

IMESS DISSERTATION

Note: Please email the completed mark sheet to Year 2 coordinator (cc Chiara Amini chiara.amini@ucl.ac.uk and fiona.rushworth@ucl.ac.uk)

Please note that IMESS students are not required to use a particular set of methods (e.g. qualitative, quantitative, or comparative) in their dissertation.

Student:	Jordan Marcella
Dissertation title:	Presenting Prague: Visions of a City through Western Guidebooks

	70+	69-65	60-61	59-55	54-50	<50
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Knowledge <i>Knowledge of problems involved, e.g. historical and social context, specialist literature on the topic. Evidence of capacity to gather information through a wide and appropriate range of reading, and to digest and process knowledge.</i>	71					
Analysis & Interpretation <i>Demonstrates a clear grasp of concepts. Application of appropriate methodology and understanding; willingness to apply an independent approach or interpretation recognition of alternative interpretations; Use of precise terminology and avoidance of ambiguity; avoidance of excessive generalisations or gross oversimplifications.</i>		68				
Structure & Argument <i>Demonstrates ability to structure work with clarity, relevance and coherence. Ability to argue a case; clear evidence of analysis and logical thought; recognition of an argument's limitation or alternative views; Ability to use other evidence to support arguments and structure appropriately.</i>	70					
Presentation & Documentation <i>Accurate and consistently presented footnotes and bibliographic references; accuracy of grammar and spelling; correct and clear presentation of charts/graphs/tables or other data. Appropriate and correct referencing throughout. Correct and contextually correct handling of quotations.</i>	70					
Methodology <i>Understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research.</i>	69					

ECTS Mark:	70/A	Charles Mark:	A	Marker:	Jiří Vykoukal
<i>Deducted for late submission:</i>			No	Signed:	
<i>Deducted for inadequate referencing:</i>			No	Date:	6 September 2022

MARKING GUIDELINES

A (UCL mark 70+) = A (Charles mark 91-100 - excellent): Note: marks of over 80 are given rarely and only for truly exceptional pieces of work.

Distinctively sophisticated and focused analysis, critical use of sources and insightful interpretation. Comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research.

B (UCL mark 69-65) = B (Charles mark 81-90 – very good)

C (UCL mark 64-60) = C (Charles mark 71-80 – good): A high level of analysis, critical use of sources and insightful interpretation. Good understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research. 65 or over equates to a B grade.

D (UCL mark 59-55) = D (Charles mark 61-70 – satisfactory)

E (UCL mark 54-50) = E (Charles mark 51-60 – sufficient):

Demonstration of a critical use of sources and ability to engage in systematic inquiry. An ability to engage in sustained research work, demonstrating methodological awareness. 55 or over equates to a D grade.

F (UCL mark less than 50) = F (Charles mark 0-50 - insufficient):

Demonstrates failure to use sources and an inadequate ability to engage in systematic inquiry. Inadequate evidence of ability to engage in sustained research work and poor understanding of appropriate research techniques.

Please provide substantive and detailed feedback!

Comments, explaining strengths and weaknesses (at least 300 words):

Focus of Jordan's paper is on the process of changes of the image of Prague in Western (means Anglo-Saxon) guidebooks since 1990s. It confronts changes of the image of Prague in the main sections of guidebooks which are introductions, history chapters, and recommendation chapters. The main sources are represented by six guidebooks published between 1994 to 2019. Analysis of the sources is supposed to rely on an empirically based discourse analysis of the written part of the guidebook.

The structure of the work is clear, and the text is smoothly going to the conclusion even if in some parts of the text the analytical approach is replaced by a sort of a commenting style. The analysis is typical more of the selection of topics and themes than on systematic discourse work. There could be some more systematic and comparative analysis of affinities and differences of how the given guidebooks were expressing certain things or commenting on them. On the other hand, there are good points like observations on differences between guidebooks written by Czech and foreign authors. Although the focus is on the written text, Jordan provides some pictorial arguments, however, does not elaborate very much on them.

Conclusions are adequate – in general, guidebooks show the improving and changing image of Prague and contribute probably (the issue of interaction between quality of guidebooks and the level of tourist's interest) first to the stable interest in visiting Prague, secondly and probably in the changing structure of people who are visiting Prague.

The main critical remarks: more systematic and comparative approach would be fine to make partial and final conclusions more convincing.

Specific questions you would like addressing at the oral defence (at least 2 questions):

Questions:

1. How much is the quality of guidebooks influenced by their sources and which sources are used mostly?
2. Is there a difference between "stereotypization" of Prague in particular guidebooks or do guidebooks use stereotypization as the main method?
3. Is it possible to comment on how particular guidebooks deal with the textual proportion between Prague and other regions out of Prague?