

IMESS DISSERTATION



Note: Please email the completed mark sheet to Year 2 coordinator
(cc Chiara Amini chiara.amini@ucl.ac.uk and ssees-imess@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	64-60	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>	A					
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 limitation or alternative views; Ability to use other evidence to support arguments and structure appropriately.</i>	A					
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>	A					

ECTS Mark:	A/76	UCL Mark:	A/76	Marker:	Agnieszka Kubal
<i>Deducted for late submission:</i>				Signed:	
<i>Deducted for inadequate referencing:</i>				Date:	16 June 2021

MARKING GUIDELINES

A (UCL mark 70+): 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 65-69):

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.

C (UCL mark 60-61):

Some evidence of critical analysis, knowledgeable interpretation. Wide range of sources used to develop a logic and coherent argument. Good understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, the extent of independent research could have improved.

D (UCL mark 59-55):

Employ relevant sources and show ability to engage in systematic inquiry. Little critical analysis of the material. It demonstrate methodological awareness but the standard and rigor of the analysis can improve.

E (UCL mark 54-50):

Mostly descriptive argument. Employ relevant but limited sources. The structure, logic and overall quality of the argument needs improvement.

F (UCL mark less than 50):

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.

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

This is an excellently researched thesis that employs the intersectional analysis in order to conceptualise the hiatus between the de jure and de facto experiences of Roma women in the Czech Republic. The employment of the intersectionality lens is thorough, meticulous, and lucid. The analysis is multidimensional and explores the various disadvantages that the Roma women face in Czech Republic as a result of their unique positioning as women, as ‘others’ and as women within a particular ethnic group. The specific discussion on the relationship between de facto and de jure experiences is very advanced and demonstrates that the author is a well-informed, compassionate and considerate researcher. The research question is clear and answered in an exhaustive manner. The author is honest about his/her positionality, research interests and professional background. This makes the critique very engaging and thorough. The knowledge of the subject is excellent. The proposed research is placed within the broader context of conducting socio-legal empirical research on the differences between legal infrastructure (i.e. the law in the books) and how the law is often experienced in everyday life. This dissertation is an outstanding example of capacity to gather information through a wide and appropriate range of readings, and to digest and apply that knowledge to design a viable research.

While this is undoubtedly excellent thesis, I think it sets slightly unrealistic expectations about the ‘law in the books’ and ‘law in action’. On the one hand, the very distinction of these categories demonstrates that there will always be a gap between how the law is written and how it is enforced and experienced. On the other hand, feminist critiques (e.g. Crenshaw herself in her famous article (1991) Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color, Stanford Law Review, 43(6): 1241-1299) have long demonstrated that the law is far from an objective tool of anti-discrimination struggle, as quite often it has been formulated from the perspective of a white, middle class man. Your intersectional perspective of approaching everyday life experiences of Roma women in Czech Republic should also be accompanied by an intersectional critique of the law and its instruments as well.

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

Why do we talk about the gap between de jure and de facto experiences? Why is there a difference between ‘law in the books’ and ‘law in action’?

Would you like to elaborate on any intersectional critiques of the law and legal instruments?

