

Master Thesis Reviewer Report

Author of the thesis: Elizabeth Pellecer Rivera

Name of the thesis: Analysis of Youth Leadership and Empowerment towards Sustainable community Livelihoods: A case study in Guatemala and El Salvador

Study programme: International Development Studies

Reviewer: Mgr. Jiří Pánek, Ph.D.

1. Content of the thesis

The author focused her thesis on comparing the impact of Youth Leaders for the Pachamama program in four communities - two in Guatemala and two in El Salvador. The thesis is structured logically into five main chapters - introduction, methodology, results, discussion and conclusions.

Nevertheless the depth of the analysis is not very satisfying. I would expect to go deeper into the analysis and try to explain some of the answers better.

The author is over-positive about some of the concepts, such as participatory development (p. 10) without providing any critique to this approach (such as Botes, L., & Rensburg, D. van. (2000). Community participation in development: nine plagues and twelve commandments. Community Development Journal, 35(1)). There are also some grammatical mistakes in the thesis (p. 12, 23, 42, or 51), but the text reads well and is understandable.

I would also expect the author to critically analyse and elaborate on answers gathered from the youth leaders and other participants in the research - sometimes it seems quite naive and idealistic (the answers) - p. 31, 35, 40.

2. Referencing

Except the weak analytical part, the referencing is probably the worst part of the thesis.

There are several mistakes in the referencing system:

- 1) The introduction would deserve more sources than it currently has
- 2) Nováček 2011 is mentioned in the thesis but it is missing in the reference list
- 3) Ahorro 2008 is in the list, but not mentioned in the text
- 4) Hatten et al 2013 is on page 11 as Hatten et al 2014
- 5) On page 10, the author is citing the definition of Sustainable development without mentioning its source
- 6) In general I don't like citing at the end of the paragraph (p. 13 for example) as it is very unclear, what is cited and what is original work of the author.
- 7) The author is using formulations such as "According to some scholars..." (p. 13, 67) without stating who are these scholars.

3. Formal part of the thesis

As it was mentioned before, the text reads well, although it is a bit simple language (not really an academic text) with a few grammar issues and mistakes. The author is not using hyphens well (p. 10, 12, etc.), is inconsistent with using 1990s vs. 90s or 80s (p. 9), or mixing geographical and political terms such as Central America, Latin America or South America (p. 11, 15).

4. Questions

How exactly did the author evaluate the attitude changes? Was it only based on participants self evaluation? If so, why did you not use any toolkit such as "How do we know it's working"? Is there any similar project like the one analysed in the thesis in the Czech Republic or in general in EU?

5. Overall evaluation

The thesis is average with a few formal mistakes. It would have been much better work, if the author analyse the impacts of the project deeper with stronger methodology and more critical point of view.

I do recommend the thesis for defence and I suggest mark C.

1st august 2016