

Question 6: Investigative Task**4 points****General Scoring Notes**

- Each part of the question (indicated by a letter) is initially scored by determining if it meets the criteria for essentially correct (E), partially correct (P), or incorrect (I). The response is then categorized based on the scores assigned to each letter part and awarded an integer score between 0 and 4 (see the table at the end of the question).
- The model solution represents an ideal response to each part of the question, and the scoring criteria identify the specific components of the model solution that are used to determine the score.

Model Solution	Scoring
(a) The boxplots reveal that the team tended to have a higher average per-game attendance during years in the new stadium than during years in the old stadium because the median value of about 25,000 attendees per game during years in the new stadium is greater than the median value of about 16,000 attendees per game during years in the old stadium. The interquartile ranges (IQRs) are similar, which indicates that variability in average per-game attendance is similar during the years in the two stadiums, but the range of average per-game attendance is slightly larger during the years in the new stadium. There are no years with average per-game attendance identified as an outlier for either stadium.	Essentially correct (E) if the response satisfies the following three components: - Indicates that the median average per-game attendance is greater in the new stadium <i>OR</i> Indicates that the average per-game attendance is usually (typically) greater in the new stadium - Indicates that the variability in average per-game attendance is greater in the new stadium <i>OR</i> Indicates that the variability in the two stadiums is roughly the same according to the IQRs - Provides sufficient context by including the response variable (average attendance or attendance) or the units of the response variable (thousands of people or people) Partially correct (P) if the response satisfies only two of the three components <i>OR</i> if the response satisfies only component 1 <i>OR</i> if the response satisfies only component 2. Incorrect (I) if the response does not meet the criteria for E or P.

Additional Notes:

- To satisfy component 1, the response may refer only to “center” and does not need to specify which measure of center (e.g., median, mean) is being used.

- To satisfy component 2, a response may refer only to “variability” or “spread” and does not need to specify which measure of variability (e.g., range or IQR) is being used. However, if the response states that the variability is about the same, the response must explicitly refer to the IQRs.
- To satisfy components 1 and 2, the stadiums must be identified (e.g., “old,” “new”), and an explicit comparison phrase (e.g., “greater than,” “about the same as”) must be used. Separate lists of characteristics alone or summary statistics alone do not count as a comparison.
- To satisfy components 1 and 2, numerical values are not required. However, if they are included, they should be reasonably correct. Numerical values can be reported in units of people (e.g., median = 16,000) or in thousands of people (e.g., median = 16).
- Any mention of shape is ignored in the scoring of part (a) because complete shape information cannot be obtained from a boxplot. Statements about shape not clearly supported by the boxplots (e.g., “the old stadium distribution is approximately normal”) should be considered a negative in terms of holistic scoring. However, statements about shape that are supported by the boxplots (e.g., “the old stadium distribution is roughly symmetric,” “the new stadium distribution is skewed to the left”) should be considered a positive.

Model Solution	Scoring
(b) During the years in the new stadium, the average per-game attendance increases linearly, from about 16,000 people in 2000 to about 27,000 people in 2016. However, during the years in the old stadium, there is no obvious increasing or decreasing trend over time for the average per-game attendance. The average attendance appears to vary about an average of approximately 16,000 attendees per game from 1970 to 1999.	Essentially correct (E) if the response satisfies the following three components: - Describes the direction of the trend in average per-game attendance in the new stadium as increasing (positive) - Describes the direction of the trend in average per-game attendance in the old stadium as relatively constant (e.g., “no association,” “flat”) <i>OR</i> Describes the direction of the trend in the old stadium as positive but less steep (e.g., “less positive,” “flatter”) than the trend in the new stadium - Provides sufficient context by including the two groups (old stadium, new stadium) AND the explanatory variable (time or year) AND the response variable (average attendance or attendance) or the units of the response variable (thousands of people or people) Partially correct (P) if the response satisfies only two of the three components Incorrect (I) if the response does not meet the criteria for E or P.

Additional Notes:

- Only describing an association or correlation as “strong” or “weak” addresses strength and not the direction of the trend and does not satisfy components 1 or 2.
- Only describing an association as “linear” or “non-linear” addresses form and not the direction of the trend and does not satisfy components 1 or 2.
- Numerical values, including years (e.g., “from 2000 to 2016”), are not required for any component. However, a response that includes years in numerical form (e.g., “1970”) satisfies the context requirement for the explanatory variable in component 3.
- Component 1 can also be satisfied if the response provides an estimated value for the correlation for the new stadium that is positive.
- Component 2 can also be satisfied if the response provides an estimated value for the correlation for the old stadium of 0 (or approximately 0). Providing positive correlations for both stadiums does not satisfy component 2 because it is impossible to compare the steepness of the trends using their correlations.

