Thesis reader review

Author´s name: Jorge Eugene Sulwey

Title: Development of Party Ideology: Analysing the Czech Pirate Party's Program and Manifesto Changes Since its Inclusion in the Czech Political System

In his master´s theses, Jorge Eugene Sulwey aims to „identify the most frequently mentioned issues in [Pirate] party manifestos, to compare the issue focus of the party programs and manifestos at different intervals, and to analyze the evolution of party priorities over time" (p. 5). In particular, the student asks following research question: has [there] been an evolution to the party's program and manifesto and what kind of evolution since its formation has there been? (p. 25). First the author introduces the reader into the theories (Party programmes, Party Manifestos, Political System of the Czech Republic(?), Pirate Parties(?) Digital Parties(?) Niche Parties(?)) that frame his thesis. Then he discusses the methodology (and methods) and data applied/analysed. In the analytical part, the author first presents Pirate party history and the background regarding its (political) programmes, later he provides the reader with detailed analysis of the electoral programmes from the years 2013, 2017, 2021. Finally the author concludes with summary and a brief discussion.

The author states that "there is a lack of comprehensive studies analyzing how party policy priorities evolve across different electoral periods" (p. 5) which should be understood as a rationale/significance for the focus of the thesis. In relation to theory, this justification makes sense as well as a promise of important reading. However, there are some problems, that question the goals of the thesis. While the analysis is a strong part of the thesis, theoretical framework is less strong, in fact bit confusing. As mentioned above, within a theoretical framework the author includes a lot of "theories". This is problematic, as the author gives some information on each of them, but not critically discussing them in relation to the research question. Thus, the chapter is more of a basic and unstructured overview of various theories that might be related to the problem the author studies rather than a framework for studying the phenomenon. I guess this also contributes to weaker description/discussion of the methodology. First the author also discuss "theory" within a Methodology chapter, so the reader is bit confused, what is the relation of "first" and "second" part of the theory as well as that both chapters (theory and methodology) also provides a lot of information on context (such as e.g. Political System of the Czech Republic). These information should be part of an individual chapter. Although the author states that he is using content analysis, he also adds other methods and data, while these are not discussed in detail. The reader does not know how these data contribute to the overall findings based on what method of analysis. There is also one problem related to the methodology. Most of the findings are of a quantitative nature, e.g. the word bubbles, but there is no justification (in the methodology part) why to use them and what kind of the information it bring. In other words we don't know how the author conducted the analysis. If the analysis is more of a quantitative nature, I suggest to use more graphs, tables (e.g. for presenting the topics), it would be easier for the reader to read it. Nonetheless, I find the analytical part persuasive as well as the findings the author provides.

To sum it up, I am convinced that the thesis surpasses the usual standards set by Faculty of Arts of the Czech Republic for master theses. If defended persuasively I recommend a grade C.

Date: Signature: