

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>				59		
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>		65				
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>		65				
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>			61			

ECTS Mark:		Charles Mark:	C	Marker:	Daniela Kolenovská
<i>Deducted for late submission:</i>			No	Signed:	
<i>Deducted for inadequate referencing:</i>				Date:	

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*):

The dissertation is based on the author's interest in finding an explanation for the disparity between the legal guarantees of equality and the discrimination faced by Romani women in the EU and the Czech Republic. The author believes that recognizing its causes will lead to law enforcement in the Czech Republic and to Romani women equality subsequently.

The first third of the dissertation advocates the theoretical framework and the research method chosen from the field of feminist analytical philosophy. Discrimination against Romani women is thought through intersectional analysis of one anti-categorical ethno-gender complex and two one-dimensional categories of gender and ethnicity. Unfortunately, this strict theoretical approach has three serious implications for possible findings:

1) The dissertation builds only on two categories which act on the marginalisation of Romani women in the Czech society and does not explain why other aspects are not considered (esp. age and religiosity).

2) The author's basic reference is legal perspective of the EU institutions, some of their partners among Czech NGOs and of international NGOs. Choosing these as main resources, the dissertation suffers from not grasping the historical context of the topic. At the same time, the Museum of Roma Culture in Brno has already proved that reminiscences of Roma holocaust or post-war migration in Czechoslovakia still do have significant impact in the Czech society. Five years ago, this was confirmed by Jan Tesař's ground-breaking book based on interviews with Josef Serynek (Czech Gypsy Rhapsody, 2016) and establishment of academic Prague Forum for Romani Histories.

3) The materials of the Czech state authorities, the office of the ombudsman, Romani social workers or Romani assistants in schools are irrelevant sources of information for the author. Thus, the dynamics of the ongoing process of equalization of Romani women in Czech society was not considered. The chosen method of restoring (living) past and present injustices together makes them seem as if they are all happening ceaselessly, in this moment.

Unfortunately, the author displays weak orientation in the Czech environment again in the part dedicated to the analyses of the European and Czech legal standards regulating the rights of minorities and Roma. In fact, The Charter of Basic Rights and Freedoms is a firm part of the Czech constitutional order and has equal legal force as the Constitution; severe rules for granting Czech citizenship were the effects of the break-up of Czechoslovakia and were related only to Roma with Slovak citizenship. Their applications for Czech citizenship were assessed under the foreign nationals' application regime – and the Czech authorities thus placed appropriate claims on them (as knowledge of the Czech language). Moreover, even these demands towards Slovak Roma were eased in 1996 and completely abolished in 1999. Finally, the well-known judgment in D.H. and Others, which confirmed discrimination against Romani pupils in Czech schools, was handed down in 2007, but it was related to the lawsuit filed for the status quo in 2000. Although the judgment entered contemporary Czech history as a milestone, special schools were abolished years before its passing, and Czech education embarked on the path of inclusion. These debates and actions are not reflected by the dissertation at all.

The final part of the dissertation notifies discrimination against Romani women in the Czech Republic in the sphere of education, healthcare, and employment. The author follows the process of establishing rules of inclusion in the schools only from the point of view of Romani children and parents. Any interview with a teacher has not been conducted for this section. Similarly, drastic sterilization is dominantly recalled when examining healthcare conditions and supplemented personal stories describing lacking healthcare are not confronted with any relevant statistics of the insurance companies nor the governmental bodies. On contrary, thanks to Eurostat data and the wider use of scientific literature, the Romani employment-mapping section works best in this third of the dissertation.

Overall, I find the dissertation average. Formally, the basic work was processed. However, the author presents dominantly external (English language-based) and non-academic understanding of the problem. This was brought about by the selective resources. The author underestimated the importance of the Czech and Romani language literature (J. Tesař, 2016; E. Ščuka, 2020; J. Horváthová, 2018; D. Janák 2018; M. Hübschmannová 2005; journal Romano Džaniben etc.). Thus, the conclusion does not bring appropriate findings. The author only evaluated the sketchy information in strict categories as evidence of discrimination against Romani women in the Czech Republic and did not recognize the causes of shallow application of the law. Solutions for unsatisfactory situation of Romani women in the Czech Republic probably dwell not only in formal law enforcement, but rather in the dynamics of uncultivated relations between different parts of Czech society. In the dissertation, this field was not even described.

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

- 1) What results did the Roma Holocaust have for the Czech society?**
- 2) What other aspects do affect marginalization of minorities and why they were not included into the dissertation?**
- 3) In your opinion, does better healthcare, higher education and employment of Romani women in the Czech Republic automatically mean their non-discrimination in terms of intersectionality?**