

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:	Michelle Angert
Dissertation title:	The disparity between de jure and de facto experiences of Romani women in the Czech Republic: An intersectional analysis

	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>	A					
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>		B				
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>		B				
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>	A					
Methodology <i>Understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research.</i>		B				

ECTS Mark:	B/68	Charles Mark:	B/88	Marker:	Maria Alina Asavei
<i>Deducted for late submission:</i>			No	Signed:	
<i>Deducted for inadequate referencing:</i>			No	Date:	14.06.2021

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 re-

search, 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):

Strengths

Michelle Angert's MA thesis engages with an under researched topic, attempting to address a lacuna both in Romani Studies and Gender Studies (namely the multifarious injustices endured by the Romani women in the Czech Republic through the lens of the intersectional theory and methods. The dissertation explores the pervasive Romaphobia with a focus on the Romani women double, or even triple jeopardy. More specifically, Michelle explores the discrepancies between the *de jure* legislation from both the European Union and the Czech Republic and the *de facto* infringements of rights and injustices Romani women are subjected to in the Czech Republic. The argument is clearly, analytically and consistently developed and the theoretical back-up is well suited and presented to support the main argument. The literature survey is solid as it engages both with the scholarship on the Roma in the Czech Republic and Romani feminism in general. The dissertation has a clear progression of ideas and Michelle made some good use of topic sentences, transitions and keyword 'signposts' to move the points of her writing forward. Her writing is coherent, and the structure of the dissertation allows for the smooth flow of the text. For a MA dissertation, Michelle Angert's research has made relevant and insightful steps in opening the ground for further studies on Romani women's status and position in the Czech Republic *vis a vis* the EU legislation concerning gender equality and Roma discrimination.

Weaknesses

Although the empirical research for this thesis unfolded during the Covid sanitary emergency and most primary sources consulted are easily locatable online, the dissertation lacks a more thorough engagement in the analysis of the primary sources, as well as a larger and rigorous selection of the available visual sources. The next challenge remains to deepen critical analysis of the primary sources and ask even more provoking questions in order to show more sides of the multifarious injustices Romani women endure. Michelle Angert is expected to insert her voice more persuasively into the scholarly debate on the issue tackled in this dissertation. While the dissertation successfully addresses - through an intersectional lens - the pervasiveness of the social and economic hardships faced by the Romani women in the Czech Republic (and beyond), it fails to engage more consistently with the epistemic injustice aspect of the *de facto* discrimination, without which an intersectional account is not fully undertaken. By the same token, the author explores Romani women's hardships at the intersection of three axes of discrimination overlooking (or barely mentioning) other axes of discrimination.

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

1. What would be the normative considerations in light of the exploration of the *de iure* and *de facto* treatment of the Romani Women in the Czech Republic?
2. Why is the intersectionality (as a method) appropriate for disentangling the questions addressed by this dissertation?
3. Are Romani women in the Czech Republic at the intersection of *only* three axes of discrimination as claimed in this dissertation?