MARKING CRITERIA
MML YEAR ABROAD TRANSLATION PROJECTS

Examiners are reminded to make use of the full range of marks

There are two sets of marking criteria for Year Abroad Translation Projects – one for the introduction and one for the translation.

Marking criteria - Introduction

Mark	***Class***	***Keyword***	***Content/ Argumentation***	***Research/ Presentation***
80-85	I* Dist.	OUTSTANDING	The introduction is an original contribution, written with clarity and precision; could be considered for publication with little amendment. Cultural context is discussed thoroughly as well as the relative importance and originality of the document and any previous translations.	Extensive background research; original and analytical assessment of primary and secondary source material. Outstanding presentation; referencing immaculate.
75-79 70-74	I	EXCELLENT VERY GOOD	An interpretative and considered approach that emphasizes how the document relates to a wider cultural context; very well structured with clear expression; reasoned justification for undertaking the translation; should be intellectually enterprising.	Excellent use of available research resources; primary and secondary sources are handled analytically; polished presentation and referencing.
60-69	II.1	GOOD	A sound presentation of objectives and consideration of the document within a context; competent and sensitive discussion of the nature and status of source material; clear account of reasons for choice.	Good use of available research resources; satisfactory presentation and referencing.
50-59	II.2	FAIR	Limited knowledge and understanding of source material; adequate structure, but not always well-developed or related adequately to larger questions. The case for a (new) translation is not made with enough conviction.	Illustration not always to the point; presentation, referencing and notes will often have inconsistencies.
40-49	III	POOR	Very basic approach; ideas are unstructured or tacked together; inadequate knowledge and understanding of source material.	Little or inappropriate use of available resources has been made; possibly sloppy presentation and severely inconsistent referencing. Little apt illustration of difficulties & solutions.
15-39	F	FAIL	Fails to demonstrate competent knowledge or understanding of source material. Inadequate explanation of choice of text and objectives.	Use of research resources, even if acknowledged, is unscholarly and plagiaristic; presentation is likely to be careless.

(continues)

MARKING CRITERIA
MML YEAR ABROAD TRANSLATION PROJECTS

Translation

Mark	*Class*	*Keyword*	*Comprehension and Conveyance of Sense*	*Style*
80-85	I* Dist.	OUTSTANDING	Should read like a publishable version by a skilled translator. No identifiable problems of comprehension. Sense fully conveyed, including ambiguities where these exist in the original.	Should give the feeling that the translation cannot be improved upon, though one or two natural failings should be allowed.
75-79 70-74	I	EXCELLENT VERY GOOD	Virtually no problems of comprehension except with the most highly specialized vocabulary. Very effective solutions to difficulties.	Shows flair for stylistic manipulation of English. Should sound as if text were written in English originally except where the language is placed under severe pressure of comprehension. Consistent stylistic register is maintained.
60-69	II.1	GOOD	Full comprehension of a wide range of vocabulary and structures. Specialized vocabulary may present some problems, but should show clear plausible attempt to overcome this.	English style clear and precise; should sound natural except in difficult syntactical constructions. The odd awkwardness is to be expected but sensitive solutions are also presented.
50-59	II.2	FAIR	General comprehension of a fair range of vocabulary, structures and style although there may be some deficiencies. Some evidence of plausible attempts to work around difficulties of perception, wordplay and other linguistic features.	Tends to awkwardness in English and literality of rendering, although this should not significantly impede the sense at this level. Alternatively, English may sound plausible, even elegant, in parts, but fails to convey accurately the sense of the original.
40-49	III	POOR	Comprehension of vocabulary and structures show quite noticeable deficiencies which obscure sense. Unable to cope with specialized vocabulary though some attempts to overcome this are perceptible. Very basic overall understanding of the source material.	Clumsy English; literal rendering impedes sense; often nonsensical turn of phrase in English; unnatural sounding. Little attempt to reflect stylistic features of the original.
15-39	F	FAIL	Comprehension of original seriously impeded; problems even with fairly everyday vocabulary and structures. Translation as a whole makes little sense.	Little sense of style; highly literal rendering which often makes poor sense in English.

Notes:

(i) Equal weight is attached to the introduction of translation and to the translation itself. The final mark should normally be the average of the two.

(ii) The criteria for the translation should be interpreted in the light of the particular translation strategy adopted by the candidate. Consistency between the strategy proposed in the introduction and its application in the translation is the important consideration.

(iii) The introduction to the translation (including the 'translator's note') must not be more than 4000 words in length. Any notes on textual difficulties appended to the translation will count as part of the 4000 words of commentary.

Approved 21 10 2021