

**COURSE DATA****DATA SUBJECT**

**Code:** 44900  
**Name:** Master's final project  
**Cycle:** Master's Degree  
**ECTS Credits:** 8  
**Academic year:** 2026-27

**STUDY (S)**

Degree	Center	Acad. year	Period
2239 - Master's Degree in New Journalism, Political Communication and Knowledge So	Facultat de Filologia, Traducció i Comunicació	1	Indefinite (Individuals)

**SUBJECT-MATTER**

Degree	Subject-matter	Character
2239 - Master's Degree in New Journalism, Political Communication and Knowledge So	Master's final project	MASTER THESIS PROJECT

**COORDINATION**

VALERA ORDAZ LIDIA

**SUMMARY**

The master's degree final project involves the preparation of a research project in the field of action of the master's degree (journalism and communication, with special emphasis on the analysis of the specific fields of New Journalism and Political Communication), the final version of which must be presented at the end of the second semester of the course to an Academic Committee made up of three members of the master's degree teaching team. The work must demonstrate the knowledge acquired in the design of research in this field. Students must demonstrate their mastery of the essential stages and characteristics of a research or planning process: approaching the topic, establishing objectives, developing the conceptual framework, presenting and analysing the information, designing the plan, implementation procedure, conclusions and a relevant bibliography. The work is validated by means of a public defence before a committee made up of three PhD lecturers.

**PREVIOUS KNOWLEDGE****RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER SUBJECTS OF THE SAME DEGREE**

There are no specified enrollment restrictions with other subjects of the curriculum.

**OTHER REQUIREMENTS**

**COMPETENCES / LEARNING OUTCOMES****2239 - Master's Degree in New Journalism, Political Communication and Knowledge So**

Be able to analyse large masses of data, opinion polls and/or measurements of a communicative nature (such as audience) in social, political and cultural processes.

**DESCRIPTION OF CONTENTS****1.**

The master's degree final project will have as its starting point the research practice developed by each student in relation to the disciplinary contents and other competencies obtained in the master's degree, and delving into those that are most relevant for a critical analysis and according to the preferences expressed by the student in the field of research. It will be carried out by each student with the support and supervision of the faculty.

and must offer a theoretically and methodologically justified analysis of an object of study in the field of the master's degree (journalism and communication, with special emphasis on New Journalism and Political Communication).

**WORKLOAD****PRESENCIAL ACTIVITIES**

Activity	Hours
Attendance at supplementary activities	0,00
Monitoring and tutoring of the master's thesis	10,00
Presentation and defence of the master's thesis	1,00
<b>Total hours</b>	<b>11,00</b>

**NON PRESENCIAL ACTIVITIES**

Activity	Hours
Independent preparation of the master's thesis	189,00
Preparation of the master's thesis project	0,00
<b>Total hours</b>	<b>189,00</b>

**TEACHING METHODOLOGY**

- Case studies or oral presentations of materials by students
- Preparation of outlines, concept maps and synoptic tables



- Research projects
- Tutorials
- Data research
- Reading, synthesis and critical analysis of texts.

## EVALUATION

The general grading system will follow the regulations of the University of Valencia approved by the Governing Council on 30 May 2017. ACGUV 108/2017. The assessment of the Master's thesis is based on three elements: - Assessment of the supervision sessions for the Master's thesis (between 0 and 1) - Assessment of the Master's thesis report (between 6 and 9) - Assessment of the oral and public defence of the Master's thesis (between 1 and 3). The oral defence of the Master's Thesis will take place before an examination board comprising three members of the Master's programme's teaching staff, none of whom will be the lecturer who supervised the Master's Thesis. The assessment criteria are set out in the following rubric: -Assessment Criteria Level of achievement Mark Excellent 9–10 Very Good 8–7 Pass 6–5 Fail

