

Interview Guide (Supervisors and Examiners)

Introductory text (read aloud):

“Thank you for participating. I will ask about your experiences supervising/examining MA dissertations at Batna 2 University’s English Department. Your responses will be anonymised. You may decline to answer any question. With your permission I will record this interview”.

Questions:

1. How do you define “rigour” when assessing an MA thesis in your department? (Prompt: methodological, theoretical, analytical, ethical dimensions)
2. What written criteria or rubrics do you refer to when assessing a thesis? How useful are they in practice?
3. Can you describe a recent thesis you examined or supervised that you regarded as rigorous? What features led you to that judgement?
4. Can you describe a recent thesis you felt lacked rigour? What specifically was missing or unclear?
5. How do issues of language (EFL) affect your assessment of substance vs. presentation? Do you separate language proficiency from epistemic contribution? How?
6. What role does supervisory work play in preparing theses for examination? Can you give examples of specific editorial or pedagogic interventions you provide?
7. How often do you cite the rubric in your written report? In what circumstances do you rely on tacit judgement instead?
8. Do you think internal-only boards shape how you evaluate theses? If yes, how?
9. Would annotated exemplars or examiner calibration sessions be useful? Why or why not?
10. Is there anything else you would like to add about standards of rigour, fairness, or improvements for thesis assessment?

Closing: Thank participant, remind about anonymisation and offer summary of findings.