

Reçu le: 24/02 / 2025 Accepté le: 26/05 / 2025 Publié le: 01/06 / 2025



Exploring Common Mistakes in Conducting Master's Dissertation among EFL Students of Language and Communication Master 2 Program at the University of Relizane

 **Benchaa Lakehal**
lakehal.benchaa@univ-relizane.dz
University of Relizane / Algérie

استكشاف الأخطاء الشائعة في إعداد مذكرات الماستر لدى طلبة السنة الثانية
ماستر في برنامج اللغة والتواصل بجامعة غليزان

 **بن شاعة لكحل**
lakehal.benchaa@univ-relizane.dz
جامعة غليزان / الجزائر

ABSTRACT:

Conducting a Master dissertation is an academic engagement that requires a strong understanding of research methodology course in terms of both theory and practice. This paper aims to identify common mistakes committed by M2 students that may hinder academic quality and success of their end-term project. A document analysis is used as a main data collection instrument in which 10 supervisors' feedback reports were analysed thematically. Findings indicated that the major frequent mistakes are related to academic language use (grammar flaws, punctuation errors and incorrect sentence structure), poor design of data collection tools, superficial analysis of data and lack of in-depth and analytical literature review. In view of these mistakes, it is suggested to offer learner training in form of seminars and workshops to better equip students with practical guidelines of research process. Besides, reconsideration of the weekly hourly volume of research methodology to enable teachers to cover all possible fundamentals of research.

Keywords: Dissertation Writing, Master Students, Common Mistakes, Higher Education

ملخص البحث

إجراء أطروحة الماجستير هو التزام أكاديمي يتطلب فهماً قوياً لمقرر منهجية البحث من الجانبين النظري والتطبيقي. يهدف هذا البحث إلى تحديد الأخطاء الشائعة التي يرتكبها طلاب السنة الثانية ماستر والتي قد تعيق جودة العمل الأكاديمي ونجاح مشروعهم. تم استخدام تحليل الوثائق كأداة رئيسية لجمع البيانات، حيث تم تحليل تقارير ملاحظات 10 مشرفين. كشفت النتائج أن الأخطاء الشائعة الرئيسية تتعلق باستخدام اللغة الأكاديمية (الأخطاء النحوية، أخطاء في علامات الوقف، والتركييب الخاطئ للجمل)، الاختيار غير المناسب لأدوات جمع البيانات، التحليل السطحي للبيانات، والافتقار إلى مراجعة أدبية معمقة وتحليلية. في ضوء هذه الأخطاء، يُقترح تقديم تدريب للمتعلمين على شكل ندوات وورشات عمل لتزويد الطلاب بإرشادات عملية حول عملية البحث. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، ينبغي إعادة النظر في الحجم الأسبوعي لساعات تدريس منهجية البحث لتمكين الأساتذة من تغطية جميع أساسيات البحث العلمي. الكلمات المفتاحية: كتابة الأطروحة، طلاب الماجستير، الأخطاء الشائعة، التعليم العالي.

1. INTRODUCTION

Within the scope of research and education, Master's dissertation represents a pivotal milestone in students' academic journey, in which they investigate an issue of interest to contribute efficiently to academia. Writing a master dissertation demands research skills, academic commitment and critical thinking. Besides, the complexity of this process lies in students' ability to utilize their theoretical knowledge in a practical way. Students are expected to master foundational research competencies, including identifying a suitable research theme and determining appropriate methodological approaches. A solid understanding of these components can significantly facilitate the research process, enhance overall academic performance and boost their motivation to do research enthusiastically.

In the Algerian context, students undertake research methodology course starting from first year licence degree up to second year master degree; throughout this course, students are introduced to the different mechanisms of research methodology in terms of theory and practice. Moreover, the course is based on topic selection criteria, drafting the research proposal, literature review, data collection methods, data analysis and interpretation, discussion of results and writing the report. The aim behind the course is make students ready to do their research with minimum obstacles and mistakes; however, they often commit mistakes and encounter enormous challenges and difficulties in getting their research completed in good way. These mistakes and hindrances are due to limited experience as researchers and inadequate practical knowledge, which might result in lower quality of Master's dissertations.