**FORMAL ASPECTS (20%)** Structure, format and grammatical accuracy (10 marks) - The organisation of the content is appropriate, demonstrating a coherent and easy-to-follow thread, and is relevant to an academic and scientific thesis - The standard of writing is appropriate, complying with spelling rules and employing technical and precise language. -The work fully meets the formal academic standards required of a Master's Thesis. -The content is well organised with a coherent thread, although there are some paragraphs or specific sections that are poorly developed and could be better structured. -Spelling rules are adhered to. Technical language is used, although there are some errors of expression and style. - The work broadly meets the formal academic style required of a Master's Thesis. - The content is organised with a thread that is difficult to follow, as the structure is irregular, with a clear lack of coherence between sections or paragraphs. -Spelling rules are followed, although there are errors that make reading difficult and detract from the quality of the work. The language used is imprecise. -The work adheres only to a very limited extent to the academic and formal style required of a Master's Thesis. -The organisation of the content is inadequate. There is no clear central theme. The structure is illogical. -Spelling rules (accent marks, syntax, grammar and punctuation) are not followed. There are numerous errors of expression. The language is inappropriate, poor or imprecise. - The thesis does not meet the academic and formal standards required of a Master's Thesis.

**APA guidelines (citations, references, tables, figures, etc.) (10 points)** - High-quality citations and references are present (mainly scientific journal articles and books), with excellent adherence to the guidelines. -There is an extraordinary quality and diversity of bibliographical references. -Relevant citations and references are present, although the link to the text is not clearly established or the source is not cited appropriately. -There is sufficient quality and diversity of bibliographical sources, but some important references on the subject matter are missing. -There are citations and references that are not listed in the references, or references that do not appear in the text. -The APA style guide is applied only partially and inconsistently. -There is a lack of quality and diversity in the bibliographic sources, although there is an acceptable minimum. -There are very few references, drawn from general handbooks or web sources with no guarantee of quality. -No style guide is followed, either in the references or in the use of tables and figures. -There is a lack of quality and diversity in the bibliographic sources to be considered an academic paper.

**CONTENT (60%)** Introduction – rationale (15 marks) – Presents a coherent and logical structure, enabling someone unfamiliar with the subject to understand it – Demonstrates excellent theoretical grounding (provides relevant definitions of key concepts) and the ability to argue a case (logical reasoning). – The importance of the work within the scientific discipline is thoroughly justified, based on studies and authors representative of the subject area. – Its structure is generally coherent and logical – Demonstrates generally good theoretical grounding (providing definitions of key concepts) and adequate argumentative ability (with generally well-constructed reasoning) – Sufficiently justifies the importance of



the work in relation to the field of knowledge, although this could be done more precisely on the basis of specific relevant studies and authors – Its structure is only partially coherent and not always logical, such that someone unfamiliar with the subject matter can follow the work to some extent. - Limited theoretical rigour (basic definitions of key concepts are missing) and room for improvement in argumentative ability. - Superficial justification: the importance of the work is not effectively justified on the basis of relevant studies and authors in the field of knowledge in question. - The structure is neither coherent nor logical, making it difficult for the reader to follow the study or work. -Lack of theoretical rigour (insufficient definitions of key concepts and theories) and lack of argumentative skill (problems with reasoning and contextualisation). -Poor and insufficient justification: there are not enough studies or authors to support and contextualise the importance of the work. Objectives and hypotheses (15 marks) – These are formulated precisely and are consistent with the study's approach, distinguishing clearly between the objectives and the hypotheses. -The hypotheses are clearly falsifiable. -They are evaluated at the end of the work, and a clear and unambiguous answer is provided to the objectives/hypotheses. -They are formulated precisely and are consistent with the study's approach, distinguishing clearly between the objectives and the hypotheses. There is a partial evaluation of the objectives/hypotheses at the end of the work, but there are hesitations, and no clear and unambiguous answer is provided. -The objectives/hypotheses are too general and neither sufficiently clear nor relevant. There is a very superficial and limited evaluation of the objectives and hypotheses at the end of the work. Their definition is neither adequate nor relevant. The objectives and/or hypotheses do not correspond to the work carried out. There is insufficient evaluation of them at the end of the work; no clear answer is provided in this regard. Methodology (15 marks) – The methodology employed is described perfectly – The methodological design (technique, qualitative/quantitative approach) is entirely consistent with the objectives set out in the paper – It reflects a significant effort in the methodological approach (variables, sample, corpus, theoretical framework, pre-test) - The methodological quality is on a par with that of a scientific paper in the field of communication - The methodology used is described in a confusing manner (hesitations, ambiguities) - The methodology followed is essentially consistent with the stated objectives (technique, approach, etc.) - The methodological design reflects a well-structured process of reflection underpinning the work (variables, sample, corpus, timeframe)-The methodological quality is good for a first foray into scientific research -The methodology employed is described in a confusing manner-The methodology is unclear and lacks sections necessary for a full understanding; it is only partially consistent with the objectives of the work. -The methodological design appears rather improvised and lacks the necessary prior process of reflection and operationalisation. - The methodological quality is limited. - The methodology used is described in a confusing/incomprehensible manner. - The methodology is confusing; the process carried out in the study is not understood. - The methodological quality of the study is low or very low, as it lacks systematisation. - The methodological design does little or nothing to address the study's objectives (technique, sample, time frame, variables, etc.). Results (15 points) – The results are presented in an appropriate and organised manner, using the relevant tables or graphs. – The results are linked to the initial hypotheses and/or the outlined research objectives. – The results are presented appropriately, using suitable verbal and graphical resources. – The results are only loosely linked to the initial hypotheses and/or the outlined research objectives. - The results are expressed in a confusing and ineffective manner, making them difficult to follow and understand. - The results are not linked to the initial hypotheses and/or the research objectives outlined. -The results are presented in an unintelligible or overly confusing manner.-The results are conflated with opinions not substantiated by any empirical analysis carried out by the student.-No final results or verification of hypotheses are presented.-The results bear no relation whatsoever to the hypotheses and/or research objectives ORAL DEFENCE (20%) Public speaking (10 marks) - The language used is correct, precise and technical (proficiency in formal oral register) - Demonstrates excellent clarity of presentation and synthesis - The structure of the presentation is organised and logical: it highlights the most important points and adapts the speech to the time available. - The language used is correct, but only partially precise and technical.-Demonstrates generally good clarity of presentation and ability to summarise.-The structure of the presentation is well-organised and generally



