Candidate and Paper						Marks and Comments			
Candidate	Assessment Unit Number	Assessment Unit Title	Assessment Unit Type	Department (Phil/Pol/ Econ/Maths/Law)	Core (Core/ blank)	First Mark	Second Mark	Agreed Mark	Marker Comments
1026376	A12737W1	Political Sociology	WRITTEN	POL	Core	78	73	76	Marker 1: [Question level marks: 2-85, 6-73, 9-78] [Comments on initial mark:] [Comments on agreed mark: We discussed and agreed that the final mark should be closer to my overall initial mark / /] Marker 2: [Question level marks: 2 (78->)-78, 6-68, 9-73] [Comments on initial mark: Q2: excellent essay! Clear, thorough, well-focused, and well-argued. Secure mastery of material and evidence of ability to form independent critical assessment; final section could have led more explicitly with Iversen and Soskice (2015)/Q6: very thoughtful and analytical essay but lacking the judgment and unambiguity of a 1st; nicely picking up on assumption in the question; great: working in terms of observale implications; ambiguity: don't both accounts have a socialization mechanism?; clear and focuse answer; unclear whether, empirically, the rise of social liberalism liner or flattening; why would a decade of glagging growth be enough to see change in survey data?; initially not identifying that postmaterialism is a dimension rather than issue position in many responses to Inglehart> getting there eventually but not clear how; very competent discussion of the difficulties around demarcating ageing, cohort, and period effects; very good discussion of implications of inter-subject differences in favor of socialization and against cognitive sophistication + addressing the problem of self-selection/ Q9: very secure command of the theoretical debate; nicely nuanced assessment of authors' methodological strategies; gaps: I would have liked to see some more data on cross-national variation in turnout to clarify what is sought to be explained empirically; what do WH find? And why is this a "blow" to the RC model?; relevance of Spoon and Kluver's findings unclear with regard to the question] [Comments on agreed mark: We discussed and agreed that the final mark should be closer to my co-marker's overall initial mark / /]
1026376	A12746S1	Thesis in Politics	SUBMISSION	POL		80	70	75	Marker 1: [Question level marks: -, -, -] [Comments on initial mark:] [Comments on agreed mark: / /] Marker 2: [Question level marks: -, -, -] [Comments on initial mark:] [Comments on agreed mark: / /]
1026376	A12747W1	Quantitative Economics	WRITTEN	ECON	Core	83	81	82	0
1026376	A12748W1	Macroeconomics	WRITTEN	ECON	Core	77	72	75	0
1026376	A12749W1	Microeconomics	WRITTEN	ECON	Core	79	78	79	0
1026376	A12761W1	Game Theory	WRITTEN	ECON		68	63	66	0

1026376	A15005W1	Theory of Politics	WRITTEN	POL	Core	80	63	70	Marker 1: [Question level marks: 1-85, 6-85, 10-73] [Comments on initial mark: re-mark?] [Comments on agreed mark: / / [REDACTED] confirm 1st class mark, [REDACTED] sees merits and virtues] Marker 2: [Question level marks: 1-65, 6-62, 10-62] [Comments on initial mark: Some nice points, but central arguments rather underdeveloped and rather talked around the questions] [Comments on agreed mark: / / We both reread this script carefully, and agreed that it had weaknesses that stopped it getting a very high mark, but the ideas were strong enough for a 1st class mark]
1026376	A15879S1	Behavioural and Experimental Economics	SUBMISSION	ECON		68	65	66	0