Model Solution	Scoring
(c) (i) Graph I indicates a strong, positive, linear relationship between average per-game attendance and the number of games won during the 47 years of the team’s existence. Average per-game attendance increases linearly, with an average increase of about 500 attendees per game for each additional game won. Variation about the linear trend in attendance is relatively small and about the same for any number of games won. (ii) No. Graph II suggests that the rates at which average per-game attendance increases as the number of games won increases are about the same for the two stadiums. A line drawn through the points for the old stadium has about the same slope as (or may have a slightly larger slope than) a line drawn through the points for the new stadium.	Essentially correct (E) if the response satisfies four or five of the following five components: - In part (c-i) describes the direction of the relationship as positive - In part (c-i) describes the form of the relationship as linear or nearly linear - In part (c-i) describes the strength of the relationship as very strong, strong, or moderately strong - In part (c-ii) indicates that the rates are about the same for the two stadiums (or slightly larger for the old stadium) - In part (c-ii) provides an explanation that indicates that if a line were drawn through the points for the old stadium, the slope would be roughly the same (or slightly greater than) the slope of a line through the points for the new stadium Partially correct (P) if the response satisfies only three of the five components. Incorrect (I) if the response does not meet the criteria for E or P.

Additional Notes:

- A response that provides an estimated value of the correlation satisfies component 1 if the estimated correlation is positive, but an estimated correlation cannot satisfy components 2 or 3.
- A response need not include the word “positive” to satisfy component 1. For example, “the average attendance is higher when the team has more wins” satisfies component 1. Likewise, a response need not include the word “strong” to satisfy component 3. For example, “variation about the linear trend in attendance is relatively small” satisfies component 3.
- Correct comments on homogeneous variation in part (c-i) (i.e., the variation about the linear trend in attendance is about the same for any number of games won) should be considered a positive in terms of holistic scoring.
- Responses that satisfy all 5 components should be considered a positive in terms of holistic scoring.
- Context is not required in part (c) because it has already been assessed in parts (a) and (b).

Model Solution	Scoring
(d) The number of games won could be a confounding variable for assessing the potential effect of opening the new stadium on average per-game attendance. The boxplots in part (a) show that average per-game attendance tended to be higher for games in the new stadium than for games in the old stadium, but the cause of the increase may actually be that attendees were more excited about attending games for teams that were better at winning. The scatterplots in part (c) show that average per-game attendance has a strong positive correlation with games won, and the team tended to win more games playing in the new stadium than in the old stadium.	Essentially correct (E) if the response provides an explanation that satisfies the following four components: 1. States that there is an association between attendance and one of the explanatory variables (stadium, year, wins) 2. States that there is an association between attendance and a different one of the explanatory variables (stadium, year, wins) 3. States that there is an association between the two explanatory variables (stadium, year, wins) identified in components 1 and 2 4. Explains the idea of confounding by describing that the variable identified as a potential confounding variable could be the cause of the association between attendance and the other explanatory variable identified in components 1 and 2 <i>OR</i> Explains the idea of confounding by stating that it is impossible to know which of the two explanatory variables identified in components 1 and 2 may be the cause of the increase in attendance Partially correct (P) if the response satisfies only three of the four components <i>OR</i> if the response satisfies only two of the four components and justifies at least one of the statements in components 1 through 3 by referring to the appropriate graph from parts (a) through (c) (e.g., “based on the boxplots,” “in part (b)”). Incorrect (I) if the response does not otherwise meet the criteria for E or P.

Additional Notes:

- The response can use any combination of 2 of the 3 explanatory variables (stadium and wins, stadium and year, year and wins). The response cannot introduce a new variable (e.g., weather, having popular players) to satisfy any component.
- An incorrectly described association cannot be used to satisfy components 1 through 3.
- To satisfy component 4 the response must discuss all three variables: the response variable (attendance)
- The strength of the response to part (d), especially communication in component 4, can be considered in holistic scoring. A well-communicated response to part (d) should be considered a positive. A poorly-communicated response to part (d), should be considered a negative.

Scoring for Question 6

Each essentially correct (E) part counts as 1 point, and each partially correct (P) part counts as $\frac{1}{2}$ point.

	Score
Complete Response	4
Substantial Response	3
Developing Response	2
Minimal Response	1
If a response is between two scores (for example, 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ points), use a holistic approach to decide whether to score up or down, depending on the strength of the response and quality of the communication.	