

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 (2018—2020)

Étudiant(e)/Student :

Prénom, Nom / First Name, Family Name : **Zoe Perrenoud**
Titre du mémoire M2 / Title of the Master's thesis : **Analysing contrasting representations of folklore in the Czech Republic through the lens of participatory movements of traditional music**

Mobilité / Mobility :

Veuillez 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 : **Martina Power**
Position/Affiliation : Researcher/Archivist
Université/University : CUNI / Prague City Archives

2. 2eme Directeur / 2nd supervisor :
Prénom, Nom / First Name, Family Name : **Gábor Czoch**
Position/Affiliation :
Université/University : ELTE

(3. 3eme Directeur / 3rd supervisor :)
Prénom, Nom / First Name, Family Name :
Position/Affiliation :
Université/University :

Rapporteur / Referee :

Prénom, Nom / First Name, Family Name : **Matěj Kratochvíl**
Position/Affiliation :

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.)

Université/University : Czech Academy of Sciences (Institute of Ethnology)

Membres du jury / Jury members:

Mgr. Jiří Janáč, Ph.D.

Mgr. Ondřej Daniel, Ph.D.

Mgr. Jaroslav Ira, Ph.D.

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 !

Zoe Perrenoud has chosen topic in which she is personally interested. This keen interest helped her to accomplish highly interesting and well written thesis that in my opinion not only meets but in many places surpasses the requirements for MA thesis. The thesis focuses on representation of folklore music in Czech Republic and the theme of folklore is considered from several perspectives – historical, political, cultural and social. Generally the thesis divides into two parts. First is a substantial theoretical section that demonstrates Zoe's profound knowledge of theoretical approaches within the folklore studies combined with conceptualization of (national) cultural heritage and the questions of social participation. Second is the analytical part that is largely based on the interviews with the participants of the folklore scene in Czech Republic. As in many cases the Covid 19 pandemic had impact on the realization of the practical part. However, Zoe adapted very well to the necessity of on-line communication and the completing of the thesis was not delayed nor the quality was reduced by the pandemic.

In the theoretical part, the opening question considers the illusion/paradox of the authenticity of folklore music. While keeping the traditional musical form, the official folklore representations lost its previous social function. It has been largely affected by the process of modernization, urbanization and also commodification (e.g. exploitation of the cultural heritage for profit). Folklore has also been used as an instrument of different political propaganda. It had an important place in the process of the national building in the 19th century as one of the key stones of the national identity. Equally it was celebrated during the communist era as the culture of the working class. Juxtaposition to the official representation of folklore is the participatory movement that tries to revive folklore's original social function, albeit losing something of its original form in the process.

Based in this theoretical framework, Zoe further explores the participatory movement trying to establish its relationship to the official representations of folklore that is in many ways opposing, but in some ways (especially on the personal level) interconnected. The empirical part consists of analyzing nine interviews with participants from different age groups and background answering a range of questions covering their personal journey to folklore music, their opinion on the historical/political usage of folklore, their stand on the official folklore representation or the importance of conserving the traditional forms and, perhaps most importantly, the personal gain (either cultural, social or psychological) the participatory movement provides.

The evaluation of the interviews answered the key question posed at the beginning. The participatory movement indeed assumes the original social function of folklore music by strengthening the feeling of belonging. It is perceived in different context – as a national identity (e.g. belonging to a group with same national culture) or a social identity (that is often diminished in the rather anonymous urban setting). The political (mis)use of folklore has been generally rejected but to some participants the traditional music still represents a source of cultural pride. Finally, the question of openness versus traditionality has been resolved in favour of the flexibility of musical forms. As Zoe concludes the initial concern about disappearing folklore music is not justified as long as we accept that the folklore music is not constant but permanently recreated.

As stated at the beginning, Zoe showed a widespread knowledge of theoretical concepts. The only critical assessment of her thesis could be, in my opinion, made in connection of certain unbalance between the robust theoretical part and less detailed empirical section. However, even the theoretical introduction represents research effort in itself, since it sets the case of evolution of Czech folklore music in the context of the modern folklorist approach. As for the formal side of the thesis, it has all the particularities. It is written in good English, though the academic writing could be slightly improved. Overall, Zoe has accomplished an excellent thesis that is well and coherently written and provides a good insight in the Czech folklore participatory movement and sets it into the wider context of folklore and heritage studies.

Questions :

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

At the introduction to the thesis it has been stated that there are links between the «official» performers of the folklore music and the members of the participatory movements – meaning that one musician can be member of both groups and create certain bridge between two seemingly adversary parties. This theme has not appeared in detail in the empirical part. Are there any examples of such links? What would be the opinion of such people on the authenticity, traditionality, social function etc.? In another words, are the «performative» and «participatory» groups really that adverse?

Date, Signature (digital), Stamp

2.9.2021

Martina Power

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