REPORT MARKS

Following are your marks for the Final Report (including analysis.R) deliverable of the coursework.

Each component was assessed, then assigned a qualitative mark from the rubric on pp. 4-5 of the coursework specification.

The component's score was then computed by multiplying the component points by the percentage corresponding to the mark in the assessment criteria for each component; the result was rounded to the nearest whole number.

The total net score is the sum of the component scores.

Many groups just copied text from other sources, including research papers and textbooks found on the Web, and pasted or paraphrased that text into their final report. The rubric clearly states that content that is "missing or copied from another source" receives a mark of zero (0).

Please don't try to claim that is not the way they do it in your country: the module team has first-hand experience as students and/or tutors on every continent except Antarctica; so, unless you went to an Antarctic university, we know that copying without attribution is not allowed where you come from. In any case, you're in England now; you must follow the rules in place here.

	Section/+ Component	Mark	Score		Possible
	Marks				
+	partA: *Submission* • *Was a final report PDF version submitted via Canvas?* Yes. • *Was it submitted on-time?* Yes. • *Is there a final_report.{docx,tex,md} file?* Yes. • *Is there a research_question.yml file?* Yes. • *Is the research_question.yml file syntactically correct?* Yes. • *Is there a visualization.R file?* Yes. • *Does it generate an image file called 'visualization.pdf'?* Yes. • *Is there an analysis.R file?* Yes. • *Does it output an analysis?* Yes.	**Excellent**	14	of	15
+	partB: *Introduction* • *Is there an introductory section (i.e. Introduction)?* Yes. • *Are the sources of copied/paraphrased text properly attributed with citations and quotation marks where needed (be *very* strict: if there is *any* doubt answer 'No') ?* Yes. • *Does the introductory section state the research question (RQ)?* Yes. • *Does the introductory section give a reason (motivation) for the RQ?* No. • *Does the introductory section *correctly* state the Null hypothesis (H0)?* Yes. • *Does the introductory section *correctly* state the alternative hypothesis (H1/H_alt)?* Yes. • *Does the introductory section describe the data set?* Yes. • *Is the original source of the data identified (not just as data.world)?* Yes. • *Was the data set obtained from data.world?* Yes. • *Are the columns that correspond to the independent and dependent variables identified?* Yes. *Summary:* Introduction does not motivate RQ.	**Needs improvement**	7	of	15
+	partC: *Visualization*	**Excellent**	14	of	15

• *Is there a section that presents data visualization (i.e. Visualization)?* Yes.
• *Are the sources of copied/paraphrased text properly attributed with citations and quotation marks where needed (be *very* strict: if there is *any* doubt answer 'No')?* Yes.
• *Does the visualization section include an appropriate plot for the RQ (scatterplot for correlation, boxplots for means/medians, stacked barplots for proportions)?* Yes.
• *Is the plot from actual output of an R script (PNG, PDF, etc.; NOT a screenshot)?* Yes.
• *Does the image have a caption or title, X and Y-axis labels, and units if they are not obvious?* Yes.
• *Are the title or caption and axis labels informative?* Yes.
• *Are there additional plots?* Yes.
• *Do they add anything useful to help the reader understand the data?* Yes.

+	partD: *Analysis* • *Is there a section containing statistical analysis (i.e. Analysis)?* Yes. • *Are the sources of copied/paraphrased text properly attributed with citations and quotation marks where needed (be *very* strict: if there is *any* doubt answer 'No')?* Yes. • *Does it describe the statistical test used to test the hypotheses?* Yes. • *Is the test appropriate for the RQ? (I.e, Spearman, Kendall, or Pearson for correlation, Student's t, Mann-Whitney U/Wilcoxon for means/medians, chi-squared for proportions.)* Yes. • *Is the test appropriate for the data? (I.e. parametric for normal, non-parametric for not normal.)* Yes. • *Does the analysis state whether the Null hypothesis is rejected or not?* Yes. • *Is the rejection (or not) of the Null hypothesis correct at p-value threshold of 0.05?* No. No sure as the results were given in exponetials. *Summary:* Alpha (p-value threshold) is not appropriate.	**Acceptable**	8	of	15
+	partE: *Conclusion* • *Is there a section that discusses implications? (i.e. Discussion and/or Conclusion)?* Yes. • *Are the sources of copied/paraphrased text properly attributed with citations and quotation marks where needed (be *very* strict: if there is *any* doubt answer 'No')?* Yes. • *Does it explain what the results mean?* Yes. • *Is the explanation plausible? Note: if they claim to have proven anything, answer 'No.'* Yes. • *Does it interpret the results, discussing reasons and/or implications?* Yes.	**Excellent**	19	of	20
+	partF: *Presentation*	**Excellent**	19	of	20

• *Does the report make claims or assertions that require citations?* Yes.
• *Are citations and references included?* Yes.
• *Are citations and references either IEEE (numbered) or Harvard (author date) format (but not both)?* Yes.
• *Is the document spelled correctly (including image labels, section headings, and table of contents if present)?* Yes.
• *Is the document punctuated correctly?* Yes.
• *Is the document grammatically correct?* Yes.
• *Is the writing understandable?* Yes.
• *Does the report convey some understanding of the reason why we might want to conduct a statistical test?* Yes.
• *Does the report show a connection between the RQ, visualization and test (even if wrong test was chosen)?* Yes.
• *Is the writing clear, concise, coherent, well-organized, and at a post-graduate standard?* Yes.
• *Does the report convey a compelling reason why we might want to conduct a statistical test? (i.e. is the RQ interesting?)* Yes.

Marks net score:	81	of	100

Total net score:	81	of	100 = 81%