



# **A Level Economics B**

## **MOCKS MARKING TRAINING**

---

Delegate booklet 3

---

---

# A level Economics B: Delegate booklet 3

---

## Contents

<b>Calculate (4 marks)</b>	<b>1</b>
Examiner marks and comments	1
<b>Explain (4 marks)</b>	<b>2</b>
Examiner marks and comments	2
<b>Analyse (6 marks)</b>	<b>3</b>
Examiner marks and comments	3
<b>Discuss (8 marks)</b>	<b>4</b>
Examiner marks and comments	4
<b>Assess (10 marks)</b>	<b>5</b>
Examiner marks and comments	5
<b>Assess (12 marks)</b>	<b>6</b>
Examiner marks and comments	6
<b>Evaluate (20 marks)</b>	<b>7</b>
Examiner marks and comments	7



## Calculate (4 marks)

---

### Examiner marks and comments

- 1 (a) Calculate, to 2 decimal places, the percentage change in the number of Britons taking domestic holidays from 2007 to 2013 (Figure 1). You are advised to show your working.

(4)

For any calculation that requires an answer it is important to note that if the answer is correct, regardless of whether any working is shown, full marks must be awarded. This is because to get the correct answer students must have applied their knowledge and so all marks are awarded.

This question clearly tells students to calculate to two decimal places but some students will give one decimal place or miss off the percentage sign. To provide further clarity on marking imprecise answers, full marks will be awarded for a fully correct answer with fewer marks for imprecise answers. For example:

- If the answer given is 9.62% award 4 marks
- If the answer given is 9.62 award 3 marks
- If the answer given is 9.6% award 3 marks
- If the answer given is 9.6 award 2 marks

If the answer is wrong the student will be able to access marks for correct workings and/or if they have used the correct formula.

**Sample 1** has the correct answer so achieves all **4 marks**.

**Sample 2** has the incorrect answer and some of the working is a bit confused. However, the student has reached the correct response to one decimal place so **3 marks**.

## Explain (4 marks)

---

### Examiner marks and comments

(b) Using Figure 1, explain the variation in the types of holiday taken by UK citizens between 2007 and 2013.

(4)

**Sample 1** achieved **3 marks**. The first sentence has a mark for knowledge and the variation is clearly identified. There is a clear explanation of why this variation exists so this gains the analysis mark. The concluding sentence offers some evidence in support but only gets 1 of the 2 application marks available.

**Sample 2** achieved **all 4 marks**. The response starts with a clear identification of the variation and gets 1 knowledge mark. The next lines offer two separate pieces of evidence in application and so gets both available marks. The response offers a comprehensive analysis of why this might have happened, in fact it makes several valid points but only 1 analysis mark is available.

## Analyse (6 marks)

---

### Examiner marks and comments

(d) Analyse **one** benefit to *Thomas Cook* of specialising in family package holidays.

(6)

**Sample 1** achieved **5 marks**. This answer does not really fit the suggested indicative content and the assessment objectives take a bit of teasing out. It is a good answer – the student has thought about the question and brings in a lot of extra evidence as context.

The response starts with some application about the airline industry and a mark for application is awarded for the sentence “As the market shifts...”

The student then identifies a benefit as “Thomas Cook benefits as it gain make more profit from...” which achieves a knowledge mark for identifying a benefit – profit.

There is some more application as the type of specialist holiday is described “...scuba diving, swimming with dolphins...” for an application mark.

Then comes the analysis in the form of a consequence of specialisation. “This guarantees Thomas Cook a stream of profit from fewer products” (1 mark) and “This eliminates the need to sell quite as many holidays to cover costs” (1 mark), another analysis point that follows on from the first one.

**Sample 2** achieved **3 marks**. This is not a very strong response. It starts with some context “...online bookings...cheaper airlines like Easyjet...” for an application mark. Then a benefit is explained “...specialising means they can target a niche...” for a knowledge mark. This is developed to show a consequence “...they will be willing to pay more for the family package holiday” for an analysis mark.

## Discuss (8 marks)

---

### Examiner marks and comments

- (e) Using a suitable diagram, discuss the likely impact of an increase in the number of budget airlines on the market for air travel.