highlights the key points, but there are certain inconsistencies in the management of presentation time.- The language used is not entirely correct, precise or technical (lacks command of formal register in oral communication).-Demonstrates little clarity of presentation and limited ability to summarise. -The structure of the presentation clearly leaves room for improvement; key points are not always emphasised, and there are notable problems with time management during the presentation. -The language used is neither appropriate, precise nor technical, but rather informal and inappropriate (problems with formal register and oral expression). -Problems with clarity of presentation and the ability to summarise. -The structure of the presentation is neither logical nor well-organised, and key points are not emphasised. -Problems with time management during the presentation. Questions/clarifications (10 marks) Your answer is very appropriate to the question or clarification, with sound reasoning and/or a scientific-professional basis. Your answer is appropriate, with very brief reasoning and/or a scientific-professional basis. Your answer is sufficient, but lacks reasoning and/or a scientific-professional basis. Your answer is insufficient and demonstrates problems with reasoning and/or a scientific-professional basis. TOTAL

Second sitting: marks will be carried over from the first to the second sitting (but not from one academic year to the next), so that students will only need to retake the elements in which they failed in the first sitting.

Intellectual honesty is vital in academic communities and for the fair assessment of students' work. All work submitted in this course must be original. Assignments involving fraudulent collaboration will not be accepted, in accordance with the "Protocol for dealing with fraudulent practices at the University of Valencia" approved by the Governing Council on 14 July 2020. ACGUV 123/2020. The use of artificial intelligence tools must comply with the provisions of the "Guidelines for the Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Teaching and Assessment Activities at the University of Valencia" or any regulations that may replace them.

## REFERENCES

- BRAVO, S. R. (1997). Técnicas de investigación social: teoría y ejercicios (2ª ed.). España: Paraninfo
- BUNGE, M. (1975). La investigación científica. Barcelona: Ariel.
- CROSBY, A. (1988). La medida de la realidad: la cuantificación y la sociedad occidental. Barcelona: Grijalbo.
- DELGADO, M. & GUTIÉRREZ, J. (1999). Métodos y técnicas cualitativas de investigación en ciencias sociales. Madrid: Síntesis.
- FESTINGER, L. & KATZ, D. (1999). Los métodos de investigación en las Ciencias sociales. Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- MIRÓN CANELO, J.A. (2013): Guía para la elaboración de trabajos científicos: grado, máster y posgrado. isbn 978-84-616-4429-2
- HOFFMAN, L (1998): Llenguatges d'especialitat. Barcelona. IULA, UPF.