Dissertation Review

Name of the student:	Samia Binte Alamgir
Title of the thesis:	WHAT IS THE WORTH OF HIGHLY EDUCATED FEMALE MIGRANTS IN THE LABOR MARKET OF BARCELONA?
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 poorly justified in terms of the literature review. The gap in the literature should be further problematized. The reference and the contribution to the academic debate are not really insightful. In particular, the student should have better justified why the focus is on highly-educated migrant women, and the literature on the integration of these high-skilled migrants should have been better review. It can hardly be the case that this is the first research on this type of migrants.

2. ANALYSIS

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

It should be noted that I had two meetings with the student at the early stages of her dissertation. The document exchange was not conventional, as she had already conducted some interviews without having grounded the interview questionnaire in the theoretical background. Thereafter, she did not contact me again until a few days before the submission deadline, and she never sent me a full draft of the dissertation.

There are some inconsistencies, like stating that the research will focus on high-educated women from twenty countries in Latin America and then conducting 16 interviews. Or striking statements like "Randomly I selected 16 participants for this thesis paper". I insisted to the student that she needed to justify the selection/contact method she had employed, but this justification does not appear in the data and methods section. The dissertation does not provide either information on which analysis method was used. Interviews can be examined through a variety of analyses.

The issue of intersectionality (in terms of skin darkness or motherhood) should have also been discussed in the theoretical section.

The empirical analysis is not very deep, and includes some troublesome statements such as: "It is true that employers have all the rights to ask about family life and marital status of an interviewee to calculate if this candidate is productive for the company or not". This is forbidden by law, even it still may be an informal practice in many companies.

While the gender-roles argument is given prominence in the abstract and other parts of the paper, this sub-section is not much developed in the empirical analysis than other sub-sections, nor it is presented in a convincing fashion why this is the most relevant factor. Also, treating gender and race separately pays a lip service to the intersectionality approach.

Likewise, some of the sub-sections are only supported by one or two statements. Conducting interviews are not about obtaining a representative sample, but the empirical analysis should be richer.

3. CONCLUSIONS

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

The thesis offers a relatively modest answer to the research question as it is poorly executed at the theoretical and empirical levels. The conclusions are a mere summary of the findings, with no relevant implications highlighted nor avenues for further research.

4. FORMAL ASPECTS AND LANGUAGE

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

The student does not always comply with some forms of academic convention, in terms of language, layout and citation style.

5. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT

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

The thesis presents several shortcomings, particularly in relation to the embedding of the research question. The answer offered is not fully persuasive, although it offers some relevant insights into the topic. The engagement with the literature is limited, as is also the case of the data and methods description. The empirical analysis is not fully developed. The research question is tested but not in a very compelling fashion.

Grade (1-5):	6.0 (in Leiden's grading), E 5.0 (in Barcelona's grading, 1-10)
Date:	Signature:
22nd June 2021	

"Sehr Gut" (1.0) = Very Good

"Gut" (2.0) = Good

"Befriedigend" (3.0) = Satisfactory

"Ausreichend" (4.0) = Sufficient

"Nicht ausreichend" (5.0) = Non-Sufficient/Fail.

The minimum passing grade is "Ausreichend" (4.0).

Intermediate grades are possible: 1.3; 1.7; 2.3; 2.7; 3.3; 3.7