

Assessed student work Economics Teacher Support Material

## Student B

### IB Economics—internal assessment summary portfolio coversheet

School code      Name of school

Candidate name

Candidate number

Student B

Commentary number	Date article published	Date commentary written	Different and appropriate source	Section of the syllabus the article relates to	Number of words
B1	14/10/2008	17/11/2008	✓	2	728
B2	02/02/2008	20/02/2008	✓	1	716
B3	10/10/2008	29/11/2008	✓	4	749

### Example B1: “Inflation soars to 5.2%”

#### Moderator comments

Criterion      A B C D E Total

Marks available 3 2 2 3 4 14

Marks awarded 1 1 1 1 1 5

The section of the syllabus example B1 appropriately relates to is section 2.

**Nature of the article**

The article is from a United Kingdom (UK) newspaper, is about the correct length and was published within one year of writing the commentary.

The article can be summarized as looking at consumer price index (CPI) and retail price index (RPI) in the UK and possible reasons for the inflation rate. It also discusses the role of interest rates in inflation. It is a fairly typical article for a weaker student and there does not seem to be much that is contentious.

**Criterion A: Diagrams**

There are three diagrams. These are untidy but this should not detract from the mark awarded.

The first one is probably relevant but the explanation is poor. The student does not say how increasing aggregate demand (AD) could lead to inflation.

The second diagram “could” also be correct but the shift in the AD is very questionable. It is not appropriate to say that cost-push inflation will also cause a shift to the left of the AD schedule.

The third one, the Phillips curve, is not explained in detail nor put into context.

**Criterion B: Terminology**

There are a significant number of economic terms used, but often incorrectly.

**Criterion C: Application**

Relevant economic concepts are applied to the article, but with little success. In the first part of the commentary, application is to a slight degree evident. However, in the second half application is weaker as the student draws the Phillips curve but does not show the relevance.

**Criterion D: Analysis**

There is some confusion about what causes inflation, and the student fails to realize that increasing pension payments may exacerbate the problem. The student has only a limited understanding of monetary and fiscal policy. There are some clear errors, for example, a belief that lowering taxes will control inflation, and a statement “raising the demand and thereby lowering inflation”.

This is a good example of “limited” analysis.

**Criterion E: Evaluation**

This is borderline levels 0 and 1. There are some judgments made at a very basic level, such as the one that monetary policy will “probably” be the most effective tool. However, judgments are very weak and not supported by any reasoning.

**Overall**

The lack of evaluation and the absence of links to the article make this a weak commentary. Furthermore, the theory is not always accurate or explained in detail.

**Example B2: “Truck pollution fine for capital”****Moderator comments****Criterion    A B C D E Total**

Marks available 3 2 2 3 4 14

Marks awarded 1 1 1 1 2 6

The section of the syllabus example B2 appropriately relates to is section 1.

**Nature of the article**

It is a little bit disappointing that this is another UK source, and a UK article. This is a good example of about the minimum length for an effective article.

**Criterion A: Diagrams**

The first diagram is largely accurate but poorly labelled, and the explanation is limited and not consistent with the labelling.

The second diagram is imprecise, not explained well and the link to the “incidence to taxation” confuses the issue.

The third diagram is not correctly labelled and seems to be irrelevant to the (rather opaque) point being made towards the end of the commentary.

**Criterion B: Terminology**

Economic terminology is limited and some errors are made. For example, the student uses the term “factors of supply” rather than “determinants of supply”.

**Criterion C: Application**

There is some context in relation to this article but the application made by the student is not always relevant,

particularly so towards the end of the commentary.

#### **Criterion D: Analysis**

Analysis is basic. For example, the student does not question that a pollution charge may have a limited effect. The work is perhaps borderline between levels 1 and 2, but the analysis is not always appropriate and there are some significant errors.

#### **Criterion E: Evaluation**

There is some evidence of evaluation. The student tries to look at the effects on various stakeholders. This is extended to the health system. However, the attempt to look for better alternatives than the daily charge is limited.

