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| Dissertation Marking Grid |
| STUDENT NUMBER |  |
|  | -39% | 40%-49% | 50%-59% | 60%-69% | 70%+ | Grade Achieved & Comments |
| Learning outcomes & scholarship | Does not exhibit a satisfactory knowledge & understanding of translation theories & techniques, understanding of link between theory, practice & practice-related issues and/or standards. Low standard of scholarship with poor linkage of issues/themes, poor use of evidence, unsubstantiated claims etc. | Exhibits a barely satisfactory knowledge & understanding of translation theories & techniques, some understanding of link between theory, practice & practice-related issues and/or standards, but with many gaps. Standard of scholarship likely to be undermined by poor linkage of issues/themes, poor use of evidence, unsubstantiated claims etc. Overall conception lacks ambition. Plenty of scope for improvement. | Exhibits a good knowledge & understanding of translation theories & techniques, and of the of link between theory, practice & practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains a good level of scholarship and demonstrates clear evidence of engagement in the discipline that lifts it above the merely ‘competent’. Exceeds the requirements of a pass | Exhibits a very good knowledge & understanding of both translation theories & techniques, a good understanding of link between theory, practice & practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains a good level of scholarship, but lacks the sophistication of execution required for a distinction. | Exhibits an extensive knowledge & understanding of both translation theories & techniques, a strong understanding of link between theory, practice & practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains an impressive level of scholarship, though there may be scope for improvement in some areas |  |
| Structuring | Does not exhibit a satisfactory standard of structuring. Unclear, little evidence of logical progression. Significant inaccuracies. Fundamental flaws in structure. | A barely satisfactory standard achieved. Mostly clear, some evidence of logical progression. Some significant inaccuracies. There may be flaws in structure, some of them fundamental in nature. | A good standard of structuring: clear, mostly logical, and errors are mostly very minor. There may be occasional and relatively minor flaws in flow of argument. | A very good standard of structuring: clear, mostly logical, and errors are mostly very minor. | A high standard of structuring: clear, logical and few errors. |  |
| Methodology | Methodology is inadequate. Research tools employed are unsatisfactory. Data retrieved of limited, breadth, veracity or reliability. No evidence of awareness of issues associated with use of qualitative/qualitative data. | Methodology is basic but sound. It is under-developed and lacking in sophistication. Research tools employed are satisfactory but very basic. Data retrieved may be of limited, breadth, veracity or reliability. Only a basic awareness of issues associated with use of qualitative/qualitative data. | Methodology good but may contain minor flaws. Research tools are functional but lack finesse. The research approach is competent but unimaginative. Competent but basic use of quantitative and/or qualitative methods. | Some weaknesses in methodology or use of research tools, but very good attempt at the research process. Competent use of quantitative and/or qualitative methods. Research tools of good standard. Methodological approach lacks the sophistication required for a distinction. | The dissertation is underpinned by a sound methodology. Demonstrates a high level of skill and sensitivity in the use of quantitative and/or qualitative methods. Research tools employed are of a high standard. |  |
| Argument & Understanding | No evidence of engagement in the relevant issues. No originality or insights. Gaps in understanding & knowledge; does not address most aspects of the dissertation. | Some evidence of engagement in the relevant issues, but may be rather basic and unimaginative in its interpretation and argumentative purpose/focus. Little originality and only occasional insights. Gaps in understanding & knowledge; may not have addressed all aspects. | A good grasp of the subject and contains evidence of insight. Though it may lack finesse, it is mostly thorough, largely clear and shows a good understanding of the subject/topic/ translation schools of thought. | A very good grasp of the subject and contains evidence of insight. Though it may lack finesse, it is thorough, clear and shows a very good understanding of the subject/topic/translation schools of thought. Lacks the intellectual independence required for a distinction. | Coherent & articulate arguments, demonstrating a high level of understanding of the topic & associated issues/debates/translation schools of thought. |  |
| Criticality & Analysis | Is inattentive to the subject matter. Almost totally descriptive rather than critical or analytical. Contains few useful observations, and insights offered are unsophisticated. | Is attentive to the subject matter, but balanced mostly descriptive rather than critical or analytical in its approach. It may contain some useful observations, but insights offered are very limited in scope & sophistication | Contains some good examples of critical analysis but limited originality & creativity in use of ideas, concepts, case studies etc. Good level of self-reflection, but plenty of scope for development. | Contains some very good examples of critical analysis but limited originality & creativity in use of ideas, concepts, case studies etc. Very good level of self-reflection though some scope for development. Critical approach lacks the sophistication required for a distinction. | Exhibits a high standard of critical analysis and/or originality & creativity. Employs ideas, concepts & theories to good effect. High level of self-reflection. |  |
| Use of Sources & Evidence | Draws on a small range of sources. Little/no assessment of evidence. Few topics are addressed and not examined in sufficient detail. Little/no use of examples. Treatment of data, translation comparisons or literature is not sound or too narrow in scope and underdeveloped. Understanding of the limits of evidence not articulated or understood. | Draws on a limited range of sources. Some assessment of evidence. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail. Some use of examples. Treatment of data, translation comparisons or literature is basically sound but narrow in scope & underdeveloped. Understanding of the limits of evidence not fully articulated or understood. | Draws on a good range of sources but range may be rather predictable. Good use of evidence/comparisons of translations. Good awareness of the limits of evidence. | Draws on a very good range of material but lacks breadth of engagement with the secondary literature required for a distinction. Judicious use of sources & evidence/comparisons of translations appropriate to the discipline. Topics are mostly addressed in sufficient detail. Very good awareness of the limits of evidence. | Exhibits a strong command of data or literature, drawing on a broad range of material and/or examining the topic in some detail and/or comparing translations. Demonstrates a high level of awareness of, and sensitivity to, the limits of evidence. |  |
| Academic Referencing | Referencing unsatisfactory, with inconsistencies or instances of poor/limited citation. Unsatisfactory bibliography with weaknesses in composition & use of referencing conventions. | Referencing largely satisfactory, though some inconsistencies or instances of poor/limited citation may be present. Satisfactory bibliography but likely to reveal some weaknesses in composition & use of referencing conventions. | A good standard of referencing, though errors or inconsistencies may be present. Good bibliography but possibly containing technical errors, some minor, some more serious. | A very good standard of referencing, though errors or inconsistencies may be present. Very good bibliography but possibly containing technical errors, some minor, some more serious. Referencing practice lacks sophistication required for a distinction. | A high standard of referencing throughout. Bibliography conforms to a high standard, though there may be a number of small errors which can be easily corrected in future work. |  |
| Written Communication | Standard of written English fails to meet that required for a Pass at Masters level; a number of serious errors may be present; Poorly structured & written, with poor attention to vocabulary & grammar. The student should consider seeking additional support in the development of their written English. | A reasonable standard of written English, though some errors may be present. | A good standard of written English, with only minor errors present | A very good standard of written English, with only minor errors present. | A high standard of written English |  |
|  | **-39%** | **40%-49%** | **50%-59%** | **60%-69%** | **70%+** | **Grade Achieved & Comments** |
| TOTAL | **0%** |