



Master's Thesis Evaluation Form

Student's name: Harshvardhan
Thesis title: Political Communication during COVID-19 in India: Study of Public Support
Name of the supervisor: Mgr. Anna Shavit, PhD.
Name of the opponent: Ing. Mgr. Jiří Remr, Ph.D.

What are the strengths and weaknesses of the thesis? Please give your reasons for the suggested grade in detail below.

- 1. Does the author show understanding of one or more theories, and use theory to generate a hypothesis or to make the problem area more understandable?*
Unpersuasive; the author tries to take the perspective of Easton's dimensions of public support however, its relevance is not clearly declared. It is not obvious that the hypotheses are derived from such theory, and that the findings support the original claims.
- 2. Is the research question articulated clearly and properly? Is the research question sufficiently answered in the Conclusion?*
No; research questions presented on p. 11 are too vague to be measured; as such, they are not operationalized. Relevance of the indicators used is not explained. The author uses the terms that are not defined, e.g., "new media technology" or "background of the respondents". Key decisions concerning the design of the study are not declared, e.g., why the political communication is narrowed just to the new media?
- 3. Is the thesis based on relevant research and literature and does it accurately summarize and integrate the information?*
Yes; the author has used an adequate number of sources: he cites a total of 50 book, journal, and internet sources. However, literature review is not truly indicating the knowledge gap.
- 4. What is the quality of the data or the other sources? Is the sampling method, data collection and data analysis appropriate?*
Poor; crucial information describing the way of research conduct is completely missing. Moreover, presented numbers are weird – what is "total sum of each question"?
- 5. Are the findings relevant to the research question? Are the conclusions of the thesis based on strong arguments?*
No; in the text there are too many axiomatic claims (especially in introductory section). Moreover, there is a mismatch between the research questions and conclusions.



6. *Are the author's thoughts distinguished unambiguously from the borrowed ideas?*
Yes; the author separated his own interpretations from the findings. He also distinguished his own ideas from those that were taken from literature and other external sources.
7. *Is the thesis containing original/innovative research (in terms of topic, approach, and/or findings)?*
Cannot be recognized.
8. *What is the quality of style and other formal requirements?*
Adequate; the author applied the citation rules correctly in most cases. However, there are some mistakes in referencing – e.g., Easton, 1975 (page 7) vs. Easton, 1965 (p. 11), if the reference is not completely missing (as it is the case on p. 9). Moreover, some sentences are not understandable (not even in the abstract); there are also some unfinished sentences. Identical information is presented in both, tables, and graphs; content of the tables is not explained, nor sufficiently interpreted.
9. *Are there any other strengths and weaknesses of the thesis, which are not included in the previous questions?*
Yes, however all weaknesses cannot be listed here.
10. *What topic do you suggest for the discussion in the thesis defense?*
 - a) Are the differences between respondents with psychological and journalism backgrounds statistically significant?
 - b) What was the response rate? What method of data collection was used? What are the descriptive characteristics of the sample, especially in terms of gender, age, place of residence, length of occupation, left-right orientation, and media consumption?

Overall assessment of the thesis:

Despite the critical remarks that the submission deserves, I would like to give the author a chance to defend his work. Therefore, I recommend it for a defense.

Proposed grade (*A-B: excellent, C-D: very good, E: good, F: fail*):

E-good

Date: 09. 09. 2021

Signature: Jiří Remr