

Name of the student:	Ludovica Maria Chieppa
Title of the thesis:	Gender equality and attitudes toward immigrants in Europe: a cross-national analysis
Reviewer:	Prof. Dr. Tània Verge

1. KNOWLEDGE AND CONNECTION TO THE FIELD

(relevance of the research question, research objective, literature review):

The case for the research question is well-made and justified. It is worth noting that the student has identified a relevant gap in the literature, that of the gender dimension of anti-immigrant attitudes in Europe. It should be mentioned that the problematization of the pitfalls of gender-blindness and the need for gender-sensitive approaches was one of the key goals of the course Politics & Gender the student undertook during the first year of his MA program at UPF. It is a pleasure as her former instructor to see that the student has been able to put into practice this goal with success.

She does an excellent job in discussing both the impact of mirco-level and macro-level factors surrounding individuals' gender and country levels of gender equality. The complexity of these relationships is very well problematised, and the integration of Schwartz's human values approach is carried out effectively and it flows smoothly in the literature review.

The dissertation offers a comprehensive engagement with the specialised literature, pinpointing great mastery of academic debates in the fields of attitudes toward immigrants, basic human values studies, and the connection of these two strands of literature with gender approaches. The hypotheses are well grounded in the literature review. It is very much appreciated that the dissertation does not just seek to test the effect of a broadly defined concept of gender equality but of various dimensions such as education, health and power.

2. ANALYSIS

(methodology, argument, theoretical backing, appropriate work with sources):

I can confirm that the student has conveyed a highly independent and critical judgement in the planning and execution of the methodological plan of the research, being always receptive to the suggestions made by her supervisor. The dissertation shows an excellent understanding of how to design and conduct research.

The selected method aligns with the research question/hypothesis, and the student has made a great effort to strenghten their statistical methods in order to run the regression models. The selection of the main variables (ID and DV) and controls to test the hypotheses is extensively explained and well justified.

3. CONCLUSIONS

(persuasiveness, link between data and conclusions, achievement of research objectives):

The results presented are persuasive, and the effort to problematise the scholarly and policy implications of the findings should also be highlighted as a relevant feature of the dissertation.

The discussion of the limitations of the study and the identification of an agenda for further research on the topic are also to be commended, showing research maturity on behalf of the student.

4. FORMAL ASPECTS AND LANGUAGE

(appropriate language, adherence to academic standards, citation style, layout):


The dissertation is very well-structured and it demonstrates a full understanding of and compliance with academic conventions, including the presentation, referencing, use of footnotes, and appendices.

5. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT

(strong and weak point of the dissertation, other issues)

All elements of a thesis are combined effectively to produce a high-quality research. As said, the literature review is very good and the data and methods section complies with high-quality standards. If the dissertation was to be published in an article format, the empirical analysis section should be a bit more polished, but it should be highlighted that the dissertation delivers what the student promises to do in the research question.

I would also like to highlight that I see a lot of potential in Ludovica as a prospective PhD student, as she is eager to master the literature she engages with and to learn the methods and techniques that best suit her empirical analyses.

Grade (A-F)	A (9, in Barcelona grades)
Date	Signature
22/06/2021	

Classification scheme

Percentile	Prague		Krakow		Leiden		Barcelona	
	91-100 %	8,5%	5	6,7%	8,5-10	5,3%	9-10	5,5 %
B (81-90)	81-90 %	16,3%	4,5	11,7%	7,5-8,4	16,4%	8-8,9	11,0 %
C (71-80)	71-80 %	16,3%	4	20%	6,5-7,4	36,2%	7-7,9	18,4 %
D (61-70)	61-70 %	24%	3,5	28,3%			6-6,9	35,2 %
E (51-60)	51-60 %	34,9%	3	33,4 %	6-6,4	42,1 %	5-5,9	30,1 %

Assessment criteria:

Excellent (A): 'Outstanding performance with only minor errors';
 Very good (B): 'Above the average standard but with some errors';
 Good (C): 'Generally sound work but with a number of notable errors';
 Satisfactory (D): 'Fair but with significant shortcomings';
 Sufficient (E): 'Performance meets the minimum criteria';
 Fail: 'Some/considerable more work required before the credit can be awarded'.