

Class	Numerical Range	Addressing the Question	Quality of Argument	Range of Knowledge/Understanding
I	70+	Work which engages closely with the question and addresses its broader implications, demonstrating the ability to engage with abstract issues. The structure of the answer will allow a clear, coherent unfolding of the writer's argument. Descriptive and factual elements will be linked effectively to the argument, and their relevance to the issues under discussion made clear.	Work which displays the ability to use the knowledge at the writer's disposal to the very best effect. Linguistically and structurally the writing will be clear, authoritative and to the point. Where relevant writers will be aware of scholarly debate in the field but will go beyond merely paraphrasing the ideas of others and demonstrate their own conceptual command. In this sense work should be original rather than derivative. It may, more rarely, also be original in the sense of putting forward persuasive and well-supported new ideas or making unexpected conclusions.	Work which displays an impressively wide range of knowledge and critical understanding, drawing on evidence relevant to the answer, knowledge of textual variants where appropriate and showing awareness of the conclusions of other writers. Awareness of argument and interpretation will be held in an appropriate balance with factual information, so that the work is neither too generalising nor too weighed down by detail. Writers will show the ability to evaluate the knowledge at their disposal, where necessary identifying apparent contradictions and resolving them.
II.i	69-60	Work within this class can cover a broad range of achievement. It will display understanding of the question and will deploy a range of relevant evidence in answering it. At best it will be regularly, but not consistently, analytical, perhaps failing to explore all the implications of the issue under discussion, or not bringing out the full relevance of the evidence cited. These weaknesses will be more marked at the bottom of the class.	Work which displays the ability to deploy ideas and knowledge to create a sustained argument. The argument will shape the structure of the work rather than emerging piecemeal, but will lack the conceptual grasp of a first class answer, demonstrating rather the ability to synthesis the view of others. At the top of the range this will be done persuasively and efficiently, but work towards the bottom of the scale, although competently structured, will lack sharpness. There may be a tendency to state ideas, rather than analysing them, or the argument may rest on unsupported claims.	Work which at best reveals a high density of relevant knowledge and deploys it effectively, demonstrating an awareness of critical issues. Nevertheless the work falls short of the highest standards in some way, perhaps by an imbalance between information and interpretation. At the bottom of the scale this imbalance may be marked, or the knowledge deployed may at times seem hackneyed and imprecise.
II.ii	59-50	Work which may make some relevant points but is inadequately focussed on the specific question under discussion, leaving the reader to draw out the implications of what is being said. The structure of the answer is likely to be dictated by the information available to the writer, rather than by the requirements of the question under discussion. The implications of the question may have been overlooked or misunderstood.	Work in which the ideas and knowledge at the writer's disposal are presented as an end in themselves, rather than as an argument. Such argument as there is may be fragmentary or unfocussed, or may be explicitly addressed only in the opening and closing paragraphs. Linguistically as well as structurally the presentation of ideas may be rather clumsy, with points imperfectly explained. There is likely to be a sense of other people's ideas being repeated uncritically; and at worst the accretion of points may give rise to unreconciled contradictions, or raise issues which are not explored.	Work which displays a degree of knowledge sufficient to answer the question only at a relatively generalising level, in which statements are supported by trite or imprecise evidence, such as a tendency to simplify the arguments of other writers or to stumble over factual detail.

Class	Numerical Range	Addressing the Question	Quality of Argument	Range of Knowledge/Understanding
III	49-40	Work which makes little sustained attempt to develop an argument in response to the question or which does so at a superficial level. The presentation of what the writer is able to remember will, to a very marked extent, take precedence over the development of an argument in response to the question.	Work which makes only a rudimentary attempt to develop a sustained argument, with the question treated as a peg upon which to hang any available ideas. Argument is likely to take the form of bald assertions, which may themselves be trite or hackneyed but which are not developed into a coherent line of thought. Structurally and linguistically the presentation may be muddled or unclear.	Work which demonstrates either too little knowledge or too little understanding to provide an acceptable argument, or at worst to sustain a full length answer. The information deployed may be misremembered or vague, or may reveal actual misunderstanding. The views of other writers may be distorted.
Ord	39-30	Work with only occasional glimmers of any argument, based mainly on what little the writer can remember.	Work which makes little if any attempt to develop a sustained argument. Any argument is likely to take the form of unsupported assertions. Structurally and linguistically the presentation is likely to be muddled or unclear.	Work which demonstrates only a vague knowledge or understanding, with either actual mistakes or insufficient detail. No reference to the work of other writers.
Fail	29-	Work which makes no sustained attempt to develop an argument in relation to the question, or where what the writer can remember does not amount to an argument.	Work which makes no attempt to develop an argument, but simply makes unsupported and often disconnected assertions. Structurally and linguistically the presentation will be muddled, unclear or otherwise deficient.	Work which demonstrates knowledge that is so deficient, vague, distorted or inaccurate, as to provide no basis for an acceptable argument.