



Posudek bakalářské diplomové práce

Autor práce: Monika Kočovská

Název práce: Samul nori: An invented tradition?

Vedoucí práce: Andreas Schirmer

Hodnotící kritéria:	Známka:
Objectives and results	B
<p>The purpose of this thesis is evident from the title. In her conclusion, the author claims that she “traced the invention of samul nori through the rise of the Korean group that started it, analyzing the strategies the group employed to transform museumworthy music into something that was both contemporary and historically authentic”. But rather than really “analyzing” the strategies, the author offers assessments of those strategies that seem to be based on literature. On the one hand, this is ultimately fine, as demanding a full-fledged analysis from a BA-thesis might be unreasonable. It is not unreasonable, on the other hand, to demand sources for those assessments – in the relevant part (p. 28–29), however, the author fails to give sources except for one at the very end (while she otherwise takes care to back up her talk with sources all the time). The main results in the more narrow sense (i.e. in the sense of the research question) are actually presented in on p. 30–33, where the author discusses views on samul nori as an invented tradition (or not).</p>	
Structure, method(s), and argumentation	B
<p>Overall, I regard this thesis as clearly structured. The methods are mostly intuitive but appropriate. The use of “analysis” as a term strikes me as misleading; after all, what is done is mostly descriptive (which is fine). However, reasonable. The concept of „invented tradition is sufficiently laid out. To establish her ground, the author devotes some effort to matters of definition: tradition, invention, and invented tradition(s). As for invention, the discussion leads somewhat astray. The section that leads us into the very center, that on invented traditions (12–15), is well done. Likewise, the authors gains more ground in her discussion of the “origins” of Korean music but the long section on p’ansori does not seem to prelude the subject, by contrast to the other sections of this part that indeed provide a foundation. The following chapter on the instruments, the beginnings, the founders, and the music of the band SamulNori are mostly descriptive. To the discussion whether samul nori is invented tradition or not we only get very late and in relatively short section (30–33). To do her justice, we need to factor in that the author provides puzzle pieces to that discussion also outside of this chapter.</p>	
Language and style	B
<p>Language is largely good and the author usually gets her points across, but with sometimes annoying imperfections. This concerns mistypes, graphical errors, missing articles, slightly wrong sentence constructions, and other mistakes</p>	
Formal requirements, academic literature, bibliography	B

This thesis follows a rather idiosyncratic style despite the supervisor's wish that she follows the Chicago manual of style (opting for author-date). However, the author remained consistent at least, and this is what matters. Mostly, this thesis looks neat and orderly and I do not see very much to be desired. On p. 17, a stand-alone quotation remains without a reference. One big mistake and misconception spoils the picture, however, as the author does not quote chapters in edited volumes by their authors but by the name of the editor (and even reduces four editors to one). A full book chapter by Keith Howard is thus referenced various times without featuring even in the bibliography. Overall, the author considers certainly enough academic literature for a BA-thesis.

Proposed overall assessment

B

Témata pro obhajobu, připomínky a doplňující otázky:

Topics for defense, comments, and supplementary questions:

1. Are Koreans more keen on heritage preservation than many others?
Are invented traditions more of an issue than elsewhere?