Commentary on candidate evidence

Assessors awarded the candidate evidence the following marks for each section of the project.

Candidate 1

Introduction

The candidate was awarded **6 out of 6 marks.**

Mark 1 was awarded because the introduction links to the research question.

Mark 2 was awarded because an appropriate research question is stated.

Mark 3 was awarded because the type of data is stated as continuous and numerical – in this data set the ratings are given on a continuous scale of 1 to 10.

Mark 4 was awarded because the source of the data is explained.

Mark 5 was awarded because reference to ‘no affiliation’ is sufficient discussion of validity.

Mark 6 was awarded because reference to ‘excluding ratings’ to make the comparison fair is sufficient discussion of credibility.

Candidate 2

Introduction

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 6 marks**.

Mark 1 was not awarded because there is no introductory discussion.

Mark 2 was awarded because a valid research question was stated ‘difference in means’.

Mark 3 was awarded because the type of data is stated as numerical. Candidates should be encouraged to state whether numerical data is discrete or continuous.

Mark 4 was awarded because the website used has been mentioned.

Mark 5 was not awarded because the attempt to discuss validity is incomplete as it does not explain why the data is accurate.

Mark 6 was not awarded because there is no discussion of bias and influence.

Candidate 3

Introduction

The candidate was awarded **5 out of 6 marks**.

Mark 1 was awarded because the introduction links to the research question.

Mark 2 was awarded because an appropriate research question is stated.

Mark 3 was awarded because the type of data was stated as quantitatively discrete (number of streams).

Mark 4 was awarded because there is an explanation of how the data were collected.

Mark 5 was not awarded because the discussion is insufficient, the candidate could have explained that Spotify has nothing to gain from falsifying streaming numbers.

Mark 6 was awarded because there is reference to how the data has been selected and sufficient discussion on how bias could have been introduced to the sample.

Candidate 4

Conclusion

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 4 marks**.

Mark 21 was not awarded because the analysis of the scatterplot is different and now states that there is ‘no relationship’.

Mark 22 was not awarded because the analysis of the descriptive statistics is now different and includes ‘suggest that there is no correlation’.

Mark 23 was not awarded because the analysis of the test result is now different ‘evidence of that there is no relationship’, previously talked about significant differences.

Mark 24 was not awarded because mark 24 is not available where marks 21, 22 and 23 have been attempted but not awarded

Candidate 5

Conclusion

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks**.

Mark 21 was awarded because the analysis of the bar chart and scatterplot is repeated. (Mark 8 was not awarded).

Mark 22 was awarded because the analysis of descriptive statistics is repeated.

Mark 23 was awarded because analysis of the t-test result is repeated. (Mark 17 and Mark 18 were not awarded).

Mark 24 was awarded because the final conclusion is stated and answers the research question.

Candidate 6

Conclusion

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 4 marks**.

Mark 21 was not awarded because a new analysis of the boxplot is given. (Mark 20 would be available if it had not already been awarded).

Mark 22 was not awarded because the interpretation of the median and the IQR is reported and is not repeated in the conclusion.

Mark 23 was not awarded because reference to the ‘means’ is missing in the repetition of p-value analysis. There is also no repetition of the CI interpretation.

Mark 24 was not awarded because mark 24 is not available where marks 21, 22 and 23 are attempted but not awarded.

Candidate 7

Presentation

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 6 marks**.

Mark 25 was awarded because a graph was introduced correctly and the statement contains no analysis ‘I have used a histogram...’.

Mark 26 was not awarded because the text below the table of descriptive statistics includes analysis.

Mark 27 was awarded for the following statement ‘I will present an un-paired t.test’.

Mark 28 was awarded because appropriate headers were included.

Mark 29 was not awarded because a new interpretation of the test results was included in the conclusion. (Mark 23 would be available for this).

Mark 30 was awarded because the bibliography contains links and screenshots.

Candidate 8

Presentation

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 6 marks.**

Mark 25 was not awarded because the text following the scatterplot assumes there is already a relationship to show.

Mark 26 was not awarded because there is no introductory text in the appropriate section.

Mark 27 was awarded because the introductory text appears directly under output and the hypothesis statements.

Mark 28 was awarded because headers were included and appropriate.

Mark 29 was awarded because the hypothesis test is presented after the graphical displays and descriptive statistics, and there is no new analysis in the conclusion.

Mark 30 was not awarded because the output from statistical software is not appropriate as a bibliography or reference to the data source.