**Investigation 10: Moderator comments**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Personal engagement  x/2** | **Exploration  x/6** | **Analysis  x/6** | **Evaluation  x/6** | **Communication  x/4** | **Total  x/24** |
| 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 8 |

**Personal engagement**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Mark** | **Descriptor** |
| 1 | * The justification given for choosing the research question and/or the topic under investigation does not demonstrate **personal significance, interest or curiosity**. 0 * There is little evidence of **personal input and initiative** in the designing, implementation or presentation of the investigation. 1 |
| **Moderator’s award**  1 | **Moderator’s comment**  No sign of personal significance.  Little evidence of personal input and initiative. |

**Exploration**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Mark** | **Descriptor** |
| 1–2 | * The background information provided for the investigation is **superficial** or of limited relevance and does not aid the understanding of the context of the investigation. 2 * The methodology of the investigation is only appropriate to address the research question to a very limited extent since it takes into consideration few of the significant factors that may influence the relevance, reliability and sufficiency of the collected data. 2 |
| 3–4 | * The topic of the investigation is identified and a relevant but not fully focused research question is described. 3 |
| **Moderator’s award**  2 | **Moderator’s comment**  The research question could be more focused. The countries sampled ought to figure in it.  The background is useful but the HDI and precisely how it is established needs explaining and more information on treatment and prevention could have been included.  The candidate does not propose to collect much data. There is some justification for the choice of the five countries that are sampled.  There are no safety, ethical or environmental issues. |

**Analysis**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Mark** | **Descriptor** |
| 1–2 | * Some **basic** data processing is carried out but is either too **inaccurate or too insufficient to lead to a valid** conclusion. 2 * The report shows evidence of little consideration of the impact of measurement uncertainty on the analysis. 2 * The processed data is incorrectly or insufficiently interpreted so that the conclusion is invalid or very incomplete. 2 |
| 3–4 | * The report includes relevant but incomplete quantitative and qualitative raw data that could support a simple or partially valid conclusion to the research question. 3 |
| **Moderator’s award**  2 | **Moderator’s comment**  The raw data is relevant although limited.  Some very basic data processing is carried out successfully.  There is some evidence of uncertainties being established on the graph (trend line plus scatter plot and R2 value). This is not, however, considered in the interpretation of the data.  Overall the interpretation is weak. |

**Evaluation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Mark** | **Descriptor** |
| 0 | The student’s report does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below. (*Scientific context*) |
| 1–2 | * A conclusion is **outlined** which is not relevant to the research question or is not supported by the data presented. 2 * The conclusion makes superficial comparison to the accepted scientific context. 1 * Strengths and weaknesses of the investigation, such as limitations of the data and sources of error, are **outlined** but are restricted to an **account** of **the practical** or **procedural issues** faced. 1 * The student has **outlined** very few realistic and relevant suggestions for the improvement and extension of the investigation. 1 |
| **Moderator’s award**  1 | **Moderator’s comment**  The conclusion is relevant but there is no discussion of the data and no explanation.  There is no reference to the scientific context.  The strength and weaknesses are outlined only.  A few relevant suggested improvements are outlined, they remain quite vague. |

**Communication**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Mark** | **Descriptor** |
| 1–2 | * The report is not well structured and is unclear: The necessary information on focus, process and outcomes is missing or is presented in an incoherent or disorganized way. 2 * The understanding of the focus, process and outcomes of the investigation is obscured by the presence of inappropriate or irrelevant information. 2 * There are many errors in the use of subject-specific terminology and conventions. 2 |
| **Moderator’s award**  2 | **Moderator’s comment**  Though the report is reasonably well structured and relevant, the lack of detail does not help the clarity of the report.  Subject-specific terminology is used correctly but there are occasional slips in the conventions and HDI is not clearly explained. |