Master's Thesis – Information for UPF supervisors (EPS, Erasmus Mundus Program European Politics & Society) – Academic year 2023-2024

Key dates for Master Thesis Supervisors

By June 14th, 2024: deadline for students to submit their final thesis project.

June 28th : deadline for the evaluation by all supervisors

From June 28th to July 1st : agreement with second reviewers and/or second supervisors on a final grade

July 2nd : EPS Students will receive their grade.

July 4th : the oral defense will take place on this date.

Formal requirements – Length of the Thesis

For **EPS students (Erasmus Mundus students)** the Master's thesis **has to be 12 000 words (± 10 % including footnotes and bibliography and excluding appendixes).** The cover page of the MA thesis should include the number of words. This is a highly relevant issue, particularly for EPS – Erasmus students.

Assessment and grading

For the EPS students the following are the official assessment criteria they have in their handbook. Therefore, the evaluation and the report should mention this type of criteria. At UPF we need a numerical evaluation from 0 to 10. In addition, this numerical evaluation is translated in some universities into a non-numerical grade.

Grades for EPS – Erasmus Mundus students

A: All elements of a thesis are combined in an effective and convincing form. The case for the research question or hypothesis is well-made and grounded in a significant and topical issue, whether derived from the literature or empirics. The thesis delivers excellent, powerful engagement with the literature, suggesting full mastery of academic and/or empirical debates. The thesis conveys an excellent understanding of how to design and conduct research. The selected method aligns with the research question/hypothesis, and the student evidences a fulsome understanding of it, both at the abstract and applied level. The thesis offers an original answer based on an outstanding analysis of relevant sources, primary as well as secondary where appropriate, that advances our understanding of the matter. It is well-structured and shows excellent awareness of the need to account for the audience. Additionally, the thesis must demonstrate a full understanding of and compliance with academic conventions, including but not limited to the presentation, referencing and

use of footnotes. A thesis performing at this level should be considered to be exceptional, indicative of a student ready to begin doctoral research or high-level professional work.

B: The thesis covers all the issues mentioned in the description of thesis elements above but does not meet the exceptional standard above. It will be excellent, at least in part, with relatively minor deficiencies that do not compromise the research design and the relevance of the answer. The research question or hypothesis will be of significance, and the student will deliver an original contribution to knowledge by answering it. The thesis will be grounded in a very good or excellent evaluation of an appropriate body of literature, discussing key concepts and debates maturely and convincingly. The student will demonstrate a very good facility with the demands of good research design. The selected method will align with the research question/hypothesis and the student evidence a good understanding of it, both at the abstract and applied levels. The thesis offers an original answer based on a very good analysis of relevant sources, primary as well as secondary where appropriate, that goes some way to advance our understanding of the matter. Additionally, the thesis must demonstrate a full understanding of and compliance with academic conventions, including but not limited to the presentation, referencing and use of footnotes.

C: The thesis covers all the issues mentioned in the description of thesis elements above but with some significant deficiencies. The research question and corresponding hypotheses are developed according to academic standards and linked to the scholarly literature but do not appear entirely convincing. The answer offered is not fully persuasive but offers relevant insight into the topic. The thesis will be referring to an adequate amount of literature, but the reference and the contribution to the academic debate are not really insightful. The research methods show interesting and innovative ideas, but there are some doubts about their development. The thesis still demonstrates knowledge and application of academic conventions (including, but not limited to the presentation, referencing and the use of footnotes), but there are apparent issues with their employment and/or a lack of attention to detail.

D: The thesis covers most issues mentioned in the description of thesis elements above, but it is relatively pedestrian, particularly in relation to the embedding of the research question. There is some engagement with the literature, identification of the method and operationalisation of that method to the research. The analysis is present but not fully developed. The selected research method may be of dubious utility, suggesting the student has an imperfect understanding of research design. The question or hypothesis is answered/ tested but not in a very compelling fashion. The thesis is vulnerable to criticism that it is derivative and descriptive, with opportunities for delivering critical analysis not exploited. Peripheral but important issues such as presentation and referencing are problematic, and the student does not always comply with other forms of academic convention.

E: The thesis does not cover all the issues mentioned in the description of thesis elements above but offers a structured piece of relevant analysis that is embedded in the literature and provides an answer to a research question. The method of analysis is explained, albeit not fully developed and persuasive. The thesis is pedestrian, descriptive and unoriginal in form.

