

## M.PHIL AND M.ST IN LINGUISTICS, PHILOLOGY & PHONETICS

### EXAMINERS' REPORT 2020

#### 1. Examination arrangements and procedures

##### 1.1. Board membership and meetings

The members of this year's Board of Examiners were Prof. Philomen Probert (Chair), Prof. Mary Dalrymple, Dr Alessandro Vatri, and Prof. Ianthi Tsimpli (External Examiner, University of Cambridge).

The internal examiners met twice during the year: they held a first meeting to agree on the appointment of assessors for each paper, and a second (remote) meeting to check draft examination papers (the External Examiner had also looked at the draft papers and sent comments to this meeting). The final Board meeting took place over Microsoft Teams on 16 July 2020, with all examiners participating and Mrs Silke Zahrir (Graduate Studies Administrator) in attendance.

##### 1.2. Adaptations in the light of COVID-19

This year's examination arrangements were adapted at short notice in the light of the global COVID-19 pandemic. The main principles were worked out by the University's Silver and Bronze Groups and the Humanities Division over the Easter Vacation, in consultation with Faculty Board Chairs, and were communicated to our MPhil and MSt students on 1 April 2020. A revised set of Examination Conventions was circulated to our students on 20 April 2020 (after Divisional approval), and a further revised version was circulated on 11 June 2020 (because the Division had required us to add a note of the penalties that would apply if on-line open-book exams were submitted late). The main adjustments applied to the M.Phil. and M.St. in Linguistics, Philology & Phonetics were the following:

- Modules that would normally have been assessed by means of a traditional three-hour examination were assessed instead by means of an on-line open-book examination. With one exception (see just below) the format of papers was not changed, but four hours rather than three were allowed in order to give candidates time to download exams at the beginning and upload their answers at the end, and to scan handwritten scripts or diagrams if applicable.
- For those examinations that included a translation component, the format was varied slightly with the addition of an instruction asking candidates to translate literally, while still translating into clear English.
- All theses and submissions were submitted on line.
- The second internal examiners' meeting and the final examiners' meeting took place remotely over Microsoft Teams.
- Vivas (had any been necessary) would have been held on 17 July 2020 over Microsoft Teams. In order to be fair towards candidates in different time zones, candidates were invited to register a preference in advance for their viva (if any) to take place in the morning or the afternoon (UK time).
- A cohort-wide extension to 12 June was granted for all theses and submissions. (For M.Phil. theses, this amounted to an extension of 6 weeks. For M.St. theses, this amounted to an extension of 6 weeks from the original deadline—although this had already been extended by two weeks earlier in the academic year. For other submissions, the cohort-wide extension amounted to two weeks.)
- A light-touch system was in place for candidates who needed to request a further individual extension for theses or submissions.

- A light-touch self-assessment system was in place for candidates to register ways in which the global pandemic or any other factors might have affected their performance on examinations or assessments.
- Where it was in a candidate's interest, a cohort-wide safety-net policy was applied to the calculation of average marks for the purposes of classification (where an award decision was being made this year). For the M.St, this consisted of half-weighting the candidate's lowest-scoring module. For the M.Phil., this consisted of either or both of the following (whichever of these—if any—was most in the candidate's interest): (a) double-weighting the "banked" paper A (sat last year); (b) half-weighting the candidate's lowest-scoring module apart from Paper A.

### 1.3. Examinations

35 candidates were examined this year: 8 first-year M.Phils, 15 second-year M.Phils (one of whom had completed four out of five modules the previous year but had got an extension on their thesis) and 12 candidates for the M.St. At the final examiners' meeting, award decisions were made on 9 of the 12 M.St. candidates and 10 of the 15 second-year M.Phils. These included some candidates who had been granted extensions, but whose marks—thanks to extraordinarily hard work on the part of our markers—were turned quickly enough to be confirmed at the final examiners' meeting. The other candidates had been granted extensions meaning that their award decisions would be made at a later date.