To this end, the following research questions are raised:

- What are the common mistakes EFL Master 2 students encounter in dissertation writing?
- What is the impact Master students' mistakes on the quality of the dissertations?

The significance of the present research lies in making both supervisors and students aware of the errors and flaws committed during the process of Master's dissertation writing. This is likely to level up the quality of research and to ensure effective contribution to academia and existing body of knowledge.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Defining Master's Dissertation

Due to its paramount importance, different scholars especially in the field of research have defined the concept of a dissertation in various ways, each emphasizing distinct aspects such as structure, purpose, and methodology. Oxford Learner's Dictionaries defines a dissertation as "a long piece of writing on a particular subject, especially one written for a university degree" this indicates that a dissertation is a lengthy and detailed written work in which the researcher investigates a specific area of interest to obtain a university degree.

Biggam (2011) conceptualizes a Master's dissertation as "the production of a substantial piece of work", this significant work usually amounting to approximately 15,000 words. Biggam highlights the key expectations and requirements for a Master's dissertation, he emphasises that a Master's dissertation is a major academic project that demonstrates a student's ability to conduct independent research and produce a considerable written work, which is detailed, well researched, and thorough.

With regard to the Algerian higher education, a dissertation is a written academic document on a specific topic that is submitted by M2 students in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the Master degree in a particular field of study. In this regard, Bekki (2023) puts that "a dissertation is defined as a long academic paper that is submitted by Master's students at the end of the program" (p.601). This long piece of work addresses an issue with an aim of solving problems and adding

valuable insights to the body of the existing literature. It demonstrates the researcher's (M2 student) ability to conduct a systematic research, work independently or in collaboration with others and reflect critically on previous works to shape a new understanding of the issue at stake. This academic work involves, but not limited to the following elements

- Abstract
- General introduction
- Literature review chapter
- Methodology chapter
- Discussions and recommendation chapter
- General conclusion
- List of references
- Appendices

Writing the aforementioned fundamentals of a Master dissertation is not a straightforward task to do, it is somehow challenging and time consuming especially for novice researchers. Having insufficient understanding of each part and the way in which it is processed and written might be challenging for some supervisees. To minimise students' anxiety, remedy their deficiencies and correct their mistakes, there is a need to provide them with some practical guidelines on the "how" to do each part.

3. Students' Challenges in Writing Master's Dissertation

Writing a dissertation is one of the most demanding tasks for students, it is often viewed as the final touch that reflects a student's ability to conduct independent research. However, many students encounter a range of challenges throughout the process (Bitchener & Basturkmen, 2006; Flowerdew & Li, 2009; Hyland, 2004; Kwan, 2008).

For instance, Biggam (2011) puts that dissertation writing has always been "a problematic area for students" (p.1). It means that students often face significant difficulties when completing their dissertations. Furthermore, these problems can include understanding academic requirements, conducting in-depth research, organizing their ideas, managing time effectively, and coping with the pressure of producing original, high-quality work. In the same view, Biggam (2011) lists the following challenges:

- Making a balance between their core subject areas alongside their dissertation.
- Having a high level of independent study and self-directed research.
- Managing time to complete the dissertation within the given deadlines.

Meeting deadlines and planning, study workload management and being autonomous as a researcher are essential academic skills students struggle to maintain maybe due to some reasons such as lack of effective planning, not knowing how to set priorities and organise task. Moreover, Saidin, Veloo and Shari (2016) believe that limited research experience and supervision guidance are the main obstacles hindering successful dissertation writing.

Other central challenges are at the core level of conducting the dissertation, language-related issues such as poor academic tone and word choice, and methodological barriers such as limited research-based knowledge. In this regard, Hamzaoui (2022) states that Algerian University students' obstacles are "lack of research knowledge including the inability to write academically using academic vocabularies" (p.41). To illustrate more, Kotamjani and Hassin (2017) highlights that linguistics problems are mainly writing coherence paragraphs, using proposer academic language and

vocabulary style, linking sentences smoothly, using correct grammar, and paraphrasing and summarising sentences.

These challenges and obstacles may vary across context, setting and the type of students. Regardless of the nature of the barriers, be it psychological, linguistic, and methodological or organisational, the possibility of producing a qualified and substantial work is at risk.

