



University
of Pardubice
Faculty
of Arts and Philosophy

Evaluation of the revised version of the Master's Thesis of Maryia Kasiankova Bc. on "Covid-19 as a challenge for students", University of Pardubice, Faculty of Arts and Philosophy

Thesis Supervisor: Doc. PhD. Lale Yalçın-Heckmann

This report should be read as an appendix to the first evaluation from 19 May 2024. In the first report I had explained the academic background of the student, praised what she has been able to achieve, despite arriving late and having missed face to face instruction in the first year. I had also asked the candidate to revise the formal deficiencies and the structural problems of the submitted thesis. Exact suggestions and recommendations were provided for.

As it had been indicated in the first report, there were repetitive sections in the first 'theoretical part', these have been remedied. The order of sub-sections is improved and numerous problematic references (i.e. source either missing in the bibliography, citation in the bibliography and the text not matching or unclear citations in the text) have been almost all corrected. What remains is listed in the appendix.

The critical comments I had raised concerning the 'empirical part' (pp. 29-61) had sections dealing with the methodological issues, these have been now removed to the first section, which reads structurally more smoothly. The critique to the content of her methodology, concerning her narrative approach, remains. Earlier I had said "for a narrative interview style, one would have expected much more data content and richer analysis, especially interpretation of the narrative style and structure of each respondent (or at least several respondents)". In the section called 'analysis of interviews' (pp. 34-56) Kasiankova has expanded on what one can say comparatively and is comparing different respondents. Here she uses an interpretative method of the responses, which she had ordered according to the themes she classifies as important for her research. This thematic classification is helpful in pointing out the commonalities or divergences between the respondents' answers. The 'rich, in-depth insights' she promises from narrative approach (p. 11), however, do not realise in this version either; the content of citations has hardly been enriched, we do not have any additional information about the respondents (e.g. about their personalities, situation during the interview, about their socio-economic background) and no further attempt to systematically analyse the interview of one respondent for instance, for discovering inconsistencies, maybe interesting contradictions (such as in the case of respondent 10, who lost his father in covid but is unhappy about vaccination).

That Kasiankova is not drawing more analytical conclusions remains her weakness; this is either because she does not have any additional data (despite the recordings) or she misses her own observations from the time. In the previous report I had suggested various aspects which could have been explored for explaining what makes a respondent 'embrace changes' or 'remain indifferent or sceptical'. "Could it have been related to having had some – even if limited – contact in the accommodations, in families or not; could it have been related to the time of arrival in the Czech Republic, hence being too new or rather already experienced in

living abroad (for those who are non-Czech)?" Kasiankova has added a few sentences in this direction, but I do not see any strong or new conclusion from the analysis.

As indicated in the previous report, "Kasiankova refers to the 'theory of planned behaviour' which stems from psychology and involves experimental research, where attitudes, behaviour and beliefs could be observed and tested with respondents, not like in her case where the whole analytical discussion is based on the respondents' replies to the questions." Here Kasiankova has slightly changed her use of this theoretical framework and tries to address two types of behaviour and draws parallels to the experimental design of TPB; to my mind this is a partial improvement and could be seen as providing some (even if limited) theoretical framework. The limited use of the concept of 'habitus' also remains a deficiency; Kasiankova's analysis goes hardly beyond using 'habits' as 'habitus'. The problem with this interpretation has been explained in the previous evaluation.

Hence, many of the formal, stylistic and structural shortcomings of the thesis have been improved. Kasiankova has also made some effort to improve the content and data analysis. Acknowledging the progress she made from the beginning till the end and the difficulty that she had to work with three languages of research and writing (Russian, Czech and English), I evaluate Maryia Kasiankova's MA thesis work with E and recommend her to be allowed to proceed to the oral defence.

