

FORM OF REPORT ON EXAMINATIONS

MPhil (HLPP) and MSt (KLPP) in General Linguistics

Part I

A. STATISTICS

Category	Number			Percentage (%)		
	2021/22	2020/21	2019/20	2021/22	2020/21	2019/20
Distinction	6	5	7	25%	20%	33%
Merit	9	9	5	38%	36%	24%
Pass	7	11	8	29%	44%	38%
Fail	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%
Withdrawn	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%
Incomplete	2	0	1	8%	0%	5%

(2) If vivas are used:
No vivas were used.

(3) Marking of scripts
All papers were double-marked. No scaling was used.

B. NEW EXAMINING METHODS AND PROCEDURES

No new examining methods or procedure were introduced.

C. Please list any changes in examining methods, procedures and examination conventions which the examiners would wish the faculty/department and the divisional board to consider.

There is much diversity in the ways in which assessors provide notes explaining how they reached their marks. Some standardization of these procedures is recommended, particularly in the light of potential student data access requests.

D. Please describe how candidates are made aware of the examination conventions to be followed by the examiners (Please attach to the report a copy of the examination conventions and any other relevant documentation, including the relevant standing orders – see *Examination Regulations*, Regulations for the Conduct of University Examinations, Part 4, cl. 4-1-4.2,

[2019-20, Regulations for the Conduct of University Examinations: Part 4 Examiners: Period of Office, Casual Vacancies, Resignation, and Removal \(ox.ac.uk\)](#)

Part II

A. GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE EXAMINATION

A number of difficulties were experienced in the running of the examination due to lack of functioning administrative support. Most aspects of the procedure were delayed as a result (notably final formatting of papers), endangering the adequate completion of the examination process. Some other aspects of the procedure also seemed odd: there seems to be no way for the Chair of Examiners to establish who has taught any particular paper or who might have the expertise to set the exam paper or assess it. A timetable for the entire procedure would also have been useful.

B. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY ISSUES AND BREAKDOWN OF THE RESULTS BY GENDER

A breakdown of results by gender is given for the past three years below. Female candidates outperformed male candidates this year, in contrast to recent years, with 42% of female candidates receiving a distinction as against 10% of male candidates.

Year	2021/22				2020/21				2019/20			
	F	M	F %	M %	F	M	F %	M %	F	M	F %	M %
D	5	1	42%	10%	3	2	17%	29%	3	4	25%	50%
M	4	5	33%	50%	8	1	44%	14%	2	3	17%	38%
P	3	4	25%	40%	7	4	39%	57%	7	1	58%	13%
Fail	0	0	0%	0%	0	0	0%	0%	0	0	0%	0%

C. DETAILED NUMBERS ON CANDIDATES' PERFORMANCE IN EACH PART OF THE EXAMINATION

Papers 21/22	Marks				
	Nos papers taken	70% and above	65% - 69%	50% - 64%	Fail
General Paper: Linguistic Theory	22	2	6	13	1
Computational Linguistics	3	1	2		
Experimental Phonetics	3	2		1	
Historical and Comparative Linguistics	2	2			
Comparative Grammar of Celtic and Indo-Iranian	1			1	
History and structure of a language: Welsh	1	1			
History and structure of Russian	1		1		

Japanese Linguistics	1		1		
Language Contact	1	1			
Philosophy of Language and Art	1		1		
Phonetics and Phonology	3			2	1
Psycholinguistics and Neurolinguistics	6	3	3		
Semantics	8	6	2		
Sociolinguistics	8	2	1	3	1
Structure of German	1	1			
Syntax	9	3	2	3	1
The History of Latin	1	1			
The Structure of Latin	1	1			
Thesis	12	6	4	1	
Translation from, and linguistic comment upon Celtic and Indo-Iranian	1			1	
Typology	1		1		

With small numbers of candidates for each option, it is difficult to make generalizations. However, the relatively low marks on the general linguistics paper, compared to other papers, are noticeable, and some attempt should be made to understand the source of this pattern.

D. COMMENTS ON PAPERS AND INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS

Candidates took a wide range of options and chose a very broad range of dissertation topics. Overall performance was good and much excellent work was submitted. A reasonable number of distinction and merit marks was awarded. The small number of candidates for each option makes it difficult to generalize about them, except for the compulsory Paper A. Marking for this paper seemed rigorous, even strict, with assessors perhaps treating it as a specialist rather than a generalist paper, and some thought might be given to defining more carefully the standard that might reasonably be expected across the board from good students not necessarily specializing in the individual areas examined in this paper.

E. COMMENTS ON THE PERFORMANCE OF IDENTIFIABLE INDIVIDUALS AND OTHER MATERIAL WHICH WOULD USUALLY BE TREATED AS RESERVED BUSINESS

Six MCEs were received. In two cases, certain marks were disregarded as a result. In other cases where it was judged appropriate, examiners checked the spread of marks to ensure that the candidate's overall mark and performance were not adversely affected.

F. NAMES OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS

David Willis (Chair), Kathryn Allan (External), Andreas Willi, Jose Elias Ulloa.