

**MARKING CRITERIA**  
**MML PART II – YEAR ABROAD PROJECT (LINGUISTICS PROJECTS)**

<b>Mark</b>	<b>Class</b>	<b>Keyword</b>	<b>Choice and presentation of source material</b>	<b>Analysis of source material</b>
80-85	I* Dist.	OUTSTANDING	Highly resourceful collection or selection of material.	An outstanding and memorable performance, in which all the qualities deemed to constitute first-class work are present in a remarkable degree.
75-79 ↓ 70-74	I	EXCELLENT ↓ VERY GOOD	Discussion of source material demonstrates a critical and sensitive approach to methods for collection or selection. Glossing and translation of the material is thoughtful, accurate, sophisticated, and sensitive to the objectives of the work. Collection or selection of the material may demonstrate particular resourcefulness or be original in some other way.	A well-structured piece of work, with clear and complete argumentation, accurately expressed. Engages closely both with the source material and the stated object of inquiry, demonstrating confident mastery of detail. The source material is placed in a wider context, with relevant material from a wide range of sources. Primary and secondary sources are handled critically and analytically. Illustration is judicious and wide-ranging. Presentation and referencing are scholarly and polished.
60-69	II.1	GOOD	The nature and status of source material is competently presented. Demonstrates a sound awareness of the issues involved in collecting or selecting the material, competently applied in practice. Glossing and translation are thoughtful and accurate.	The work shows a good broad-based knowledge of the object of inquiry, presented in an organised way, with a clear argument. The source material is placed in context, and its relevance is clearly brought out, with full and appropriate exemplification. Broadly accurate in technical detail, with accurate presentation and referencing.
50-59	II.2	FAIR	Shows awareness of issues in collection or selection of material, but this is not always applied consistently in practice. Glossing and translation of material are adequate and conform to basic scholarly principles. May contain some basic factual errors in understanding or interpretation.	A discernable structure is evident and the ideas expressed are broadly accurate and relevant to the source material. However, arguments may be underdeveloped or the significance of the source material left implicit; breadth of reference may be lacking; there may be a tendency to state ideas rather than to explain or justify them; illustration of ideas is not always to the point; presentation and referencing will often have inconsistencies.

(continues)

40-49	III	POOR	Little awareness of issues involved in collecting or selecting the material. Shows some knowledge and understanding of the source material, but glossing and translation are inconsistent and error-prone.	Shows some knowledge of the object of inquiry, but is poorly organised, with ideas left unstructured. Deficient in understanding the relevance of the source material, with little or inappropriate illustration from that material; little reference to the wider context; severely inconsistent referencing.
15-39	F	FAIL	Procedure for collecting or selecting source material is unexplained or unscholarly. Glossing and translation of material is thoughtless, careless and inconsistent. Fails to demonstrate understanding of source material.	Fails to explain the object of inquiry, or the relevance of the source material. Use of research resources, even if acknowledged, is unscholarly and highly derivative or plagiaristic.

**Notes:**

The Linguistics Project will consist of an analysis of not more than 4,000 words. An examiner who has reason to believe that a Year Abroad Project has exceeded the word limit and thus infringed the rubric should ask the Faculty Office to ascertain the exact word count. One mark will be deducted for every 100 words or part thereof over the maximum word count.

Approved 27 11 2017