

**Pré-rapport du mémoire de M2**  
**Pre-report of the Master's thesis**  
Édition/Edition (2021—2023)

**Étudiant(e)/Student :**

Prénom, Nom / First Name, Family Name : Tatiana Tikhonova  
Titre du mémoire M2 / Title of the Master's thesis : Online Communication of the Hungarian National Gallery and the National Gallery Prague: The Case Study of the Two Visegrad Alliance Member Countries' National Galleries

**Mobilité / Mobility :**

*Veillez souligner les établissements !/ Please, underline the institutions !*  
Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem, Budapest (ELTE)

École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales de Paris (EHESS)

Università degli Studi di Catania (UNICT)

Univerzita Karlova, Prague (CUNI)

Université Laval, Québec (UL)

**Directeurs de recherche / Supervisors<sup>1</sup> :**

Prénom, Nom / First Name, Family Name : . Jirí Janáč  
Titre /Title : Phd  
Université/University : Univerzita Karlova, Prague (CUNI)

**Évaluation/Evaluation:**

*Veillez consulter le tableau de conversion ci-dessous !/ Please, consult the grade conversion chart below !*

Note dans l'établissement / Grade at the institution:

Note dans le 2eme établissement (ELTE) / Grade at the 2<sup>nd</sup> institution (ELTE):

(Note dans le 3eme établissement / Evaluation – grade at the 3rd institution: )

Note TEMA+ / TEMA+ grade:

**Pré-rapport / Pre-report :**

*max. 4500 caractères espaces inclus/max. 4500 characters including spaces*

---

<sup>1</sup> Le pré-rapport est écrit par le 2eme directeur (ou par le 2eme et 3eme directeurs)qui ne participe pas à la soutenance et inclut des questions à aborder lors de la soutenance./The pre-report is written by the 2nd supervisor (and in case the 3rd supervisor too), who does not personally take part in the defense and it includes questions to be addressed to the student during the thesis defense.

*Diploma thesis of Tatiana Tikbonova deals with the highly topical issue of digitization of museum collections and usage of digital data for enhancing visitor experiences. However, as she rightly points out, important part of the story is also the necessity to re-define central message of the historically developed institutions and find new ways how to communicate it. By expanding into the online space, museums and galleries have to accordingly adjust their traditional practices of knowledge dissemination and well-established forms of interaction with their audiences. Simultaneously, the audience has changed as well – from passive consumers of presented content to “pro-sumers” expecting and demanding space for participation and active role. Following in the steps of Graham Black or Nina Simon, Tatiana looks into the process of transformation of museums/galleries facing the “challenge of change.” Positioning her research within “museum online communication studies”, she asks, how entering the virtual world impacted on the communication style and strategies of museums. In order to make her analysis feasible, she narrowed down the topic geographically by selecting two mutually comparable case studies, and her choice turned out to be viable and functional on both the practical (she spent part of her studies at ELTE in Budapest and CUNI in Prague) as well as on the intellectual level (she focused on traditional “stone” institutions – national galleries - established in the context of nation building and operating in very similar – Visegrad/central European – cultural milieu).*

*Focusing on Prague National Gallery and the Budapest based Hungarian National Gallery she investigates how these institutions “went online”, which preferred strategies, goals and tools they have employed, and what kind of drawbacks and issues appeared on the way. Last but not least, she also thematizes the question to what extent both by definition “national” actors target also non-native audiences and how they position themselves in egalitarian (concerning access to audiences) and competitive online world. In order to achieve such ambitious goals, Tatiana developed a comprehensive methodology based on 1) definition of basic notions, framing of the research and delimitation of the research area (museum, audience, participation, social media, PR) and 2) on data collection and interpretation. In her “three-level” analysis of online communication she starts from design (i.e. production of the content – based on interviews and public documentation), then moves to consumption and tries to evaluate effectiveness of such efforts (analysis of online content produced by institutions) and finally deals with “user engagement” (interviews with members of audience - semi-structured interviews with international – i.e. English speaking - students of the Faculty of Humanities of Eötvös Loránd University).*

*The results of Tatiana's work can be summarized on several levels. I will focus on three of them. At the most basic level, hypotheses based on existing literature have been confirmed; the thesis clearly shows that galleries are indeed pushed by “circumstances” into a fundamental conceptual transformation in which they actively participate also by developing “digital communication strategies”. But this is a long journey that requires adapting online activities to local conditions (social, cultural and, from the institutional point of view, economic). The present work clearly demonstrates that there is a fundamental mismatch between theoretical constructs, the practical possibilities of institutions, and the needs of site-specific targeting of audiences. Here we are getting to the second perspective - concerning the central European context, we see that chosen institutions are having difficulties harmonizing the universal concept of “online and engaging” museum as “open space” with their role of “national art deposit and educator”, i.e. an instrument of local version of ethnic based nationalism. The third major result is undoubtedly the highly provocative interpretation of the disinterest in online communication with the museum on the part of the interviewed students, supported by an analysis of website traffic (although I might have some reservations concerning its representativeness).*

*To sum up - the thesis is logically structured, written in a sophisticated language and I consider it really beneficial from the point of view of the field. Therefore, I suggest a grade of excellent.*

### **Questions :**

1) Does, all in all, “going online” mark a fundamental change of functioning on the part of the analysed institutions or, in your opinion, are they simply half-heartedly joining the trend? It seems, that to a great extent they just changed the communication medium from paper to digital, and otherwise they very much continue to do the business as usual...

2) Your work seems to revolve around an implicit question – what could be the role of “national galleries” role in central European context?

3) The actual lack of interest in online content on the part of users documents a certain “deification” of this form of “communication” in contemporary discourse. However, it is questionable whether the problem is not rather with “art” as such. We learn a lot about transformation of public and museums, but very little about parallel transformation of the notion of “art” and the ways how it is created, curated and “consumed” in contemporary society. Is this context completely irrelevant for the topic of the thesis?

Date, Signature (digital)

**12/6/2023**

### **TEMA+ Grade conversion table**

ELTE (Hungarian)	EHESS (French)	UNICT (Italian)	CUNI (Czech)	UL (Canadian)	Notes TEMA+
5	16-20 (pas de 19 et 20)	30 (A, Excellent)	A	95-100 (A+, 4,33) 90-94 (A, 4,00) 85-89 (A-, 3,67)	Très bien/Excellent
4	14-15	27-29 (B, Very Good)	B	80-84 (B+, 3,33) 75-79 (B, 3,00) 70-74 (B-, 2,67)	Bien/Good
3	12-13	23-26 (C, Good)	C	66-69 (C+, 2,33) 63-65 (C, 2,00) 60-62 (C-, 1,67)	Assez bien/ Amply sufficient
2	10-11	21-22 (D, Satisfactory) 18-20 (E, Sufficient)	D, E	55-59 (D+, 1,33) 50-54 (D, 1,00)	Passable/ Satisfactory/ Almost sufficient
1	0-9	1-17 (F, FX)	F	49 et moins (E, 0,00)	Insuffisant/ Insuficient