Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each section of the project.

Candidate 3

Introduction

The candidate was awarded **4/6 marks.**

- [1] ✓ Mark 1 was awarded as the candidate explained visitor numbers to the UK, specifically looking at a growing industry.
- [2] ✓ Mark 2 was awarded as the candidate stated that data will be tested to see if there is enough evidence to suggest a linear relationship between year and visitor numbers.
- [3] × Mark 3 was not awarded as the candidate did not mention the type of data being studied – categorical or numerical. Mentioning the 'number of overseas visitors' is not sufficient evidence for identifying that the data is numerical data.
- [4] ✓ Mark 4 was awarded as the candidate provided information on the background of the data source, stating that it came from the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO).
- [5] ✓ Mark 5 was awarded as the candidate stated that because the data has come from a UN agency website, it could be assumed to be a valid source.
- [6] × Mark 6 was not awarded as the candidate made no comment on the credibility of the method used to gather the data.

Subjective impression

The candidate was awarded **8/8 marks.**

- [1] ✓ Mark 1 was awarded as the candidate generated an appropriate graphical display – bar chart.
- [2] ✓ Mark 2 was awarded as the candidate generated a second appropriate graphical display – scatter plot.
- [3] ✓ Mark 3 was awarded as the candidate made a comment relating to the usefulness of their first display – stating that their bar chart plot shows no linear relationship.
- [4] ✓ Mark 4 was awarded as the candidate made a comment relating to a second display – the scatter plot with a regression line.

- [5] ✓ Mark 5 was awarded as the candidate has included appropriate titles, labels and scales.
- [6] ✓ Mark 6 was awarded because the mean has been calculated for the dataset.
- [7] ✓ Mark 7 was awarded because the standard deviation has been calculated for the dataset.
- [8] ✓ Mark 8 was awarded as the candidate has included labels for each descriptive statistic and has clearly stated the liner model and associated statistics.

Analysis and interpretation

The candidate was awarded **6/6 marks.**

- [1] ✓ Mark 1 was awarded as the candidate's calculation of the Regression Line is shown.
- [2] ✓ Mark 2 was awarded as the candidate has stated Pearson's correlation coefficient.
- [3] ✓ Mark 3 was awarded as the candidate has included interpretation of the line of best fit in context with their research question.
- [4] ✓ Mark 4 was awarded as the candidate has presented a *p*-value and rejected null hypothesis (also stated).
- [5] ✓ Mark 5 was awarded as the candidate included (minimal) interpretation of the descriptive statistics.
- [6] ✓ Mark 6 was awarded as the candidate included evidence of interpreting all the graphical displays in context with the research question.

Conclusions

The candidate was awarded **2/4 marks.**

- [1] ✗ Mark 1 was not awarded as the candidate's evidence did not explicitly link the conclusion to the graphical displays.
- [2] ✗ Mark 2 was not awarded as the candidate did not give enough detail relating to the descriptive statistics within the conclusion.
- [3] ✓ Mark 3 was awarded as the candidate gave some detail relating to the additional statistics (hypothesis test) within the conclusion.
- [4] ✓ Mark 4 was awarded as the candidate connected the conclusion to the project aim.

Presentation

The candidate was awarded **6/6 marks.**

- [1] ✓ Mark 1 was awarded as the candidate provided figure numbering and associated descriptions.
- [2] ✓ Mark 2 was awarded as the candidate gave an explanation and introduction of the calculated statistics.
- [3] ✓ Mark 3 was awarded as the candidate gave a (minimal) explanation for the linear regression and the value of r.
- [4] ✓ Mark 4 was awarded as all sections contain appropriate headers.
- [5] ✓ Mark 5 was awarded as the sections of the report flow logically.
- [6] ✓ Mark 6 was awarded as the candidate included an appendix of the data.

Project total

The word count was within the 2,200 limit and so the candidate was awarded **26/30** overall for the project.