



Ústav světových dějin

Master's Thesis Review

Student's name and surname: Anna Pestova

Title of the thesis: Uzupis (Vilnius) and Kalamaja (Tallinn): Cultural Quarters and the Post-Soviet Urban Space Transformation in Baltic States

Reviewer's name and surname: PhDr. Stanislav Tumis, M.A., Ph.D.

1. Heuristic (please, evaluate by grade 1, 2, 3, 4 – in case of grading 3 and 4 the reviewer is obliged formulate critical points)

1.1 Evaluation of the selection of literature and sources	1
1.2 Complexity of used sources from the perspective of the state of the art	1

Short evaluation: The M.A. thesis is based on the representative sample of sources which include important works of secondary literature, references to websites, internet articles, journals, newspapers etc., guidebooks, fiction, reports etc. in Lithuanian, Estonian, Russian and English languages. All these sources are supplemented with interviews with chosen inhabitants of both analysed places (Uzupis and Kalamaja). In case of interviews I miss clear formulation concerning the category of interviewed respondents and their reliability and representativeness. Even so, the extent of sources is fully sufficient and enables the author to discuss the whole topic in its complexity.

2. Research problem and its solution (please, evaluate by grade 1, 2, 3, 4 – in case of grading 3 and 4 the reviewer is obliged formulate critical points)

2.1 Choice of the formulation of the research issue respects the task given to the student	1
2.2 The relevance of the goal from the perspective of research area methodology	2



Ústav světových dějin

Short evaluation: The methodological postulates are based primarily on the theories of gentrification which are discussed in some of the introductory sub-chapters. Yet, I miss wider methodological discussion about this phenomenon which should be more elaborated. Moreover, the results of analyses should be both more interconnected with and applied to theoretical assumptions. In this way the study tends often to description than analysis.

3. Thesis' structure evaluation (please, evaluate by grade 1, 2, 3, 4 – in case of grading 3 and 4 the reviewer is obliged formulate critical points)

3.1 Is the structure of the thesis logical?	1
3.2 Does the thesis' structure work along the methodology and methods declared in the introduction	1.5

Short evaluation: The study is well structured and arranged. I miss only, as I mentioned above, more interconnection with theoretical assumptions and methodology.

.

4. Quality of analysis and interpretation (please, evaluate by grade 1, 2, 3, 4 – in case of grading 3 and 4 the reviewer is obliged formulate critical points)

4.1 Analysis of sources and literature	1
4.2 Interpretation of sources and literature in their interaction	1

Short evaluation: The arguments of author are well developed and the ideas based on different sources are convincingly discussed and well argued.



Ústav světových dějin

5. Quality of the text (please, evaluate by grade 1, 2, 3, 4 – in case of grading 3 and 4 the reviewer is obliged formulate critical points)

5.1 Style and grammar	2.5
5.2 Use of terminology	1

Short evaluation: Unfortunately, there are so many mistakes and inaccuracies in English (often simple mistakes in grammar). In case of non-native speakers, I recommend proofreading by native speaker. Terminology is used without problems.

6. Synthetic evaluation (500 signs):

Despite of all above mentioned mistakes and inaccuracies the author submitted well-argued M.A. thesis dealing with extremely interesting phenomenon which has not yet been discussed in such complexity. Her analysis and interpretation using interdisciplinary approaches has attributes of matured scientific work. I highly appreciate also her comparison of the role of both explored places, their differences and similarities. I suggest excellent grade.

7. Questions and comments which should the candidate answer and discuss during the defense:

Do you plan to develop your research and continue in this topic? Do you plan to publish the results of your work in any scientific journal?

Suggested grade: Excellent (1)

Date: 30th August 2017

nám. Jana Palacha 2, 116 38 Praha 1
IČ: 00216208
DIČ: CZ00216208

Signature:

Tel.: (+420) 221 619 203
Fax: (+420) 221 619 385

usd@ff.cuni.cz
<http://usd.ff.cuni.cz>



FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA
UNIVERZITY KARLOVY
V PRAZE



Ústav světových dějin

nám. Jana Palacha 2, 116 38 Praha 1
IČ: 00216208
DIČ: CZ00216208

Tel.: (+420) 221 619 203
Fax: (+420) 221 619 385

usd@ff.cuni.cz
<http://usd.ff.cuni.cz>