

## YOUR GRADE

The work produced is of good quality, and would be graded as a mid to low 2:1. Whilst the work does include some critical analysis, it is largely descriptive, which has limited the grade from acquiring a high 2:1 or 1<sup>st</sup> standard. Critical analysis is imperative for acquiring the highest grades, and there are suggestions within the work as to where this should be added. In principle, there should be evidence of extensive wider reading to critically analyse many of the points proposed by the Bank of England and European Commission. Furthermore, certain assertions could be more focused, such as citing specific trade agreements or regulations, instead of providing vague overviews.

The overall content and quality of the work is very good, which is evidence through a strong grasp of academic writing. The structure and flow is excellent, which engages the reader and helps communicate many of the points being made. Adding more critical analysis is the major area of improvement for the work.

## OVERVIEW OF YOUR WORK

The work is very well written, and maintains good flow and structure throughout. Furthermore, it is clear that the writer has a strong grasp of academic writing, with the majority of assertions being effectively communicated. The writer also shows evidence of wider reading, with some assertions being critically analysed (such as the impact of CPI inflation and international currency rates). This helps develop the piece to provide a deep analysis on implications for the UK and EU member states.

The major area of improvement for the work is to add more critical analysis, which will ensure the work achieves a high 2:1 or 1<sup>st</sup> grade. Although aspects of EU implication have been explored, mostly the work seems to focus on implications for the UK. It is expected that the work would favour UK implications more than EU, but contrasting the implications of assertions would add more critical analysis. It would also evidence extensive wider reading, and help critically analyse many of the assertions by the Bank of England or European Commission. Finally, the use of conjunctive adverbs could be reduced, as overusing these starts to impact on the flow of the work, whilst also creating long and complex sentences that dilute the point the writer is trying to make.

## SPELLING AND GRAMMAR

Overall, the spelling and grammar was excellent, although a few changes have been made within the document. Also, there are some suggestion to reduce sentence length to ensure you are effectively communicating your point and improving clarity of information. As noted, there is also an overuse of conjunctive adverb, such as However, Moreover, Therefore, In addition etc.... These do not need to be used within every sentence, and are only required when directly linking two similar or contrasting points.

## REFERENCING

One suggestion has been made with regards to using the referencing system, and how to reference when using more than two authors. Furthermore, one reference is missing the corresponding reference list entry.

Overall, the referencing was very good and evidenced wider reading. However, there is a heavy reliance on two main sources: The Bank of England the European Commission. Cross-analysing these points with additional referencing will improve the critical analysis of implications, and will evidence extensive wider reading. All references are also derived from suitably reliable and academic sources.

## STRUCTURE AND FLOW

The structure of the work is excellent, and effectively segments the essay into an introduction, main body, and conclusion. Headings could be removed from essay assignments, however this is not always necessary.

Furthermore, the flow of the work is also very positive, with each point being effectively linked between the different sections. No changes were made to either the structure or flow of the essay.

## USE OF LANGUAGE

There were a few grammatical mistakes which were rectified with track changes, and others that have a comment bubble for suggestions. The main grammatical errors derived from the use of long and complex sentences, which sometimes made it difficult to understand the points that were being made. These sentences jeopardise the quality of the content within the work, and suggestions are made to split such sentences up into smaller segments.

## PRESENTATION SKILLS

The work was presented excellently, and there were minimal changes to the presentation style. With the work being an essay it could be recommended to remove the headings, but this is not mandatory, and the assignment still maintains a structural flow of introduction > main body > conclusion.

## ADDITIONAL CONTENT SUGGESTIONS

One additional source should be added to the work, although wider reading could be used to critically assess many of the points cited by the Bank of England and European Commission. Being more critical allows for higher grades to be achieved.

You should aim to be more specific when mentioning things such as trade agreements, or 'EU member states'. Specifically mention examples of which agreements/legislation/countries, to evidence wider reading.

Also, the work could include more critical analysis with regards to EU implications, as many the work focuses on the implications on the UK. This would further improve the critical analysis of the work.

Overall, the assignment is well focused, maintains effective use of grammar and answers the topic question. Addressing the points mentioned within this form will allow the work to become more critical, and result in a higher grade being achieved.