4. Methodology

4.1 Research Methods

The present research employs a qualitative research to collect in-depth information about the recurring mistakes M2 students commit from topic selection to writing the final research report. The researcher used a document analysis as the main research method in which examiners' feedback reports are analysed thematically. Document analysis is defined by Bowen (2009) as "a systematic procedure for reviewing or evaluating documents", these materials can be both "printed and electronic" (p.27). This type of data collection instrument aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of such organizational or institutional documents in terms of content, aims and procedure.

4.2 Description of the Supervisor's Feedback Report

The examiners' feedback report a written document prepared by the dissertation examiner in which a detailed report about the overall quality of research is provided. The feedback is related to the quality of the problem being studies, language used, content provided, methodology employed, and bibliography. After receiving the students' dissertations, examiners start reading and assessing the research work; it will either be accepted with major or minor revisions or rejected in case of proved plagiarism. .

Be it with minor or major revisions, the students are still required to modify, correct and edit the work before the final submission. The major aims of this report are:

- To evaluate the quality of the work including originality and clarity
- To shed light on strengths and weaknesses of the dissertation
- To provide insights about the key components of the dissertations such as language, content and methodology
- To raise students' awareness of their mistakes and errors
- To guide students for better improvement in the future

This report is designed to systematically assess the quality of a Master's thesis, focusing on five key academic components as summarised in the following table:

Table1: Supervisor's Feedback report description

Criteria	Details
Institutional Information	- University: University of Relizane - Faculty: Faculty of Letters and Languages - Department: English - Field of Study: Foreign Languages - Specialty: Language and Communication
Basic Identifiers	- Examiner's Name and Surname - Examiner's Academic Rank - Student(s) Name and Surname - Title of the Thesis
Evaluation Criteria	- <i>Language</i> (5 points): it assesses spelling, punctuation, capitalization, grammar, sentence structure, vocabulary, word choice, coherence, and clarity.

	- <i>Methodology</i> (7 points): it evaluates research design, alignment with the topic, objectives and questions, data collection procedures, analysis and interpretation, and adherence to academic standards. - <i>Problematic and Content</i> (8 points): it examines the clarity of the research problem, relevance to the research scope, and the literature review, including key concepts and theories.
Final Decision and Justification	- The examiner indicates whether the thesis is accepted for evaluation. If rejected, a detailed justification is required.
Final Mark and Examiner's Signature	- A final score out of 20 is assigned. - The examiner signs the document to validate the assessment

Table 1 demonstrates a detailed description of supervisor's feedback report. It provides standardized and constructive feedback related to three main elements namely language, methodology and problematic and content.

4.3 Sample

The sample of the current research consists of 10 supervisor's feedback reports who are currently teacher at Relizane University and eight completed Master's dissertations the researcher, as an examiner, has reviewed and assessed from 2022 to 2024. The sampling technique opted for is convenience and purposive sampling because the researcher is also a teacher at the same setting in which the supervisors whose feedback reports were analysed and teachers from different academic backgrounds such as ESP, applied linguistics, didactics to see if that effects their evaluation criteria.

4.4 Ethical issues

Ensuring ethical considerations such as obtaining necessary approvals from teachers is pivotal for the validity of reliability of data. Via email, the researcher has contacted teachers (who are his colleagues) to request permissions to get access to supervisor' feedback reports. Teachers were informed that the provided data would be used for academic purposed and with complete confidentiality in which their identity is kept anonymous

- Supervisors' Feedback Reports Analysis

The supervisor's feedback report provides a detailed description of three main categories based on which supervisors evaluate students' dissertations: language, methodology, and problematic and content. Below is an in depth thematic analysis:

.1 Language

This major evaluation criterion plays a crucial role in dissertation writing due to its paramount importance in maintaining clarity and coherence of ideas and data being presented. The feedback on language use in the dissertations reveals several recurring themes as illustrated below:

a) Grammar, Punctuation, and Sentence Structure:

Many supervisors noted problems with grammar, punctuation, and sentence structure. These issues included misplaced punctuation, subject-verb agreement errors, wordiness, and faulty parallelism. For instance, supervisor 1 mentioned that "misplaced punctuation affects sentence structures." In similar vein, supervisor 5 said that "many sentences especially the longer ones have not been accurately punctuated"