The following elements were examined by 4-hour on-line open-book exam:

- A: Linguistic Theory (compulsory for all M.St students on the Advanced Study track, and for all first-year M.Phil students)
- B(i): Phonetics and Phonology
- B(iv): Historical and Comparative Linguistics
- B(vi): History and Structure of English
- B(x): Morphology
- C(i): Comparative Grammar of Indo-Iranian and Anatolian
- C(ii): Historical Grammar of Indo-Iranian and Anatolian
- C(iii): Translation from, and linguistic comment upon, texts in Indo-Iranian and Anatolian
- D(i) History of: French; Italian; Latin; Old High German
- D(ii) Structure of: Italian; Latin
- D(iii) Translation from, and/or linguistic comment upon, texts in: Latin; Italian; Old High German

The following elements were examined by written submission:

- B(ii): Syntax
- B(iii): Semantics
- B(v): Psycholinguistics and Neurolinguistics
- B(vii): Experimental Phonetics
- B(viii): Sociolinguistics
- B(ix): Computational Linguistics
- B(x): Special project in Lexicography
- B(x): Special project in Phonetics
- B(x): Special project in Typology
- D(iii-c): Special project on an aspect of the structure or history of a language

In addition, 10 M. Phil theses and 3 M.St. theses were considered at the final examiners' meeting. The titles of these theses are listed in Appendix A below.

A further 5 M.Phil. theses and 2 M.St. theses had been granted an extension meaning that they would be considered at a later date. The titles of these theses are also listed in Appendix A.

#### **1.4. Determination of candidates' marks**

Last year a new marking scheme came into effect for students who began their courses in 2018/19. The current year was therefore the second one in which this scheme applied to M.St. candidates and the first in which it applied to M.Phil. candidates. One candidate (among those whose results were confirmed after the final examiners' meeting) had registered when the old marking system was in place, and therefore continued to be assessed under the old system.

All examination scripts, written submissions and theses were marked by two internal assessors. In one instance, the initial assessors were unable to agree on a mark and a third marker was asked to adjudicate. The External Examiner was also asked to look at this case, and at all cases where the internal markers had agreed a mark below the pass mark, and at those scripts and submissions receiving the single highest and lowest marks for the M.Phil. and for the M.St. In addition to reading these scripts and submissions, and the markers' comments where available, the External Examiner also read a considerable sample of other scripts and submissions (again with the markers' comments where available), including the lowest and highest scoring scripts and submissions for each module. For paper A, she looked into how many candidates answered each section and the range of marks awarded.

For M.St. and second-year M.Phil. students, this year's cohort-wide safety-net policy (explained under 1.2 above) was applied to the calculation of average marks for the purposes of classification, wherever it was in a candidate's interest. In most instances the safety-net policy did not affect the candidate's classification (a point suggesting that our classification system is fairly robust, in the sense that candidate's outcomes do not depend too much on the fine-tuning of the system), but it resulted in an M.St. candidate's outcome being raised from Pass to Merit, and in another M.St. candidate's outcome being raised from Merit to Distinction.

The Board had appointed a small subcommittee (consisting of Mary Dalrymple and Ianthi Tsimpli) to consider individual mitigating circumstances notices, as set out in the University's policy and guidance documents. However, as part of the University's response to the COVID-19 pandemic, we were asked not to band this year's mitigating circumstances notices into three levels of seriousness. Since the seriousness banding would have constituted the main work of the mitigating circumstances sub-committee, we decided not to convene a pre-meeting of the sub-committee but to consider all mitigating circumstances notices fully in the final examiners' meeting (whether these were submitted via this year's self-assessment form or in the traditional way), with all examiners present. There were 15 applications from candidates whose results were finalised at the final examiners' meeting. For reasons of confidentiality the actions taken by the Board in these cases are set out in a separate appendix to this report (Appendix B). Any applications from further candidates would be considered at a later date, when those candidates' results were finalised.

The Board may at its discretion summon borderline candidates to be examined orally. Of those candidates whose results were confirmed at this year's final examination, none were summoned for oral examination. Candidates whose results would be confirmed later were asked to keep a later date free (with the exact date depending on the candidate's submission deadlines) in case the Board summoned them for oral examination.

## **2. Results (for candidates whose results were confirmed at the final examiners' meeting)**

### **2.1 Summary**

In the M.Phil, 2 candidates were awarded Distinction, 3 were awarded Merit, 5 gained a Pass and none failed.

In the M.St, 5 candidates were awarded Distinction, 2 were awarded Merit, 2 gained a Pass and none failed.

Among the 8 first-year M.Phil candidates who took only Paper A this year, two earned marks above 70 and six passed with marks between 50 and 64.