F: The thesis does not represent a piece of independent research as far as it does not formulate a straightforward research question and/or lacks engagement with the literature and/or the method of inquiry and/or does not provide an answer based on the critical analysis of primary and secondary sources.

Evaluation procedure for students with second reviewer and/or second supervisor

EPS students - Erasmus Mundus students will have a second reviewer of their Master Theses (from Prague, Krakov or Leiden). Both reviewers, the UPF supervisor and the second reviewers from the previously mentioned universities will have to agree the common final grade. This means that they will have to be in touch either by email and, if necessary, through skype and/or zoom. According to the EPS-Erasmus Mundus rules, students have the right to see their evaluation of both reviewers before their oral defence. This means that in this current year your evaluation should be available by June 28th and then exchange this information with the second reviewer and to agree on a final grade by July 1st .

Oral defence of the thesis

The oral defence of the Master thesis will take place this year on July 4th in the classroom 20.053. The oral defence is 20 % of the final grade. This 20 % of the final grade is not so much about the quality of their work as for their capacity to do a good presentation to show their proficiency when presenting their research as well as providing convincing arguments when reacting to questions made by the Tribunal.

EVALUATION

Please be aware that in order to be able to go to the defense (on July 4th), Erasmus Mundus Students need to pass (5 out of 10 as agreed evaluation grade between both reviewers, the supervisor and the second reviewer).

Annex 1 – Template Dissertation Report EPS

EPS { European Politics and Society

Joint Dissertation Review

Name of the student:	Ramón Brais Freire Braña
Title of the thesis:	From minoritized to digitalized: Assessing the digital realm's influence on preexisting language ideologies. The case of Galician
Reviewer:	Juan Carlos Triviño-Salazar

1. KNOWLEDGE AND CONNECTION TO THE FIELD
(relevance of the research question, research objective, literature review):

The thesis aims to answer the questions: "to what extent and how including minoritized language communities into the online realm have shaped and reshaped their pre-existing language ideologies? Furthermore, and being that so: what are the specific factors that contribute to such changes upon language ideologies?" The research questions are clear, well-defined and justified. Moreover, the author makes an important effort to put forward the gaps in the literature of socio-linguistics and minoritized languages and presents an innovative contribution to the field.

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

The author offers a theoretical model to understand the extent to which language ideologies of minoritized languages change in the online realm. The thesis offers a high level of sophistication as it is able to put forward a theoretical argument that is applied on the crucial case of Galician. In fact, the findings are quite interesting as it shows the resilience of the language in the online realm and the (unintended) strategies that inform changes in the language ideologies. The author makes an important effort to back up the statements made with excerpts from the rich qualitiative material obtained through interviews.

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

A strong component of the thesis, it is of excellent quality as it offers a clear scientific contribution in light of the empirical findings. Moreover, the author makes a strong case for why we should care about language ideologies of minoritized languages.

4. FORMAL ASPECTS AND LANGUAGE
(appropriate language, adherence to academic standards, citation style, layout):

Excellent. The language used, the adherence to academic standards, citation style and layout are of utmost quality.

5. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT
(strong and weak point of the dissertation, other issues)

Strong points: the clear and well-argued theoretical contribution and its empirical application. Overall, the paper is strong regarding research design.

Weak points: more than weak points, I would call them limitations. The interview sample could be a bit bigger, similarly with the crucial case, a comparisson with other minoritized language could be made?

Grade (A-F)	**A** (UPF grading system: 9.5/10)
Date	Signature
18/06/2024	 TRIVIÑO SALAZAR JUAN CARLOS - 26615634B Firmado digitalmente por TRIVIÑO SALAZAR JUAN CARLOS - 26615634B Fecha: 2024.06.19 18:14:50 +02'00'

GRADE CONVERSION MA EPS

Percentile	Prague	Krakow	Leiden	Barcelona
A (91-100)	91-100 %	4,51-5,00	8.0-10	9-10
B (81-90)	81-90 %	4,21-4,50	7.5-7.9	8-8,9
C (71-80)	71-80 %	3,71-4,20	7-7.4	7-7,9
D (61-70)	61-70 %	3,21-3,7	6.5-6.9	6-6,9
E (51-60)	51-60 %	3,00-3,20	6-6.4	5-5,9

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’.