(8)

**Sample 1** achieved **Level 2, 4 marks**. This answer has a correct diagram and a somewhat generic answer lacking in context. Other than repeating "budget airlines ...market for air travel" which is in the question, this answer could be describing any rightwards shift of the supply curve caused by new entrants in any market.

Looking at the response as a whole it does not meet the descriptors in Level 3 as it does not have 'accurate knowledge and understanding supported throughout by use of relevant evidence' neither is there 'a balanced awareness of competing arguments'. It does however meet the Level 2 descriptors.

There is no attempt at judgement so does not meet the requirements fully so it is appropriate to place this response within the middle of the band.

**Sample 2** achieved **Level 3, 7 marks**. There is good use of evidence throughout the response and there is a judgement, placing the response as a whole within Level 3. As the response does not fully meet the descriptors it remains with the middle of the band with 7 marks.

## Assess (10 marks)

---

### Examiner marks and comments

(f) Assess the likely benefits to TUI of having over 220 brands (Extract C).

(10)

**Sample 1** achieved **Level 4, 9 marks**. This is a good and well written response that belongs in Level 4. It has 'accurate knowledge and understanding' with 'logical, coherent chains of reasoning' and a 'balanced awareness of the validity and significance of competing arguments'.

Where it does not quite succeed is 'supported throughout by use of relevant evidence'. Much of the admittedly, very good, argument is generic, particularly on the counter argument in the second half, so it cannot reach full marks. It does have some good use of evidence in the first part where "...different styles of holiday..." and "Crystal holidays ...quality ski experience..." is used in support and this is enough to keep it at the mid-level point in Level 4.

**Sample 2** achieved **Level 3, 6 marks**. This is a much more generic and standard response centred on one main argument of spreading risk. The counter argument explores the lack of opportunities for economies of scale and the organisational difficulty in coping with 220 brands. Taken as a whole it does not meet the Level 4 descriptors but it does meet Level 3.

The response is generic and the limited use of 'relevant evidence to support the argument' prevents it from moving upwards. On the other hand it does show 'accurate knowledge and understanding' and does have 'well developed arguments' which is enough to keep it at the mid-point in this level.



## Assess (12 marks)

---

### Examiner marks and comments

(h) Assess whether the new Dreamliner aircraft could provide TUI with a competitive advantage.

(12)

**Sample 1** achieved **Level 3, 6 marks**. This is not a very convincing response and much of this is lifted directly from the evidence. The response also lacks balance and development. Taken as a whole the response goes beyond the Level 2 descriptors because it does use more than 'limited relevant evidence' and goes further than a 'limited attempt to address the question'. This places the response within Level 3.

The response has 'competing arguments that lacked balance' but doesn't quite meet the other descriptors fully so it placed at the bottom of the level.

**Sample 2** achieved **Level 4, 10 marks**. This response has balance and reasonable use of context throughout. It does show 'full understanding of the question' and 'arguments are developed and evaluated' so is placed within Level 4. However, the response only just reaches this level as there is a lack of balance in the arguments with a weaker counter argument and a conclusion that could have been stronger.

## Evaluate (20 marks)

---

### Examiner marks and comments

- 3 Using Extracts F and G, evaluate whether the Chinese government should intervene in the coal mining industry.

(20)

**Sample 1** achieved **Level 4, 18 marks**. This is a strong response which reaches Level 4. It has 'well developed and logical chains of reasoning' and is 'supported throughout by use of relevant evidence'.

There is excellent awareness throughout of China and its need for power to support its industries and economic growth. The arguments are eloquent and show 'full awareness' and at first glance this would appear to be heading to the top of Level 4. However, the response fails to address the question being asked, i.e. should '...the Chinese government intervene in the coal mining industry' or not? It does have a conclusion but to get the full 20 marks it would need to fully address the question. Despite this, an excellent and articulate response means it is placed in the middle of the band.

**Sample 2** achieved **Level 3, 12 marks**. Taken as a whole the response has more than a 'limited attempt to address the question' and there is an 'awareness of competing arguments' which places it into Level 3.

Although the response fulfils some of the requirements of Level 3 it does not meet all of them. There are some assertions particularly in the second half of the answer. This places the response slightly under the mid-point as more Level 3 characteristics were missing than present.