

MARKING CRITERIA

TRANSLATIONS INTO ENGLISH (MML) Papers A2 & B2

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

| Mark | Class | Keyword | Comprehension and Conveyance of Sense | Translation technique and style | |
|--------------------|-------------|------------------------|---|---|--|
| 80-85 | I* Dist. | OUTSTANDING | Comprehension of the original is wholly convincing and its sense fully conveyed, including any ambiguities and/or nuances. | Translation strategy applied is highly effective and consistent throughout. Outstanding rendering of tone, style, and register. Leaves little room for improvement. | Reads like a good publishable version by a skilled translator. |
| 75-79 70-74 | I | EXCELLENT VERY GOOD | Virtually no problems of comprehension except with the most highly specialized vocabulary. Where there are nominal problems, judicious use of paraphrase or other devices ensure effective sense conveyance. | Translation strategy applied is highly effective and consistent, though the odd slip may be present. Displays excellent stylistic manipulation of English. Should read like an authentic piece of English. | 75-79: Shows considerable evidence of intelligent and imaginative translation solutions. 70-74: Shows ability to maintain consistent stylistic register, and to introduce variety when necessary. |
| 60-69 | II.1 | GOOD | Good comprehension of a wide range of vocabulary and structures. Specialized vocabulary may present some problems, but rendering shows clear plausible attempt to overcome them. 65-69: Highly plausible. 60-64: Plausible. | Translation strategy applied is generally effective, though there may be some inconsistencies. English style (apart from problems caused by comprehension) clear and precise. Sounds natural except in difficult syntactical constructions. The odd awkwardness is to be allowed. | 65-69: Demonstrates clear attempt to convey stylistic effects 60-64: Shows a slight tendency to literalism which nevertheless does not impede clear comprehension. |

Translation reform proposal 19/1/2024

| | | | | | |
|-------|------|------|--|--|---|
| 50-59 | II.2 | FAIR | <p>General comprehension of a fair range of vocabulary and structures, although there will be noticeable deficiencies. Problems with specialized vocabulary; some attempt should be made to overcome these.</p> <p>55-59: Some plausible attempt to work around gaps in lexical or syntactical knowledge.</p> <p>50-54: Deficiencies compromise sense.</p> | <p>Limited evidence that a consistent translation strategy has been applied. Tends to awkwardness in English and literalness of rendering, although this should not significantly impede the sense at this level.</p> <p>Alternatively, English may sound plausible, even elegant, in parts, but fails to convey accurately the sense of the original.</p> | <p>55-59: While not quite nonsensical, displays an over-literal style that sometimes makes the sense difficult to follow. Contrived and awkward in places.</p> <p>50-54: Often sounds contrived and awkward. Some nonsensical turns of phrase in English are present.</p> |
| 40-49 | III | POOR | <p>Comprehension of original significantly impeded, sometimes even with basic vocabulary and structures. Completely unable to cope with specialized vocabulary. There should nevertheless be an overall understanding of the context or gist.</p> | <p>No evidence that any translation strategy has been applied. Highly literal rendering which often makes poor sense in English. Virtually no sense of style.</p> | <p>45-49: Some discernible attempt to work round perceived problems.</p> <p>40-44: Directionless. Virtually no attempt to work round perceived problems.</p> |
| 15-39 | F | FAIL | <p>Comprehension of even basic linguistic items is impeded. The translation as a whole makes little sense.</p> | <p>No evidence that any translation strategy has been applied. No sense of style whatsoever. Often nonsensical.</p> | |

Last update: Jan 24

Approved, date: Jan 24, USC