Moreover, supervisor 3 highlighted that the main issues of language are related “to misuse of punctuation and grammar mistakes” and that students commit mistakes like “mixing between possessives and plurals, the misuse of subject-verb agreement, the use of wordiness and faulty parallelism” emphasising that these mistakes appear many times through the research.

b) Formal and Informal language

Some supervisors praised students for using formal and academic language, which is appropriate for a master's dissertation. In this context, supervisor 2 noted that the researchers had a "good command of the language," and supervisor 8 mentioned that students manage to use "correct academic English except for minor word-choices" However, there are some students who struggled with maintaining a formal tone, with issues such as wordiness, informal word choices, and fragments. As illustrated by supervisor 3 who pointed out "incoherent fragments," and supervisor 10 who noted "the language used is quite simple" but with many errors such as spelling, punctuation, capitalisation and sentence structure. .

c) Spelling and Capitalization

Despite the assistance of the auto-corrector of the computer in highlighting spelling mistakes, several supervisors pointed out to spelling mistakes, particularly in key sections like the cover page, acknowledgements, and table of contents. In this juncture, supervisor 10 mentioned that there are "many spelling and capitalization mistakes" across multiple pages. Supervisor 4 who highlighted that “minor revision as far as capitalization is required”.

d) Tense and Word Structure

Some students struggled with consistent tense usage, which affected the flow of the dissertation. Many students seem to have difficulty with which tense to use especially in data analysis, discussion and presenting the results. Supervisor 6 declared that “there are various mistakes of different types (grammar...tense use, etc.) in the same line of thought, supervisor 9 mentioned "mistakes in tense use." Issues with word formation and structure were also noted, particularly in complex sentences, for example supervisor 9 highlighted "word structure" errors

Table 2: Language Evaluation

Score (out of 5)	Number of Supervisors	Percentage
2	1	10%
3	5	50%
3.5	2	20%
4	1	10%
5	1	10%
Total	10	100%

The vast majority of students struggled the most with grammar, punctuation, spelling and sentence structure, leading to the lowest average grade (3.4/5)As illustrated in table 1, A score of 3 was given by 50% of supervisors, indicating that most students had moderate proficiency in academic language but made several noticeable mistakes. Two supervisors (20%) gave a 3.5, suggesting slightly above average language skills, though still not free of issues. Only 10% awarded a score of 5, meaning excellent language performance was rare. Another 10% assigned a score of 4, reflecting competent but not outstanding writing. One supervisor (10%) gave a low score of 2, highlighting significant issues such as grammar, punctuation, and word structure problems.

.2 Methodology

To ensure doing a systematic research, collecting reliable data and reaching valid results, the researcher is ought to pay huge attention to the methodology adopted. Below are major methodological errors Master students do in writing their dissertations:

a. Research Tools and Instruments

Some students used appropriate research tools, leading to reliable results, Supervisor 1 praised students for the selection of appropriate research tools and so did supervisor 9. Supervisor 8 also stated that students succeed in the choice of instruments that fit for the study purpose. In a similar vein, supervisor 2 said, "the two researchers have selected appropriate research methodology tools to fulfil the main objectives of their exploratory investigation"

While other students chose tools that were not well aligned with the research objectives and the nature of the theme being studies as mentioned by supervisor 10 "The research tools used are not aligned with the purpose of the study; this kind of research themes requires an experimental method". In addition to the use of a "teachers' questionnaire" that was not well-designed.

b. Data Collection and Analysis

According to the majority of supervisors, despite student's ability to choose research tools that are aligned with the research objectives as highlighted above, they still have a chaotic or disorganized data analysis processes. For example, supervisor 6 criticized that "the way the analysis proceeds is chaotic" where data analysis took place before the discussion of results. Supervisors often noted that the analysis lacked depth, particularly in qualitative studies. In this regard, supervisor 4 mentioned "the interview required deep analysis," and supervisor 10 noted that "Classroom observation is not well analysed"

c. Research Process

Some students followed the research process steps accurately, while others skipped important stages. For example, supervisor 8 praised the students for "following the research process steps," while supervisor 6 noted that the candidates "did not respect the stages of the research process."

