SELLL Marking Criteria (Language & Linguistics)

General Description	Grade	Criteria
DISTINCTION Work in the 70-100 range shows excellent (70-79), outstanding (80-89), or superlative (90-100) understanding of the subject. It represents the work of a highly competent taught postgraduate student (70-79), displays some qualities associated with PhD-level work (80-89), or displays qualities associated with the research output of an advanced PhD student (90-100). It demonstrates an impressive understanding of both module content and relevant scholarly debates surrounding module content.. Evidence of independent research and research skills is impressive. Work in the 80-100 range, beyond the above, shows outstanding or superlative evidence of independent research, and demonstrates potential to make a noteworthy contribution to the field. Work in the 90-100 range, beyond the above, innovates upon or concretely advances current knowledge.	90-100	• achieves all the criteria listed in the 80-89 range AND makes a substantive contribution to the field
	80-89	• knowledge: comprehensive knowledge showing outstanding depth and/or breadth • independence: displays outstanding levels of ambition and originality in conceptualisation; ranges substantially beyond taught material • evidence: rigorous and exacting selection & authoritative interpretation of primary evidence and/or data • secondary sources: subtle and considered engagement with sources; deeply conversant with the relevant debates and major developments in the field • critical/analytical skills: dynamic and incisive critical analysis and/or independent skills in the analysis of new data • argumentation: cogent, tightly focused & fluently developed argumentation • writing and presentation: excellent command of academic writing (including referencing and layout) and discipline-specific vocabulary; consistent communicative clarity
	70-79	• knowledge: extensive knowledge showing considerable depth and/or breadth • independence: significant ambition and originality in conceptualisation; ranges well beyond taught material • evidence: thorough and judicious selection & sophisticated interpretation of primary evidence and/or data • secondary sources: sophisticated engagement with sources, including understanding of key developments and/or debates in the field • critical/analytical skills: adept and insightful close reading and/or critical analysis • argumentation: sophisticated, consistently focused & finely wrought argumentation • writing and presentation: excellent command of academic writing (including referencing and layout) and discipline-specific vocabulary; near-consistent communicative clarity
MERIT Work in the 60-69 range is conversant with relevant scholarly sources, though may lack a firm grasp of wider contexts. There is clear evidence of independent research, knowledge has been well-assimilated. Some independent insights are offered, although their potential implications may be either overlooked or overstated. The argument may lack a consistently sophisticated focus.	60-69	• knowledge: detailed knowledge showing appropriate depth and/or breadth • independence: some ambition and originality in conceptualisation; significant evidence of work beyond taught material • evidence: detailed and careful selection & interpretation of primary evidence and/or data • secondary sources: conversant with most of the relevant sources; sustained thoughtful engagement with sources; reaches for, but may not fully achieve, a nuanced grasp of their arguments • critical/analytical skills: precise and thorough close reading and/or critical analysis • argumentation: coherent & consistently well-developed argumentation • writing and presentation: precise command of academic writing (including referencing and layout) and discipline-specific vocabulary; few or no errors in grammar, punctuation and lexical choice
PASS Work in the 50-59 range shows an accurate appreciation of major debates in the	50-59	• knowledge: sound knowledge but lacking in depth and/or breadth • independence: some evidence of work beyond taught material

field but may be overly dependent on received ideas. There is some evidence of independent research, albeit limited in scope. Major points are insufficiently elaborated and/or supported.		• evidence: sufficient and largely relevant use of primary evidence and/or data • secondary sources: sound knowledge of sources but engagement with them is partial or inconsistent • critical/analytical skills: adequate close reading and/or critical analysis • argumentation: generally coherent argumentation, with some flaws (e.g. inconsistency, repetition, insufficient development) • writing and presentation: general command of academic writing (including referencing and layout) and discipline-specific vocabulary; reasonably well-written
CONDONABLE FAIL Work in the 40-49 range shows a poorly informed grasp of scholarly sources and is under-researched. The argument, though somewhat relevant to the topic or research question, is derivative. The work may have a discernible argument but it is descriptive rather than analytical. The evidence may largely derive from non-scholarly sources.	40-49	• knowledge: superficial knowledge • independence: minimal evidence of work beyond taught material • evidence: contains some but insufficient and/or irrelevant use of primary evidence and /or data • secondary sources: little knowledge & unsophisticated use of sources • critical/analytical skills: partial or cursory close reading and/or critical analysis • argumentation: contains incoherent, unfocused and/or irrelevant elements • writing and presentation: inadequate command of academic writing (including referencing and layout) and discipline-specific vocabulary; writing lacks clarity or precision and has errors
OUTRIGHT FAIL Work in the 0-39 range shows little to no grasp of scholarly sources and is severely under-researched. The argumentation, if discernible, is not perceptibly relevant to the topic or research question, and it is lacking in originality or analytical skill. The evidence may almost entirely derive from non-scholarly sources.	0-39	• knowledge: inadequate or inaccurate knowledge • independence: little to no evidence of work beyond taught material • evidence: often or entirely insufficient and/or irrelevant use of primary evidence and/or data • secondary sources: little to no knowledge of sources; little to no thoughtful engagement with sources • critical/analytical skills: poor close reading and/or critical analysis • argumentation: often or entirely incoherent, unfocused and/or irrelevant • writing and presentation: little to no command of academic writing (including referencing and layout) and discipline-specific vocabulary; writing is careless and has many errors