

Annex One: Euroculture Master Thesis Assessment Form 2017-2019



Name of Student: **Isabel Sánchez Rodríguez**

Thesis Title: *European Cultural Identity in Light of Brexit: A Comparison between Liverpool 2008 European Capital of Culture and Hull 2017 UK City of Culture*

University of the 1st semester: Olomouc

University of the 2nd semester: Udine

Name of Supervisor / University: Ilaria Zamburlini (Udine)

In this report, please consider the following, by answering the following questions. Please add a short explanation instead of simply answering 'yes', 'no' or 'partly':

1) Content: Problem statement, method and theory:

a) Is the topic of the thesis clearly presented and motivated?

The Research Question is presented within the Introduction, but the motivation behind it is quite naïve.

b) Are the aims and objectives of the thesis clearly identified and explained?

Yes, partly.

c) Is there a well formulated problem statement and is it of sufficient complexity for an MA level? Briefly explain?

I think that the RQ could have been a bit more complex when it comes to the explanation of why addressing such topic is relevant.

d) Has the student convincingly explained the relevance of the research?

Not really – I believe that a more profound explanation should have been provided.

e) Has a suitable methodology and theoretical frame been taken to solve the stated problems?

There is a theoretical framework and methods are vaguely presented – it seems to me that it is not really clear how methods are put into practice when it comes to the analysis of the research question.

f) In case where empirical research has been conducted: is there a suitable research design and has the research been conducted adequately?

Not to a satisfactory degree.

g) Does the conclusion provide convincing answers/proof to the initial questions/hypotheses?

I find the conclusion too naïve and generic.

h) Does the research constitute a contribution to knowledge in this field or domain?

The RQ in itself is interesting, but it is not accompanied with a strong analysis of the proposed framework.

2) Structure:

a) Is the thesis coherently structured in chapters and sections?

Yes.

b) Are concepts clearly introduced and explained, and critically and consistently applied?

Not always (e.g. the concept of identity could have been more accurately explained)

3) Sources (primary and secondary):

a) Has (enough) relevant (primary and secondary) literature been adequately interpreted and integrated into the thesis?

No. This is the most problematic aspect of the thesis, as it is not clear where sources come from.

b) Is the bibliography/list of references complete and accurate?

Yes, mostly.

4) Stylistics:

a) Is the use of language (English) acceptable and of the required standard (i.e. no spelling mistakes and typos, range of vocabulary, grammar)?

There are a few mistakes when it comes to syntax.

b) Are references in the text given in a coherent and consistent manner (either in text or as footnotes)?

Yes.

5) Format:

a) How is the thesis presented (i.e. consistency in lay-out, choice of fonts, headings, tables and graphs)?

The thesis is neatly presented.

b) Does the thesis contain all required elements (title page, declaration, table of contents, bibliography, etc.)?

Yes.

6) Quality of writing process:

a) To what degree has the student been able to work independently?

The student has worked independently.

b) Have recommended revisions been executed to a satisfying degree?

The student has not asked to any supervisor for supervision. Our initial comments (on the portfolio) has not been put satisfactory into practice.

c) Any other relevant comments (e.g. on planning and commitment of the student).

The thesis is very short and there has not been any contact with supervisors. I believe that asking for suggestion could have been helpful for the writing process and the final outcome itself.

7) Possible questions for thesis defence (only if this thesis is to be defended Orally):

Not applicable.

.....
(National) Grade: 21 (twenty-one) out of 30

*Suggestion for corresponding converted grade
according to the other university's (national) grading scheme: E*

Date and place: Udine, 13 January 2020

Signature: Ilaria Zamburlini, PhD