Table 3: Methodology Evaluation

Score (ouf of 7)	Number of Supervisors	Percentage
4	2	20%
5	4	40%
5.5	1	10%
6	3	30%
Total	10	100%

Table 2 demonstrated that the majority of supervisors (40%) gave a score of 5, suggesting that most students demonstrated adequate understanding of research methodology. 30% gave a score of 6, reflecting strong methodological design with minor issues. Two supervisors (20%) gave a score of 4, indicating the presence of methodological flaws or gaps in research execution. One supervisor (10%) gave a 5.5, suggesting solid performance nearing excellence but with slight room for improvement. The average grade of methodology was 5.3/7, with some issues as highlighted above.

.3 Problematic and Content

The way the problem is stated determines the essence of the whole work since it is considered as the starting point. The content being reviewed supports understanding the nature of the problem and make it is clear for the reader. Thus, well stated problem and content are pivotal elements in the research process. The feedback on the problematic and content of the dissertations revealed the following items

a) Clarity of Research Problem

Supervisors stated that many students clearly defined their research problems and objectives, which added value to their work. According to supervisor 1 "The issue under study is definitely accurate, clear and very well investigated" so did supervisor 4 who noted "The problematic is well-stated" and supervisor 5 also praised the "clearly formulated objectives." It was also mentioned that "The problematic was set appropriately" supervisor 9 said. However, others struggled to define their research problems for instance, supervisor 10 noted that the "statement of problem is not well stated."

b) Content Consistency and Depth

The contents of many dissertations were descriptive rather than analytical, lacking depth in their analysis. Supervisor 4 noted that "The content is descriptive, it lacks analysis", relevance was also an issue for some students, for example, supervisor 6 highlighted that the theoretical content "lacks relevance to the perspectives the research" leading to inclusion of redundant information. By contrast, supervisor 5 praised students on content consistency saying, "Content consistency has been successfully achieved"

Several supervisors noted issues with the conclusion, either because it was missing or because it needed to be re-written. Supervisor 4 revealed that the "conclusion of the first chapter must be re-written," and Supervisor 10 noted the absence of a "general conclusion."

c) Originality and Novelty

For some supervisors, some students demonstrated originality in their research, supervisor 7 praised the students on the choice of the topic and the way it was addressed "the topic gave the research a sense of novelty and showed originality in the study". Others addressed themes that had been repeatedly investigated, leading to a lack of novelty. Supervisor 3 noted that the theme of "e-learning tools" had been "repeatedly investigated."

Table 4: Problematic and Content Evaluation

Score (out of 8)	Number of Supervisors	Percentage
4	1	10%
5	2	20%
5.5	2	20%
6	2	20%
6.5	1	10%
7	3	30%
Total	10	100%

As shown in table 3, the highest score of 7 was given by 30% of supervisors, suggesting these students presented and discussed their dissertation problem with excellent clarity, relevance, and depth. 20% gave a score of 6, meaning the work was above average in content quality and problem

formulation. Another 20% scored the content at 5.5, and 20% at 5, reflecting a range of average to above-average performance. One supervisor each (10%) gave scores of 6.5 and 4, with the latter possibly indicating poor articulation of the research problem or weak content cohesion. Students performed slightly better in problematic, content criteria (6.1/8) compared with the previous criteria.

- Discussion

Language being the most significant aspects of writing the master dissertation through which researchers put their thoughts into meaningful words had surprisingly the lowest average grade (3.4/5), indicating significant linguistic problem for students. Though Master students have been learning the language for almost four years, they still do mistakes at the level of language mechanics such as capitalization, punctuation, spelling in addition to grammar and sentence structure. These findings are consistent with findings from studies on dissertation writing within the same academic context. For example, Bakhou and Bouhania (2021) highlight that the main problems encountered by master students face are related to the linguistic difficulties such as limited lexical background knowledge, grammatical flaws and lack of coherence and cohesion in writing.

Similarly, Hemaidia and Abdelhadi (2021) conclude that one of the common indicators of a weak dissertation is “inadequate academic writing style” (p.10). The main mistakes are done at the level of spelling, informal language, wordiness, incorrect grammar and the use of long and unclear sentences. This inconsistency of style and poor writing skills lead to lack of clarity of the ideas and knowledge being delivered to the readers. .