### **2.2 Distinctions**

7 of the 19 candidates on whom award decisions were made at the final examiners' meeting were awarded Distinctions—2 in the M.Phil. and 5 in the M.St. This was only an interim tally, since eight candidates had award decisions still outstanding, but so far the proportion of Distinctions was considerably higher than last year's (when 4 out of 20 graduating students earned a Distinction). However, the Board noted that there had been recent years in which the proportion of Distinctions was more comparable to this year's—and in the exceptional year 2017/18 the proportion of Distinctions was even higher (with 13 out of 23 graduating students earning a Distinction). We were satisfied that all the candidates who were awarded a Distinction this year thoroughly deserved the award.

### **2.3 Failures**

No candidates failed (although one candidate's outcome was raised from a borderline Fail to a Pass in consideration of mitigating circumstances: this case is discussed further in Appendix B). In this respect this year's cohort was again more successful than last year's (when one M.Phil. candidate failed and one was awarded the M.St. rather than the M.Phil.). However, the examiners noted that there have been other recent years (2015/16 and the exceptional year 2017/18) in which no candidates failed and no M.Phil. candidates were awarded the M.St. rather than the M.Phil. We were satisfied that all this year's candidates who were awarded a degree thoroughly deserved the award.

No first-year M.Phil. candidates failed Paper A, and a second-year candidate who had failed Paper A last year passed on a resit. This level of success had not been seen in the previous two years, but it had been seen in 2015/16 and 2016/17. The Board was satisfied that this year's cohort thoroughly deserved their success.

### **2.4 Theses**

Theses were generally of a high standard. Of the ten M.Phil. theses examined, 2 received marks well over 70, 4 received marks between 65 and 69, 3 received marks between 50 and 64, and one received a failing mark. (The last of these was a mitigating circumstances case which is discussed further in Appendix B.)

This was the first year in which M.St. candidates were divided into an Advanced Study strand and a Research Preparation strand. Those on the Research Preparation strand begin the course with a solid background in the main core areas of Linguistics (they typically have an undergraduate degree in which Linguistics forms at least 50% of the teaching and assessment), while those on the Advanced Study strand work to acquire this background on the M.St. course itself. Candidates on the Research Preparation strand submit a thesis and do not take Paper A, while those on the

Advanced Study strand take Paper A and do not submit a thesis. Of the three M.St. (Research Preparation) theses considered at the final examiners' meeting, two scored marks above 70 and the other a mark of 69. Although the number of candidates is too small to generalise with any confidence, these thesis marks at least suggest that the new Research Preparation strand is working well, with candidates admitted to this strand being sufficiently well prepared to produce a very good thesis in the short time available.

Following a recommendation of last year's examining board, candidates offering theses were asked to provide a brief abstract. This was helpful for assigning markers, although the timescale for considering examiners' recommendations (at the Graduate Studies Committee and then the Faculty Board) meant that this year's candidates had already submitted thesis titles for approval by the time they were asked to submit abstracts. **Recommendation: in future years it will be helpful if candidates could be asked to submit the short abstract for approval at the same time as they submit their thesis title.**

### 2.5 Paper A

In her general comments to the Board the External Examiner again commended the thinking behind Paper A, which is designed to ensure that all candidates have acquired a reasonable grasp of the main core areas of Linguistic Theory. (The only candidates who do not sit Paper A are those on the Research Preparation strand of the M.St., who are required to have a solid background in the main core areas of Linguistics when they begin with course.) Having raised concerns about candidates' performance on Paper A last year (as had the previous year's External Examiner, Prof. Kersti Börjars), and on the Syntax section in particular, the External Examiner pointed out that no such concerns were raised by candidates' performances this year.

### 2.6 Prizes

This is the second year in which the Faculty will be able to award prizes both for the best performance in the M.St. (the George Wolf Prize) and for the best performance in the M.Phil. (the Katrina Hayward Prize). In order to give a chance to the 3 M.St. candidates and 5 M.Phil. candidates with award decisions still outstanding at the time of the final examiners' meeting, the decisions on which candidates should be awarded prizes were postponed until a later date.

## 3. Procedural matters

This year was an exceptional year in the light of the COVID-19 pandemic. The Chair would like to record her thanks to the University's Silver and Bronze Groups, the Humanities Division, and our Faculty Board Chair, for the swift and sensitive work they did to adjust our examinations process to the situation we all found ourselves in.