#### **Overall**

There is some slight improvement in the analysis over the previous commentary, although not enough to reach level 2. This is a rare example of work in which the student does better at evaluation than analysis.

### **Example B3: “Africa’s expensive borders”**

#### **Moderator comments**

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>Total</b>
Marks available	3	2	2	3	4	14
Marks awarded	0	1	1	1	1	4

The section of the syllabus example B3 appropriately relates to is section 4.

#### **Nature of the article**

The *International Herald Tribune* is used as a source. It is a pity that the student has taken all sources from either the UK or United States of America. However, this is an interesting and varied article.

It tackles the clichéd argument that the tariffs of most economically developed countries (MEDCs) are the main barrier to Sub-Saharan Africa’s involvement in world trade. The article could yield lots of interesting ideas for an able student. However, it is probably a little overwhelming for a weaker one.

#### **Criterion A: Diagrams**

It is not completely clear whether or not this should be a level 0 or a level 1. The first diagram as explained by the student is of very little relevance to the article and the second diagram is not clearly explained or relevant, being about MEDC agricultural subsidies. This is a judgment call and one that occasionally needs to be made in criterion-related assessment.

#### **Criterion B: Terminology**

This is weak throughout the commentary, with the student's main definition—that of less economically developed countries (LEDCs)—being very weak indeed. There are not many economic terms included.

#### **Criterion C: Application**

Linkages between economic theory and the extract are not well developed. Some relevant points are made, drawing heavily upon the article, but the application is not convincing. The student seems to forget the article is about Africa's domestic barriers to trade.

#### **Criterion D: Analysis**

The economic analysis is undeniably weak, tending to be a simple description of possible problems that an LEDC may face.

#### **Criterion E: Evaluation**

There are very limited and unsupported judgments in this commentary. The last paragraph contains one or two judgments, but they are unsupported and even a little confusing.

#### **Overall**

A good article but beyond the capacity of this student. He or she sacrifices an opportunity to evaluate whether internal barriers to trade are really more important than access to MEDC markets. This is an example of a commentary that is really an essay rather than an investigation of the issues raised in the article.

#### **Criterion F: Rubric requirements**

This criterion assesses the extent to which the student meets the five rubric requirements for the complete portfolio.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Yes/no</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Word limit	✓	Correct
Section of the syllabus— articles	✓	Appropriate

Sources	✓	Appropriate
Contemporary articles	✓	Appropriate
Contents	✓	Correct
Marks out of 3 (criterion F)	3/3	All five rubric requirements are met

**Marks out of 14 x 3**  $5 + 6 + 4 = 15$

**Total marks**  $15 + 3 = 18/45$



**Student B: example 1 (B1)**

[http://xmltwo.ibo.org/publications/DP/Group3/d\\_3\\_econo\\_tsm\\_1102\\_1/pdf/StudentB\\_example01\\_en.pdf](http://xmltwo.ibo.org/publications/DP/Group3/d_3_econo_tsm_1102_1/pdf/StudentB_example01_en.pdf)



**Student B: example 2 (B2)**

[http://xmltwo.ibo.org/publications/DP/Group3/d\\_3\\_econo\\_tsm\\_1102\\_1/pdf/StudentB\\_example02\\_en.pdf](http://xmltwo.ibo.org/publications/DP/Group3/d_3_econo_tsm_1102_1/pdf/StudentB_example02_en.pdf)



**Student B: example 3 (B3)**

[http://xmltwo.ibo.org/publications/DP/Group3/d\\_3\\_econo\\_tsm\\_1102\\_1/pdf/StudentB\\_example03\\_en.pdf](http://xmltwo.ibo.org/publications/DP/Group3/d_3_econo_tsm_1102_1/pdf/StudentB_example03_en.pdf)



**Moderator comments**

[http://xmltwo.ibo.org/publications/DP/Group3/d\\_3\\_econo\\_tsm\\_1102\\_1\\_e&part=2&chapter=3&mode=moderator&mode=moderator.html](http://xmltwo.ibo.org/publications/DP/Group3/d_3_econo_tsm_1102_1_e&part=2&chapter=3&mode=moderator&mode=moderator.html)