

|                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| Name of the student: | Ludovica Maria Chieppa   |
| Title of the thesis: | Gender equality and attitudes toward immigrants in Europe: a cross-national analysis |
| Reviewer:            | Dr Agnieszka Sadecka   |

### **1. KNOWLEDGE AND CONNECTION TO THE FIELD**

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

The student demonstrates an excellent understanding of the topic and provides an extensive, relevant and critical literature review, referencing up-to-date scholarly articles and major publications on the topic. The research questions and hypotheses are clearly formulated, and more importantly, they address a gap in the study of correlation between gender equality and attitudes towards immigrants.

### **2. ANALYSIS**

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

As the research problem is clearly identified and research questions are formulated in a crisp and coherent manner, the entire thesis study follows a logical structure, allowing to test the hypothesis and provide answers to the research question(s). It is clear that the student is able to maintain focus and use her analytical skills in selecting the theoretical basis for her research, and critically assess the existing research on the topic. The methodology is adequate and very well explained, the student demonstrates a high sophistication in the analysis of data. The student is able to combine an individual and societal dimension of the research. The student shows awareness of both limitations and potential next steps (or opportunities for further research in the field).

### **3. CONCLUSIONS**

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

It is evident that the thesis is an ambitious undertaking and it does not fall short on its scope – the student manages to convincingly highlight the fact that more gender-equal countries tend to also be less xenophobic, and provide evidence in the empirical data that was analysed. She also dispels the commonly believed argument that women tend to be less anti-immigration than men – it is not always the case, and the reasons behind it are more complex than what previous research may show. The thesis does not limit itself to testing the hypotheses only – the student is well aware of various factors (power, education, employment opportunities etc.) that could be taken into account when analysing anti-immigrant attitudes, and provides compelling explanations as to which factors could indeed be relevant here. She is also aware how values and worldviews could correlate with attitudes towards migrants. This shows academic maturity and independence of thinking.

### **4. FORMAL ASPECTS AND LANGUAGE**

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

The thesis is written in a clear and logical manner and it adheres to academic standards. The student shows a very good knowledge of academic terms and concepts. The structure, style, layout and overall presentation (including visuals, such as graphs) are very good. The referencing and citation style is consistent. In fact, the thesis could be transformed to an academic article and published in a scholarly journal (as it has also been observed by the primary reviewer).

### **5. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT**

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

This is an excellent thesis, of an above-the-average quality. The thesis is successful in all categories – research design, methodology, empirical analysis, interpretation and discussion of results. The only aspect that could further enrich the research would be to provide even more in-depth explanations behind country variations, taking into account other social, cultural and economic aspects – however, this would require a much more extensive research, far beyond what is feasible in a Master dissertation.

|                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| <b>Grade (A-F):</b> | A – 9 (Barcelona grade) / 5 (Krakow grade) |
| Date:               | Signature:                                 |
| 24.06.2021          | <i>Agnieszka Sadecka</i>                   |

classification scheme

| Percentile | Prague   |       | Krakow |        | Leiden  |        | Barcelona |        |
|------------|----------|-------|--------|--------|---------|--------|-----------|--------|
|            | Range    | %     | Grade  | %      | Range   | %      | Range     | %      |
| A (91-100) | 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'.