

Subject: Re: Paper 1 (2019) — Tom — marked & returned
Date: Tuesday, 3 March 2026 at 17:26 Greenwich Mean Time
From: Eliot King <eliotkingtuition@gmail.com>
To: Sarah
Attachments: Tom-Paper1-2019-marked.pdf

Hi Sarah,

Here is Tom's paper returned with feedback.

Tom achieved 52/80 on this one, which was a B grade (just 2 marks off an A). Below is some more detailed feedback on each question:

2-Marker and 4-Marker:

As usual, Tom effectively answered these questions with good technique and accuracy — no marks dropped.

9-Marker:

Again, a very strong performance on this question — Tom was very thorough in his explanations and hit nearly all of the talking points that the mark scheme was looking for. Tom made one mistake in his analysis, mentioning that excess demand leads to a shift in demand — this should be explained the opposite way around.

15-Marker:

Tom has continued to be consistent in performing well on 15-mark questions, and this one is no different — great knowledge and explanations, as well as some strong examples from the real world. This will put him ahead of other students in the final exam.

Tom lost just a couple of marks due to not mentioning enough determinants of PED and PES — he mentioned one for PES and none for PED; the examiners would like students to mention a couple for each.

25-Markers:

The 25-markers were where Tom's overall mark fell on this paper.

Tom's main points and his explanations of these points were excellent. His examples and application were also strong.

Tom lost marks on the 25-markers for his evaluation — in both essays he opted to do two evaluation paragraphs instead of three. If he is to do this, then the evaluations need to be just as developed as his main points; unfortunately, in these responses they were only a couple of sentences long, so despite great evaluation points he would not receive many marks for developing them.

To show what this looks like, here is an example of a fully developed evaluation paragraph Tom could use:

“However, the impact of a rise in the national minimum wage **DEPENDS ON** the wage elasticity of demand for labour. If the wage elasticity of demand for labour is more elastic, e.g. customer service workers, who are more easily replaceable by AI, then the rise in the minimum wage will generate a more significant contraction in quantity demanded, as firms replace workers with AI. In this case, unemployment rises more substantially. On the other hand, if demand for workers is more wage inelastic, e.g. nurses, who are more difficult to replace with capital, then the rise in the minimum wage will cause a smaller contraction in demand for labour, and unemployment does not rise considerably.”

Similarly to last time, Tom also needs to be more specific in his conclusions — either mention something that his answer “depends on” or state which exact policies the government needs to implement.

Focus for the next paper:

- Focus on completing the full 25-mark structure, i.e. three points and three evaluations — if timing is tight, I'd recommend starting with the 25-markers.
- Conclusions — refrain from just summarising your points. Focus on adding a new evaluative point that your entire answer **DEPENDS ON**.
- Ensure you fully reference diagrams when including them — explain the shift and the impact on the price/quantity.

Let me know if Tom has any questions!

Best wishes,
Eliot

Genuine feedback from a real marked paper — names have been changed for privacy.