CHARLES UNIVERSITY
Faculty of Social Sciences
Institute of Communication Studies and Journalism

MA THESIS REVIEW

NOTE: Only the grey fields should be filled out!

Review type (choose one):
~~Review by thesis supervisor~~   Review by opponent

Thesis author:
Surname and given name: Machado Raupp, Eric
Thesis title: From bricks to pixels and memory: An Instagram-ic multimodal analysis of the meanings upheld in the journalistic commemoration of the fall of the Berlin Wall
Reviewer:
Surname and given name: Silverio, Robert

Affiliation: FSV UK

1. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RESEARCH PROPOSAL AND THESIS (mark one box for each row)

		Conforms to approved research proposal	Changes are well explained and appropriate	Changes are explained but are inappropriate	Changes are not explained and are inappropriate	Does not conform to approved research proposal
1.1	Research objective(s)	X				
1.2	Methodology	X				
1.3	Thesis structure	X				

COMMENTARY (description of the relationship between the research proposal and the thesis. If there are problems, please be specific):

2. EVALUATION OF THE THESIS CONTENT
Use letters A – B – C – D – E – F (A=best, F= failed)

		Grade
2.1	Quality and appropriateness of the theoretical framework	A
2.2	Ability to critically evaluate and apply the literature	A
2.3	Quality and soundness of the empirical research	A
2.4	Ability to select the appropriate methods and to use them correctly	A
2.5	Quality of the conclusion	A
2.6	Thesis originality and its contribution to academic knowledge production	B

COMMENTARY (description of thesis content and the main problems):
The theme is highly interesting even though the evaluation of the changed perspective on the Fall of the Berlin Wall through Instagram is, of course, limited. The author is, however, aware of these limits.

3. EVALUATION OF THE THESIS FORM
Use letters A – B – C – D – E – F (A=best, F= failed)

		Grade
3.1	Quality of the structure	B
3.2	Quality of the argumentation	A
3.3	Appropriate use of academic terminology	A
3.4	Quality, quantity and appropriateness of the citations (both in the theory part and in the empirical part)	A
3.5	Conformity to quotation standards (*)	A
3.6	Use of an academic writing style, and correct use of language (both grammar and spelling)	A
3.6	Quality of the textual lay-outing and appendices	A

(*) in case the text contains quotations without references, the grade is F; in case the text contains plagiarised parts, do not recommend the thesis for defence and suggest disciplinary action against the author instead.

COMMENTARY (description of thesis form and the main problems):

4. OVERAL EVALUATION (provide a summarizing list of the thesis's strengths and weaknesses):

> The thesis is of a high quality. My only serious objection is that the author posed only one research question. Research Question: "What meanings sustaining collective memory about the Berlin Wall are referred to and upheld in the commemoration of the 30th anniversary of the Fall on Instagram?" (p30). I believe it is a shortcoming because the author has to - and successfully does - answer more of them in the end. If the research question were broken into several subquestions and connected hypotheses, the structure would be more precise and more reader-friendly. Having said that, I do not imply that the text is chaotic - far from that.
> I appreciate the media selection, the methodology, and mostly how individual Instagram posts are analyzed. It was important that the author included Al Jazeera and Folha de São Paulo, avoiding thus a strictly Europocentric perspective. I also appreciate that the author included RT, though I believe that the fact that it is not a traditional news outlet but a propagandist tool should have been stressed a bit more.
> The photographs are well analyzed, although more thematically than aesthetically. (Some of them are - although I am not sure what "This picture assumes an aesthetic role following Instagram's visual grammar." p44 means.) More attention might have been given to the provenience of the photographs.
> These partial objections do not want to put in doubt the overall high quality of the text.

5. QUESTIONS OR TOPICS TO BE DISCUSSED DURING THE THESIS DEFENSE:

5.1	My only question is connected to my objection in the evaluation above. In retrospection, do you think it would have been helpful to break down research questions into subquestions and hypotheses?
5.2	
5.3	
5.4	

6. ANTIPLAGIARISM CHECK

The reviewer is familiar with the thesis' score in plagiarism analysis in SIS.

If the score is above 5%, please evaluate and indicate problems:

6.1	

7. SUGGESTED GRADE OF THE THESIS AS A WHOLE (choose one or two)
A

If the mark is an "F", please provide your reasons for not recommending the thesis for defence:

Date: 4.9.2023   Signature: Robert Silverio…………………………..