

THESIS STRUCTURE

Title	<p>Max two lines. Concise, clear, without jargon.</p> <p>First line (main title) could be more poetic/metaphorical/a sentence from an interview that summarises your argument, points to the tension you are addressing.</p> <p>Second line (subtitle): topic of your thesis.</p> <p>Example: <i>We Were Gasping for Air:</i> (Post)Yugoslav Anti-War Organising and Its Legacy</p>
Abstract	<p>Max 200-250 words Summary of your research which refers to all of the thesis parts (think in terms of having one sentence for each thesis section). It should be clear what your argument is.</p> <p>One paragraph.</p> <p>Take a look at and imitate abstracts in good academic journals.</p> <p>There should, in principle, be no Future Tense in your abstract. You are presenting your completed research.</p>
Table of Contents	<p>Do not put “Table of Contents” in your Table of Contents.</p>
Introduction ≈5-10%	<p>[Anecdote/story/seductive opening, where and when are we]</p> <p>Identification of the puzzle/tension/dilemma and a presentation of your research question.</p> <p>In case your research questions has more aspects/dimensions, please do not just give a list/enumeration of questions. A list of questions is not a sign of good writing style. Develop your question/s into paragraphs.</p> <p>No bullet points!</p> <p>Your introduction should also contain your main argument.</p> <p>The introduction finishes with the structure of the thesis (what can the reader expect).</p>

THESIS STRUCTURE

Literature Review

≈30%

What is known about this topic? What have other authors already argued/published?

State of the art/conceptual framework

Issue-driven rather than author-driven account!

Not a mere enumeration of authors and their arguments i.e. **not just a list of authors one below the other (e.g. Smith argues... Miller argues... Johnson argues...): organise your literature review around ideas, not authors (you can then put authors' names in brackets as references).**

Literature review is the *function* of the chapter, **it should not be its title**. You can give it a title that summarises its content.

You can have (around) two literature review chapters introducing different conceptual dimensions of your project.

Methods

≈5-10%

In general, this chapter should include the following subsections:

Please don't call this chapter Methodology

General considerations (no subtitle necessary, but it is fine if you have one) about how to approach your research question methodologically, reflections concerning your positionality etc.

Data collection – how did you collect your data? Who were your participants (in case of interviews) – description of your population and your sample; any other material? Participant observation, documentary material?

Data analysis – how did you analyse your data?

Ethical considerations – informed consent, treatment of data etc.

Analysis

≈30%

An account of **your own empirical material!**

This is not a literature review anymore, but a presentation of your own empirical corpus.

This part is completely yours – it is about your material.

Start with an overview of the themes that you have identified and then introduce each of them in detail and substantiate them with your empirical material.

(For example, you may have three themes, each of these may have four or five dimensions, for every dimension give one excerpt as evidence).

You can refer to some authors (as it is not possible to totally separate analysis from discussion), **but the focus is on your material.**

A good analysis is a series of (pleasant) surprises for the reader. The reader says “haaa, I haven’t thought of that! Good! I want to read more!”.

Discussion

≈20%

Start with a broad restatement of the problem/issue.

Then revisit your literature review in the light of your own empirical material.

Are there any new insights, can you enter into a ‘dialogue’ with the existing literature on the basis of your fieldwork?

Intertwine your insights with those of other authors.

No new empirical material at this point!

(e.g., no interview excerpts. It is fine to quote an author, but not new data from your empirical corpus, e.g. you should not write about your interviewees here, you should not mention their names etc).

THESIS STRUCTURE

Think in terms of **reflexive (theoretical) generalisations** of your argument. How can you 'go beyond' your empirical material and address broader (deeper, longer-term) patterns?

Towards the end of the Discussion, think about what has remained unanswered. What are your suggestions for further research on the basis of what has remained unanswered.

(You can have e.g. two Analysis chapters and one Discussion chapter.)

[It is good to keep them separate, but sometimes it is also possible to merge analysis and discussion. This can be done either by intertwining them or presenting your data in the first part of the chapter and discussing them in the second part. You can have 2-3 empirical chapters organised in this way.]

[Conclusion]

Possible but not necessary.

If you choose to have it, it should be strong and to the point. It should contain: a restatement of the problem and your argument, final considerations, reflection upon the research process, limitations of your research design and suggestions for further research. Of course, make sure that there is no duplication between your discussion and your conclusion.

References

All references mentioned in the text should appear in this list.

All references appearing in the list should be in the text.

E.g., APA (American Psychological Association) is a straightforward referencing style.

Please apply it consistently throughout your text!

Consult the guidelines of the APA style or the referencing style of your choice regularly.

Appendix

E.g., interview guide etc.

THESIS STRUCTURE

Please always check with your supervisor about anything that may be specific to your discipline.

Bojan Bilić
bojan.bilic@unibo.it