	Evaluation criteria	Evaluation 1 – 10 points *)
1.	Formulation of objectives (objectives are clearly formulated and in compliance with the type and nature of the thesis).	7
2.	Means to achieve goals (methods are appropriate to goals and other parameters of the thesis).	7
3.	Writing process (process of writing of the thesis corresponds to chosen goals and methods, the text is clearly and logically structured).	7
4.	Fulfillment of objectives (objectives of the thesis are met to the reasonable extent and at a level that corresponds to the nature of the work).	7
5.	Knowledge of the author regarding discussed issues (the work reflects the knowledge of relevant sources and literature).	8
6.	Originality of writing (the thesis has elements that prove creative interest of the author and his/her independent thinking regarding the issue).	8
7.	Content (the choice of content elements of the thesis is relevant, their interrelations are expressed, context and content make a logical whole).	6
8.	Language quality (the level of orthographic and stylistic quality meets the requirements of the diploma thesis, used terminology is correct and unified).	6
9.	Work with information sources, compliance with formal rules (sources in reasonable quantities are appropriately selected and correctly cited and interpreted; the thesis is properly laid out and in compliance with relevant standards).	6
10.	Thesis contribution (outcomes of the thesis can find a specific meaningful application in theory or practice of the field).	7

*) 1 point expresses the lowest possible level of fulfillment of the relevant criteria, 10 points the highest possible level

Questions for the defence	<p>(1) <i>The author states that the main objective of the study is to identify elements that intervene in the educational process of the multi-age schools in rural Mexico. The author also states that many documents describe the causes of problems faced by multi-age schools (p. 14) and lists many problems of multi-age schools in rural Mexico already at pages 18 to 20. Thus, it is not clear what exactly the research gap is (though the attempt was made at page 8) and how the author addresses this gap or how the author elaborates on the previous findings - this could be more clearly stated. The author should elaborate on it more during her defence.</i></p> <p>(2) <i>During the data collection, the researcher was not physically present in the target school. The interview was conducted through a videocall and observations were conducted using video recordings made by another person. The author also mentions it herself as a potential limitation of the study. How could this approach influence the findings of the study?</i></p>
---------------------------	---

Comments	
	<p><i>The thesis deals with an interesting topic of multi-age schools in rural Mexico and the challenges they face. The author reviews the current educational legislation in Mexico and the literature concerning multi-age schools. Despite a considerable number of sources, it is sometimes not clear where the information in the text is taken from (e.g. current problems of multi-age schools in Mexico at p. 18-20). Also, though the text is very comprehensive in scope, it suffers from typos and the sentences are sometimes hard to understand. Further, the structuring of the text is sometimes not clear, which makes reading complicated. A clearer hierarchy of titles and clearer indication of how different text passages relate to each other would be helpful. Concerning the research study itself, the author conducted interview (through videocall) with the teacher at one rural multi-age school in Mexico and analyzed videorecordings of six 50min sessions. The absence of the researcher, who could not attend the school personally, is mentioned as a potential limitations of the study, but recommendations for future research are provided, which is good. Overall, the thesis displays the personal involvement and interest of the author in the topic.</i></p>

Overall evaluation **)	<i>The thesis meets the requirements for diploma theses in the field.</i>
-------------------------------	--

Date and signature of the author of the diploma thesis review:

PhDr. Ondrej Papajoanu, Ph.D.

2nd September 2022