

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

Étudiant(e)/Student :

Prénom, Nom / First Name, Family Name : Fernanda Schröter Freitas
Titre du mémoire M2 / Title of the Master's thesis : *The Impact of Google Maps' Reviews and Algorithms on Erasmus Students' Choices of Museums to Visit in Prague*

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 / Supervisors¹ :

Prénom, Nom / First Name, Family Name : Judit Klement
Titre /Title : PhD, associate professor
Université/University : Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem, Budapest (ELTE)
Atelier Department for Interdisciplinary History

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 2nd institution (ELTE): 5

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

Note TEMA+ / TEMA+ grade: Excellent

Pré-rapport / Pre-report :

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

¹ 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.

TEMA+ Secretariat :
ELTE BTK Atelier
1088 Budapest
Múzeum krt. 6-8.
Phone/fax: + 36 1 485 52 08
<http://www.mastertema.eu>
secretary@mastertema.eu

The central problematic of the thesis is a well-established and relevant scientific question: the impact of Google Maps reviews on cultural institutions, because “the cultural sector still overlooks this powerful resource” (11).

In the short “Introduction” chapter (1) the author explained her aims and scopes in an informative way, as well as the structure of the thesis, which was clear and goal-oriented. The latter is also generally true for the thesis: the author knows what she is looking for, and the thesis consistently moves towards answering the questions posed. I really appreciated the detailed presentation of the development of Google Maps and the way how the author used the mechanisms of social media (datafication, commodification, selection) for explaining the impact of Google Maps. I was also convinced with the proposed theoretical frameworks of “platform society” and the concept of “e-WOM”, the power of storytelling. The conclusions of chapter 2 gave a solid basis for chapter 3, which focused more precisely on the “consequences of Google Maps” on European cultural institutions and identity. It was impressive to read also about the latest European regulations related to the digital world. The author emphasised convincingly the relevance of her research on cultural institutions and on the perspective of the review readers.

I can only compliment the presentation of the research proposal and the methodology. Choosing participants of an Erasmus course (Erasmus program is crucial point regarding the European integration and identity) and combining questionnaire and interviews were logical and good decisions. I would have liked to read the questionnaire in appendix, but unfortunately, this part of the thesis missed from my copy. The author went consciously through the possible methodological questions and ended up to the results of the research in chapter 4. My only concern was the low number of cases of the survey (20 students) and the interviews (5 students) but the way and the concept of the research was excellent. Reading the deep analysis, by the way, I was convinced by this research. Just as a suggestion, if you have so low number of cases, you should always mention the case numbers, not only the percentage. Finally, in chapter 5, I really appreciated the way how the author consistently compared her results with the findings of literature. (To be honest, the final summary of chapter 6 already felt somewhat redundant.)

I think, this research made an important message for all heritage institutions: they are measured by Google and other reviews and these opinions have real effect on their future visitors, and “if technology influences the museums people visit, it could impact the EU” (12.)

Questions :

What do you think what can be done for making people more aware of the impact of Google Maps and social media platforms?

What do you think how the museums can use your results in their online presence?



Budapest, 15 June 2023
Date, Signature (digital)

Judit Klement

TEMA+ Secretariat :
 ELTE BTK Atelier
 1088 Budapest
 Múzeum krt. 6-8.
 Phone/fax: + 36 1 485 52 08
<http://www.mastertema.eu>
 secretary@mastertema.eu

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