



Name and title of evaluator: **Nils B. Weidmann**

Please tick box: I am  first supervisor  second supervisor of the thesis.

Student number: 1066432

Name of student: Mia Nahrgang

Title of the thesis: From Supreme Gentlemen to Incel Rebellion – Analysing the Radicalisation Potential of the Incel Community on Twitter

*Click the desired box in the diagram below and add your comments. Boxes will expand as you type.*

Assessment dimensions (listed items are optional criteria)		Assessment				
		Fail	Pass	Satisfactory	Good	Very good
1	Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Topic: Definition and context</li> <li>• Research question</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: The introduction is well written and motivates the research question well. However, while the practical relevance of the topic is discussed at length, I would have liked to see a more detailed discussion of the scientific added value we gain by studying the Incel community specifically. What do we learn about the spread of hateful content that we do not know yet? Parts of the introduction are too detailed, for example the effect sizes. Moreover, the language here is not precise enough: “an increase in the toxicity score of a tweet”: An increase by how much?						
2	Literature review/theoretical framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of the relevant literature</li> <li>• Gap in the literature</li> <li>• Theoretical argument</li> <li>• Research hypotheses</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: This is a very extensive literature review, covering different literatures that are relevant for the project. However, these different literatures are somehow treated in isolation, and it is not clear how do the pieces fit together (Incel, Twitter, radicalization)? Also, what exactly is the theoretical gap in the literature? The theory reads very much like at lit review, and there is little independent theory development. The definition of “toxicity” needs to be introduced before the hypothesis. The “toxic” example provided is not a good one, since it is anti-Muslim. What does toxicity mean in the Incel community?						
3	Research design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Case selection, data collection and method of analysis</li> <li>• Suitability of research design and methodological approach</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comments: The author performed an extensive analysis retrieving Twitter data via an API, which is laudable. I have some reservations regarding the two predictor variables used here. Is toxicity a good measure? It has very low scores overall. This is surprising, given that a relatively extremist community was pre-selected. Or does the toxicity classifier fail to identify the content we should be interested in? Similar concerns arise for the misogyny score, which I believe is closer to what the analysis wants to capture. Why are there so few misogyny words? Only 3000 of the 19000 words seem to contain any. This would have deserved a more critical discussion, since these results go counter to the initial assumption of the Incel community as being misogynist. Why is there such a low correlation between toxicity and misogyny? Are the two indicators not supposed to capture something similar? If not, what is the conceptual difference?						
4	Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data quality</li> <li>• Execution of analysis</li> <li>• Presentation of results</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: The overall setup of the analysis is straightforward. Using a log-transformed count as the dependent variable seems reasonable. I’m not sure why the models are distributed across several (sometimes small) regression tables, which makes it difficult to compare them. Also, why not opt for the “best” modeling choice right away (robust standard errors, FEs)? Why control for number of followers, if a user FE model is used? The latter should net out user-specific features such as the count of followers (which makes me wonder why these models can be estimated at all, since the user FE perfectly correlates with the follower count). The addition of an analysis of the deleted tweets is great, and I would have loved to see this explored more. The author can confirm the fact that the deleted Tweets are more toxic, which confirms the expectation. However, since the author uses Tweets that are captured relatively early on, the results of the analysis should be less biased as compared to those obtained on a later sample.						
5	Summary and Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answer to the question</li> <li>• Broader implications of the findings</li> <li>• Critical discussion of own research</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: The final chapter is very short. It very briefly summarizes the thesis and outlines possible limitations. Some of the language is not precise enough (the sentence from the introduction about the effect sizes shows up again). I wonder how the results of the analysis support the conclusion that the Incel community becomes more radicalized. We see that radical content diffuses more, but overall the results also indicate that only a fraction of the overall content seems to be radical. How does this go together with the conclusion the author draws?						

6	Write-up and presentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Structure</li> <li>• Language and flow of the text</li> <li>• Acknowledgement of sources and quotations</li> <li>• Design and careful layout</li> <li>• Spelling and punctuation</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: The thesis is structured in a straightforward way. It is laudable that the author partly employs graphical illustrations to visualize some key relationships and results. Overall, the thesis is well written and the language is fine, although there are some linguistic errors. "can bet detected" (p. 38)						

**Summary and final assessment:**

The thesis covers a very interesting and relevant research question, and the author has made a great effort to implement a new analysis. This level of independence is laudable for an MA thesis. There are some parts, however, where the thesis is less convincing; for example, the theoretical contribution could have been discussed more explicitly, and the two predictor variables would have required more conceptual discussion.

Grade: 1.3

Date of signature: **27-7-2022**

Name of examiner: **Nils. B. Weidmann**



..... (Signature assessor)