Communication with the Proctors' Office and the Examinations Office generally went smoothly, in spite of the large amount of extra work that both offices had to handle as a result of the pandemic. Applications for extensions and requests for alternative arrangements and adjustments were handled promptly and sensitively. One procedural mishap could, however, have been serious, although it was resolved just in time:

Board Administrators were promised spreadsheets recording mitigating circumstances notices no later than two days before the final examiners' meeting. One day before the meeting, Silke Zahrir had still not received the spreadsheets. She chased the Proctors' Office by email more than once but received no response. On the morning of the day of the meeting, the Chair chased the Proctors' Office by telephone; it emerged that the two spreadsheets (one for the M.Phil. and one for the M.St.) had been sent two weeks previously but to the wrong person, and that since then a series of updates had also been sent to the same wrong person. Once this came to light the

spreadsheets were sent to Silke Zahrir, but there was insufficient time for Silke to anonymise them and for Board members to read this large amount of information carefully in advance of the meeting. For this reason, we conducted the meeting in two parts. In the first part (beginning at 11 a.m. and lasting just under an hour) we considered candidates' performances on academic grounds alone. We then adjourned the meeting for just over three hours, during which time Silke first anonymised the mitigating circumstances information and combined the updates with the original spreadsheets, and the Board members then read all the information carefully. We then reconvened at 3 p.m. to consider mitigating circumstances, and concluded the meeting around 5 p.m.

Communication with the Faculty went smoothly too, and it has been extremely helpful for the Faculty to have more hours of Silke Zahrir's time than was the case in previous years.

**Recommendation: in future it might also be helpful for the Chair to be on the Faculty's Graduate Studies Committee *ex officio*, to help the Chair understand the progress of the Faculty's responses to recommendations from the previous year's examiners. (The current Chair realises at this late stage that last year's examiners' report implies that this was already supposed to be the case, and apologises for not raising this earlier.)**

In its discussion of procedural matters the Examining Board revisited a question which had already arisen last year, in the light of a change which had been made in response to a recommendation from last year's Examiners. Currently markers are asked to provide feedback on theses and submissions (and this feedback is passed on to the candidate after the examinations are concluded), and this year for the first time markers were also asked to provide a brief explanation wherever borderline or failing marks were given to responses on exam scripts. This was both for the benefit of the Board and for the benefit of any candidates who failed a paper. (In principle comments would have been passed on to the candidates who failed an entire paper, in order to help guide their preparation if they were resitting. As it happened, of those candidates whose results were considered at the final meeting none failed any exam papers this year.)

The Board found it very helpful to have this additional information. However, we noted that it would also be helpful for the Board—and not least for the External Examiner—to have at least brief comments from all markers explaining all numerical marks. Some markers already provide such information (although they are not required to do so), and where they are available these comments can be extremely helpful. We note that it is right for the Board to give extra scrutiny to the results of candidates whose marks put them near a borderline (including the Pass/Merit and Merit/Distinction borderlines), and that a candidate's marks profile can put them near a borderline without any of their marks for individual papers being near the borderline. Likewise, it is right for the Board to give extra scrutiny to the results of candidates who have mitigating circumstances, even if none of their marks for individual papers are near a borderline. The External Examiner commented that at her institution (the University of Cambridge) markers are required to provide c. 300 words of comments on all submissions and exam scripts. We recognise that the advantages to the Board of having comments on all answers will have to be balanced against the additional work this will entail for markers, and that markers already do a great deal of work to make our exams run smoothly.

**Recommendation: we recommend that the Graduate Studies Committee and the Faculty Board consider requiring brief comments from all markers to explain all numerical marks.**

The examination of our M.Phil and M.St candidates is always a complex operation, given the range of options and topics undertaken. This year the complexity was infinitely greater still, owing to the need to adjust rapidly and sensitively to the ever-changing public health situation. The Chair would like to put on record her heartfelt thanks to everybody involved for their extraordinarily hard work, patience, and support, and not least to the Graduate Studies administrator Mrs Zahrir, to co-

examiners Prof. Dalrymple, Dr Vatri, and Prof. Tsimpli, and to the many colleagues who acted as assessors under difficult circumstances—and in some cases under extremely difficult circumstances indeed. It has been a real privilege to work with all of you.

Philomen Probert (Chair of Examiners)

Mary Dalrymple

Alessandro Vatri

Ianthi Tsimpli (External Examiner)

3 August 2020

## EXAMINERS' REPORT ON THE M.PHIL AND M.ST IN LINGUISTICS, PHILOLOGY & PHONETICS 2020

### APPENDIX C: RESULTS CONFIRMED AFTER THE FINAL EXAMINERS' MEETING HAD TAKEN PLACE

#### 1. Background to this Appendix

In the light of the large number of extensions granted this year, there were 3 M.St. candidates and 5 second-year M.Phil. candidates whose marks were not yet available by the time of the final examiners' meeting on 16 July 2020. Results for these candidates were confirmed by confidential correspondence between all the examiners (including the external) as each candidate's results became available.