Additionally, in the second evaluation criteria, methodology is one of the fundamentals of the success of any research work has scored moderately (5.3/7) being one of the key elements of writing the master's dissertation. The score of methodology, which is relatively satisfactory, signifies that students may have a basic understanding of methodology in term of theory, but still struggle to the methodological chapter at the practical level. The main mistakes associated with methodology are summarised as follows:

- Limited research tools (some relied on a single tool).
- Poor questionnaire design (structure and alignment issues).
- Incomplete analysis (interviews and classroom observations lacked depth).

In the same way, Bekki (2023) argues that “students' lack of understanding of the content of the methodology chapter was one of the most common difficulties they encountered” (p.610). Issues such as research tool design and the superficial analysis of data, particularly in qualitative studies are the main obstacles highlighted in the supervisors' feedback reports. In this juncture, Abdulrahman Hasan Abdullah (2023) indicates that the majority of the Yemen postgraduate students committed common mistakes related to “inappropriate methodology, references system was not clear and some plagiarism issues.” (p.9). Some students often struggle with interpreting qualitative data, leading to descriptive rather than analytical content. This aligns with the feedback from supervisors who criticized the lack of depth in analysis.

Content and problematic criteria performed slightly better (6.1/8), but Lack of depth in analysis, unclear problem statements in some studies, missing citations and insufficient references. Irrelevant or insufficient theoretical framework in certain cases were the main common mistakes. The tendency to produce descriptive rather than analytical content is a well-documented issue in academic writing. This aligns with Chouchane (2024) who argues that students often focus on summarizing superficially existing literature rather than critically analyzing and synthesizing it, which restricts the value it adds to the dissertation.

The difficulty in clearly defining research problems is another common issue. This is consistent with the results revealed by Manchishi et al (2015) in which they argue that the main

challenge facing students in writing the research proposal is their inability to come up with clear statement of problem.

Writing a Master's dissertation is challenging task especially for students with limited research experience. As highlighted earlier, the main common mistakes committed by students are language related issues such as grammar, punctuation and academic writing, methodological barriers such as lack of in depth analysis and discussion. As for content and problematic, the most frequent problem is descriptive contents rather than analytical ones. These mistakes and others minimises the validity, credibility and reliability of the research findings, leading to poor quality of dissertation writing in terms of content and form.

- Limitations of the study

One major significant limitation of the present study is the restricted sample size, as it was based on ten teachers' feedback reports only. Likewise, the research was conducted entirely within one institution (Relizane University). This narrow framework limits the ability to gather a diverse range of perspectives and experiences from other academic contexts. As a result, the findings cannot be assuredly generalized to a broader population of teachers or academic settings.

Another limitation lies in the content and depth of the feedback reports themselves. Many of the reports lacked detailed, offering limited insights into critical areas of student work. Specifically, recurring issues such as improper referencing, violations of ethical standards, or methodological inconsistencies and language flaws were either slightly addressed or not mentioned at all. This absence of thorough and reflective feedback constrains the analysis potentially preventing the study from fully capturing the diverse challenges students typically face in dissertation writing.

- CONCLUSION

The present research aims at identifying the recurring mistakes Algerian EFL Master 2 students make in dissertation writing. These mistakes stand as an obstacle in achieving a higher research quality and exhibit an academic piece of writing. The main flaws are related to three main elements namely 1) language mechanics such as spelling, tense use, vocabulary choice and sentence structure; 2) methodological issues, students seem to have a serious problem with designing research tools aligning the set objectives and deep and critical analysis of data. In addition to 3) problematic and content struggles, this can clearly be observed in students' difficulty with in-depth analysis and examination of the related literature. Examiners as recurring mistakes also highlighted problems such as in-text citation, and referencing style. Although students have shown a basic understanding of research as a process, i.e, familiarity with core elements of research, students are still unprepared for effective dissertation writing.

Consequently, the aforementioned mistakes affect the overall quality and value of the dissertation in terms of form and content. In view of these challenges, the following recommendations are set:

- a) Offering Supervisor training, this is through training supervisors to give constructive, formative feedback and support students' development in both research and writing.
- b) Organising extensive practical trainings for students to be able to conduct their research with minimum obstacles and mistakes.
- c) Promoting collaboration between the research methodology instructor and the academic writing instructor; this encourages the two teachers to work together to provide students with clear understanding about to design research and how to write it clearly.
- d) Increasing the weekly hourly volume of research methodology course would effectively enable the teacher to cover as many aspects of research methodology as possible, which

eventually lead to well-organized and qualified dissertations.

