

Name of the student:	Paulina Frank
Title of the thesis:	Exploring the Evolution of Media Representations-An Analysis of Russia-German Aussiedler in the German Print Media Surrounding the Ukraine war of 2022
Reviewer:	Toni Rodon

1. KNOWLEDGE AND CONNECTION TO THE FIELD

(relevance of the research question, research objective, literature review):

The MA dissertation studies the changes in the media discourse of Russian German before and after Russia invaded Crimea and started the war in Ukraine. The topic of how external events influence internal dynamics has been gaining traction in the literature in political science and this dissertation can be situated as part of these efforts. Furthermore, the topic is still in line of current political and international events.

The literature review is thorough and most relevant works are cited. There are however to parts that could be improved. First, the theory could have developed a bit more the logics behind social identity theory, which is only cited indirectly in the text. Second, the dissertation could have developed a bit more the mechanism through which the media acts in this way after the conflicts in Russia (is it because of the structure of the media? the type of readership? Is it maybe an unintended consequence of the political dynamics triggered by the events?)

2. ANALYSIS

(methodology, argument, theoretical backing, appropriate work with sources):

The methodology is correct and well-explained. It is based on a qualitative exercise of more than 100 articles. This implies an important effort and a contribution. The analysis is mainly descriptive, and the reader often misses, given the qualitative nature of the dissertation, a few illustrative cases of the dynamics being described. In other words, the results section is a bit short.

3. CONCLUSIONS

(persuasiveness, link between data and conclusions, achievement of research objectives):

Conclusions are persuasive and the MA dissertation does a good job in linking the research objective and the analysis. The link between the data and conclusions is also good, although in some passages the interpretation of the empirical descriptive patterns goes a bit too far, given that differences highlighted are only based on a descriptive exercise.

4. FORMAL ASPECTS AND LANGUAGE

(appropriate language, adherence to academic standards, citation style, layout):

The formal aspects of the MA dissertation are correct. Some aspects could have been improved, a) the length of the introduction, b) in some instances the text is a bit dense or unstructured. For instance, pages 6 and 7 do not have any paragraph break. C) there are some formal inaccuracies on how the hypotheses are formulated ('I predict') and some of the hypotheses are encapsulated on others. d) an additional graph having a comparison between the results on Crimea and Ukraine would have helped the reader in seeing the differences between the two.

5. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT

(strong and weak point of the dissertation, other issues)

This is a good MA dissertation that examines a relevant topic, both in academic and political terms. In addition, there is an important effort in the empirical part, in which an important number of texts have been processed, coded, and analysed.

The weakest part of the dissertation are its theoretical discussion, which is a bit unstructured and in which the mechanisms are not entirely developed, and its analysis section, which is rather short, especially given that all the material would have allowed to dig deeper in the story.

Grade (A-F)	A (ben grade 9.25)
Date	Signature
DD/MM/AAAA	

Classification scheme

Percentile	Prague		Krakow		Leiden		Barcelona	
	91-100 %	8,5%	5	6,7%	8,5-10	5,3%	9-10	5,5 %
B (81-90)	81-90 %	16,3%	4,5	11,7%	7,5-8,4	16,4%	8-8,9	11,0 %
C (71-80)	71-80 %	16,3%	4	20%	6,5-7,4	36,2%	7-7,9	18,4 %
D (61-70)	61-70 %	24%	3,5	28,3%			6-6,9	35,2 %
E (51-60)	51-60 %	34,9%	3	33,4 %	6-6,4	42,1 %	5-5,9	30,1 %

Assessment criteria:

Excellent (A): 'Outstanding performance with only minor errors';
 Very good (B): 'Above the average standard but with some errors';
 Good (C): 'Generally sound work but with a number of notable errors';
 Satisfactory (D): 'Fair but with significant shortcomings';
 Sufficient (E): 'Performance meets the minimum criteria';
 Fail: 'Some/considerable more work required before the credit can be awarded'.