#### 2. Determination of candidates' marks

In all respects (including the application of the cohort-wide safety-net polity), these candidates' results were considered in the same way as the others. However, as noted in the main report, the current year was the first in which a new marking scheme came into effect for M.Phil. students. Among those second-year M.Phil. candidates whose results were confirmed after the final examiners' meeting, one had registered when the old marking system was in place, and therefore continued to be assessed under the old system.

As noted in the main report, candidates whose results were to be confirmed after the final examiners' meeting were asked to keep a specific date free (with the exact date depending on the candidate's submission deadlines) in case the Board summoned them for oral examination. In the event, no candidates were summoned for oral examination.

#### 3. Results (for candidates whose results were confirmed after the final examiners' meeting)

##### 3.1 Summary

Of the three M.St. candidates in question, one was awarded a Distinction, one was awarded Merit, and one was awarded a Pass. In addition, one of the MPhil candidates was deemed to have transferred to the MSt (Advanced Study track) in consideration of mitigating circumstances, and was awarded a Pass (this is a complicated case which is discussed further in the confidential update to Appendix B).

Of the other four M.Phil. candidates, two were awarded Merit and two were awarded a Pass.

When taken together with the results confirmed earlier, this year's cohort achieved the following results overall:

In the M.St., 6 candidates were awarded Distinction, 3 were awarded Merit, 4 gained a Pass and none failed.

In the M.Phil, 2 candidates were awarded Distinction, 5 were awarded Merit, 7 gained a Pass and none failed.

As noted in the original report, among the 8 first-year M.Phil candidates who took only Paper A this year two earned marks above 70 and six passed with marks between 50 and 64.

##### 3.2 Distinctions

Of the 8 candidates on whom award decisions were made after the final examiners' meeting, one was awarded a Distinction (in the M.St.). The latter was a Research Preparation candidate with an unusual marks profile: they achieved a mark in the 50's on their Thesis and marks in the 80's on their other two modules. Under the Faculty's current regulations for the M.St. (which differ from those for



the M.Phil.), a low thesis mark is not an obstacle to a Distinction provided that the candidate achieves an average mark of 70 or above across all units of assessment and providing all criteria for the award of the degree are also met (so provided no mark falls below 40). In the instance at hand, the Board was satisfied that the Distinction was well deserved: the candidate had not only performed outstandingly on two of their modules, but had done so in an extremely difficult year. However, the Board also wondered whether the Faculty's policy would be worth revisiting for the future: like the M.Phil., the Research Preparation strand of the M.St. is designed to lead on to a research degree, and given this it may be worth considering a minimum thesis mark requirement comparable to the existing one for the M.Phil. **The Board recommends this question for consideration by the Graduate Studies Committee.**

Now that results have been finalised for the whole cohort, the overall number of distinctions awarded to this year's M.Phil. and M.St. candidates comes to 8 out of 27 graduating students. The proportion of Distinctions remains considerably higher than last year's (when 4 out of 20 graduating students earned a Distinction). As noted in the main report, however, there had been recent years in which the proportion of Distinctions was more comparable to this year's—and in the exceptional year 2017/18 the proportion of Distinctions was even higher (with 13 out of 23 graduating students earning a Distinction). We remain satisfied that all the candidates who were awarded a Distinction this year thoroughly deserved the award.

### 3.3 Failures

Of the candidates whose results were confirmed after the final examiners' meeting, none failed. In this respect it remains the case that (as noted in the main report) this year's cohort was more successful than last year's (when one M.Phil. candidate failed and one was awarded the M.St. rather than the M.Phil.). However, as also noted in the main report, there have been other recent years (2015/16 and the exceptional year 2017/18) in which no candidates failed and no M.Phil. candidates were awarded the M.St. rather than the M.Phil. We remain satisfied that all this year's candidates who were awarded a degree thoroughly deserved the award.