While dissertation writing presents numerous challenges, they can be significantly reduced through proper guidance and supervision, interdisciplinary collaboration, and institutional support. Addressing these issues not only improves student academic success but also enhances the overall quality of academic research.

- References

1. Abdulrahman Hasan Abdullah, L. (2023). Common mistakes committed and challenges faced in research proposal writing by University of Aden postgraduate students. *Journal of Social Studies*, 29(1).
2. Bakhou, B., & Bouhania, B. (2021). *Dissertation writing challenges as perceived by a group of Algerian master students at Adrar University*. *Journal for Social and Human Sciences*, 20(4), 392–405.
3. Bekki, C. (2023). The Challenges Faced by Supervisees in the Writing Phase of the Supervision Process. *Journal of Faslo el-khitab*, 21(02), 599-616.
4. Bitchener, J., & Basturkmen, H. (2006). Perceptions of the difficulties of postgraduate L2 thesis students writing the discussion section. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 5(1), 4–18
5. Biggam, J. (2011). *Succeeding with your master's dissertation: A step-by-step handbook* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
6. Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
7. Chouchane, S. (2024, November). *Mistakes to be avoided when writing a dissertation in literature*. Paper presented at Writing a Master's Dissertation: Academic Writing Challenges & Practical Solutions, Sétif 2 University, Algeria. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication>.
8. Flowerdew, J., & Li, Y. (2009). English or Chinese?: The trade-off between local and international publication among Chinese academics in the humanities and social sciences. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18(1), 1-16.
9. Hamzaoui, C. (2022). A thematic analysis on the obstacles experienced by EFL students and supervisors in master's thesis writing. *ATRAS Journal. A Conference Special Issue*, March 2022, Moulay Tahar University, Saida, Algeria.
10. Hemaïdia, M., & Abdelhadi, A. (2021). Exploring master's dissertation writing common weaknesses: An analysis of interviews with examiners. *Développement des Sciences Sociales*, 14(1), 1–21.
11. Hyland, K. (2004). Disciplinary interactions: Metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 133–151.
12. Kotamjani, S. S., & Hussin, H. (2017). Perceptions of challenges in writing academically: Iranian postgraduate students' perspectives. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 6(4), 1-4. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.6n.4p.1>
13. Kwan, B. S. C. (2008). The nexus of reading, writing and researching in the doctoral undertaking of humanities and social sciences: Implications for literature reviewing. *English for Specific Purposes*, 27(1), 42-56.
14. Manchishi, P. C., Ndhlovu, D., & Mwanza, D. S. (2015). Common mistakes committed and challenges faced in research proposal writing by University of Zambia postgraduate students. *International Journal of Humanities, Social Sciences, and Education (IJHSSE)*, 2(3), 126–138.
15. Oxford Learner's Dictionaries. (n.d.). *Dissertation*. In *Oxford Learner's Dictionaries*. Retrieved October 10, 2023, from <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/dissertation>
16. Saidin, K., Veloo, A., and Shari, A. (2016). Exploring postgraduate students' challenges in doing master research. *International Conference on Education and New Development (END 2016)*, 12–14 June 2016, Ljubljana, Slovenia. <http://end-educationconference.org/2016/>

- **Appendix : Supervisor's Feedback Report**

People's Democratic and Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
University of Relizane
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of English



Field: Foreign Languages
Branch: English Language
Specialty: Language and Communication
Academic year:

Report on the Graduation Thesis – Master

Name and surname of the examiner:
Rank:
Name and surname of the student(S).....
Title of the thesis:

Thesis Evaluation in terms of:

- 1- Language: (.../ 05)
.....
- 2- Methodology: (...../ 07)
.....
- 3- Problematic and content: (...../ 08)
-

Examiner's decision: Thesis accepted for evaluation: yes ☐ No ☐

In case the report is negative, the examiner is required to mention the reasons for refusing to discuss the thesis:

.....

Mark: / 20

Relizane on: / /

Examiner's signature

Department of English