

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



Rapport du mémoire de M2 Report of the Master's thesis Édition (2019—2021)

Étudiant(e)/Student :

Prénom, Nom / First Name, Family Name : **Ekaterina Mazur**
Titre du mémoire M2 / Title of the Master's thesis : **Catholic Cathedral in Europe and Representation of Heritage via Mobile Applications**

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 / Supervisor :

1. Directeur principal / Main supervisor¹ :

Prénom, Nom / First Name, Family Name : **Jaroslav Ira**
Position/Affiliation : Assistant Professor
Université/University : CUNI

2. 2eme Directeur / 2nd supervisor :

Prénom, Nom / First Name, Family Name : **Judit Klement**
Position/Affiliation : Associate Professor
Université/University : ELTE

Rapporteur / Referee :

Prénom, Nom / First Name, Family Name : **Čeněk Pýcha**
Position/Affiliation : lecturer at Institute of Information Technologies and Librarianship
Université/University : CUNI

Membres du jury / Jury members:

Mgr. Jiří Janáč, Ph.D. (chair)
Mgr. Jaroslav Ira, Ph.D.
Mgr. Ondřej Daniel, Ph.D.

¹ Le directeur principal est le responsable de l'étudiant pour min. une année./ The main supervisor is responsible for the student for at least one year. The second director, who is responsible for the student either in Semester 1 or in Semester 2. (In case of 3 mobilities: the third director is responsible for the student in Semester 3.)

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: **1 (A)**

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**

Rapport / Report (max. 4500 caractères espaces inclus/max. 4500 characters including spaces) :

Veillez indiquer votre opinion et remarques sur le mémoire M2 !/ Please, indicate your opinion on the Master's thesis !

Ekaterina Mazur came up with rather original, very interesting and highly topical theme. Digital heritage has become a burgeoning field of heritage research and practice, and as the current pandemics has revealed, very actual theme. It should be noted that the pandemic of covid-19 necessitated complete reconsideration of Ekaterina's original idea (that was based on research into Erasmus exchange students' perceptions and access to Prague cultural heritage). In spite of this challenge, Ekaterina managed to quickly adapt and reformulate the theme, complete her thesis in due time and high quality, and on top of that, incorporate the pandemics' implications for heritage field in her work.

The bulk of the thesis is logically divided into two theoretical chapters and one analytical chapter. In both theoretical chapters, based on vast range of literature, Ekaterina demonstrates remarkably broad orientation in the fields of religious heritage, and digital museology, respectively. The first one is particularly interesting, as it brings to the fore many insights and thought-provoking ideas, such as the question about what happens to the spiritual/sacral/religious dimension of heritagized and re-presented objects of religious provenience, and how this aspect can be reintroduced in the heritage presentation. Ekaterina combines discussion of specific theoretical issues with broader themes of secularization and tourism as two major challenges to religious sites. She reads the texts critically, while also with respect to her empirical example, which is cathedrals. That said, in some parts Ekaterina diverts perhaps too far from her major theme, for instance in her accounts of mass tourism or secularization. This also makes the first chapter disproportionately large in comparison to the second chapter on museums and digital technologies.

The empirical part is based on a well-chosen and justified sample of mobile applications of four touristically attractive and highly-visited cathedrals in Europe. The analysis is very systematic and rigorous, underpinned by a sophisticated analytical framework (Multimodal Cultural Analysis), borrowed from the communication studies. In this way, Ekaterina only underlines a high sense for interdisciplinarity. Although Ekaterina refrained from a comparative analysis, still the survey brings interesting insights into the variety of applications and different solutions taken. The analysis could have perhaps been augmented by a simple comparative table.

In formal terms, the thesis is well-done, with proper references, and is written in sound academic English. At some points, the line of argument is a bit hard to follow, but the text is generally well-understandable and ideas put clearly.

Based on theoretical overview, Ekaterina builds up a two-fold question/proposition that concerns accessibility and participatory dimension of religious heritage: a) mobile applications make heritage more accessible to visitors in general (enhanced experience, more interactivity, more complex information etc.) ; b) mobile applications have potential to diversify religious heritage presentation to different audiences (especially laics – believers) and, by the same token, to reintroduce religious aspect in the presentation. While the theoretical part and the analysis have shown many ways how these objectives can be pursued in the applications or where the space is for improvements, I still remain a bit unconvinced about how much the digital technology *per se* (or media aspect) makes a difference (rather than e.g. innovative content that can be put in quite traditional media, such as brochures and boards). I think that Ekaterina might ponder on this a bit more during her defense.

Questions :

Veillez indiquer vos questions à aborder lors de la soutenance !/Please, indicate your questions to be addressed to the student during the thesis defense!

What makes mobile applications as media of heritage presentation different from, say, websites on the one hand, and on-site leaflets on the other hand? Do they bring something substantially or radically new? If so, in what sense? Are there any drawbacks or new risks connected with them?

15 June 2021

Jaroslav Ira

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/ Insufficient