### 3.4 Theses

Of the four M.Phil. theses examined after the final examiners' meeting, one received a mark over 70, one a mark between 65 and 69, one a mark between 50 and 64, and one a mark between 60 and 69 on the old scale. When these are taken together with the M.Phil. theses examined earlier, the overall distribution of M.Phil. thesis marks for this year's cohort is as follows: 3 M.Phil. thesis marks above 70, 5 between 65 and 69, 4 between 50 and 64, and one a mark between 60 and 69 on the old mark scale.

Of the M.St. candidates whose results were confirmed after the final examiners' meeting, two were Research Preparation candidates and had therefore submitted a thesis. Both gained marks between 50 and 64. When these are taken together with the M.St. (Research Preparation) theses examined earlier, the overall distribution of M.St. thesis marks for this year's cohort is as follows: 2 M.St. thesis marks above 70, 1 between 65 and 69, and 2 between 50 and 64.

### 3.5 Prizes

As mentioned in the original report, this was the second year in which the Faculty was able to award prizes both for the best performance in the M.St. (the George Wolf Prize) and for the best performance in the M.Phil. (the Katrina Hayward Prize). Once all candidates' results had been confirmed, the Board considered which candidates should be awarded prizes. The George Wolf Prize was awarded to an M.St. candidate with very high Distinction-level marks. The Katrina Hayward Prize was split between two candidates whose averages were close to one another's. Each of these candidates achieved a Distinction and some very impressive marks. In one case, the candidate's

strongest performance was in their Thesis and in the other in their taught modules. The Board would like to congratulate all three winners on their strong performances, and would like to reiterate its congratulations to the whole cohort on their success under very difficult circumstances.

**Procedural matters**

Communication with the Examinations Office, the Proctors' Office, and the Education Committee generally went smoothly, in spite of the large amount of extra work which fell to these colleagues as a result of the pandemic. The Chair of Examiners would like to reiterate her thanks to them for their swift and sensitive handling of mitigating circumstances notices and requests for extensions.

Communications could have gone more smoothly in one instance, and this case is discussed further in the confidential update to Appendix B.

The Chair would like to reiterate her heartfelt thanks to everybody involved in this year's examination process for their extraordinarily hard work, patience, and support—and especially to Mrs Zahrir, to her co-examiners Prof. Dalrymple, Dr Vatri, and Prof. Tsimpli, and to everybody who acted as an assessor in what seemed at times like a never-ending process.

4 July 2021

Philomen Probert (Chair of Examiners)  
Mary Dalrymple  
Alessandro Vatri  
Ianthi Tsimpli (External Examiner)

**EXAMINERS' REPORT ON THE M.PHIL AND M.ST IN LINGUISTICS, PHILOLOGY & PHONETICS 2020**

**APPENDIX A: THESIS TITLES**

**(A) MPHIL THESES CONSIDERED AT THE FINAL EXAMINERS' MEETING**

Classifier as a cue for structure building in head-final relative clause in Mandarin Chinese  
 Double past participle forms in the Sicilian dialects  
 How accurate a reflection are Ennius' Annals of the language of the time?  
 Modelling the Indexical Field: The case of (ing) in American English  
 The metrical treatment of Romance loan words in Middle High German and its impact on the native word prosodic system  
 The prosodic features of dog-directed speech in English  
 The Romanesco dialect in diachrony and synchrony: a study on the written use of the dialect on social media  
 The semantics of the Rig Vedic reduplicated presents  
 Tone Assimilation and Dissimilation in Guanzhong Mandarin  
 Wh-constructions in Malay

**(B) MST THESES CONSIDERED AT THE FINAL EXAMINERS' MEETING**

Emotion Word Processing and Alexithymia  
 Latin *muta cum liquida* clusters: evidence from Roman grammarians  
*Si* and Information Structure in Old French

**(C) MPHIL THESES TO BE CONSIDERED AT A LATER DATE**

Presenting the Past: The tri-modal discourse system in the exposition of the earliest R̥gvedic Indra mythology  
 Relative constructions in Oroquen  
 Second Consonant Shift and Open Syllable Lengthening in German in regard to the phonological characteristics contrasting geminates and affricates, looking at Old High German, Middle High German and Swabian Dialect  
 Modeling Geographic and Class-Based Variation in Diphthong Pronunciation of United Kingdom English  
 Clitic boundaries in modern Russian phonology

**(D) MST THESES TO BE CONSIDERED AT A LATER DATE**

Phonological Adaptation of Arabic Coronals in Malay Loanwords  
 The sociolinguistic effects of deafness in Australian Aboriginal communities