Nürnberg, 9 August 2024
Lale Yalçın-Heckmann

Lale Yalçın-Heckmann

Kasiankova – revised thesis – comments

(No page numbers, until p. 11, in the pdf version)

p. 10, last line: (?) is missing at the end of the sentence.

p. 11, line 3 from top: the word 'places' should be 'place'.

p. 11, line 14 from top: the wording 'how such shifting turned places' does not make sense.

p. 11, subsection 'Research methods', 2nd paragraph, line 4 from top: the words 'social circumstance' should be 'social circumstances'.

p. 12, line 3 from bottom: it is not correct to say 11 respondents were asked the same questions, it should be 10 respondents (all students) who were asked the questions about emotions, anxieties etc. The respondent 11 was a College Hall employee and she was primarily asked about her experiences concerning others, the students in the residential halls.

p. 14, 1st line after the sub-section 'Research reflexivity': small sample is not the only problem for representativeness or significance of findings; how this sample was chosen is not transparent. Saying 'purposeful sampling' does not really explain how the respondents were actually chosen. Most likely the respondents were chosen out of convenience and not strictly on the basis of providing variation in background and experiences. The reader has no information about the background of the respondents.

p. 16, paragraph after sub-section 'The theory of planned behaviour', line 4 from top: delete 'f' before Rusu 2021.

p. 18, line 6 from top: Kasiankova cites Bourdieu's work *Distinction* (1979) in French. If she has not read the book in French, she should have referenced the English translation 1984. If she is citing a source referencing Bourdieu, then she should say: Bourdieu 1979: 55, cited by xx... I had corrected this in the earlier version of the text, the wrong way of citing the source has not been corrected. If she has really read the book in French, then I would like to be informed about this.

Besides the correctness of citation style, it is not clear how Bourdieu's discussion of 'distinction', of social class membership and drawing borders of identity through behaviour would be relevant to her research. Will she talk about group behaviour where social class membership or social inequality would be observable?

p. 18, 2nd paragraph from top, line 7 from top: unclear where the '(' comes to an end.

p. 19, 4th paragraph from top, lines 4-5 from top: Kasiankova argues that behaviour during the pandemic might have become habits and like a habitus, but what she says about social background is unclear. If students are behaving similarly as in washing

hands etc. this does not show similar social background. Social background needs to be explored separately and then related to behaviour, only after that can one establish a possible causal link between pandemic behaviour and social background. Has she explored the social background of her respondents? Where is the discussion of this?

p. 20, entry (6th of March 2020), line 3: the word 'heath' should be 'health'.

p. 20, last entry (15th of March, 2020) at the bottom: the source is missing.

p. 22, entry (27th of February, 2021): 'crisis measures has been' should be 'crisis measures have been'.

p. 23, 3rd paragraph, line 1: the word COVI-19 should be COVID-19.

p. 23, line 9 from bottom: Kasiankova is wrong in saying that 134,000 students made the sample size of Tasso et.al. 2021. The study says that 134,000 students made the sample universe and sample size was 257 students!

p. 24, subtitle 2.5.1.: 'pandemics' should be 'pandemic'.

p. 25, 3rd paragraph, lines 3-4 from top: 'Shrier (2021: 66)' should be '(Shrier 2021: 66)'.

p. 28, line 2 from top: The results of Horalek et.al.'s study are not shown in 'bullet points'.

p. 32, 5th paragraph from top: delete the paragraph about Dodd et.al. (2021), as it is not about the CZ situation and there has been already enough coverage of the other studies and it disrupts the flow of argument. Same applies to the paragraph and citation from Dodd et.al. (2021) in the middle of the page 33. Redundant, should be deleted.

p. 33, line 3 from bottom: the word 'touch' should be 'contact'.

p. 35, lines 2-3 from the citation from Participant 8: The sentence stating with 'Anyone who was...' and the sentence 'Would know ...' should be one sentence together, no dot in between.

p. 42, citation from Participant 4: the citation starts with a ", but the final " is not there. Hence the end of citation is not marked.

p. 43, citation from Participant 4: 'sending supportive emails' probably should be 'receiving supportive emails', since this is repeated below; it is about what the university did. Check and change.

p. 44, line 2 from bottom: the word 'changed' should be 'changes'.

p. 46, citation from Participant 2: The citation has to end with ". The sign " has moved to the beginning of the next sentence. Delete from there.