

	Max	Pts.	Notes to markers
Application of Course Concepts:	45		Total is 50: More than 45 to account for answers with varying strengths. Record at most 45 here.
1. Demonstrates understanding of results in Table 1	3		3 – “Good,” 2 – “OK,” 1 – “Poor,” 0 – “No idea/NA”
2. Demonstrates understanding of results in Table 2	3		3 – “Good,” 2 – “OK,” 1 – “Poor,” 0 – “No idea/NA”
3. Correctly <i>applies</i> concept of statistical significance	2		2 – “Good,” 1 – “Marginal,” 0 – “No idea/NA”
4. Correctly <i>applies</i> concept of economic significance	2		2 – “Good,” 1 – “Marginal,” 0 – “No idea/NA”
5. Notes that UNLIKE A&V, ECO220 does NOT find that females are less generous than males when the cost of altruism is low but rather finds they are more generous although this is not significant	4		4 – “Excellent,” 3 – “Good,” 2 – “Marginally Passing,” 1 – “Poor,” 0 – “No idea/NA”
6. Notes that LIKE A&V, ECO220 DOES find that females are more generous than males when the cost of altruism is higher	4		4 – “Excellent,” 3 – “Good,” 2 – “Marginally Passing,” 1 – “Poor,” 0 – “No idea/NA”
7. Notes that UNLIKE A&V, ECO220 finds females generally more generous	2		2 – “Good,” 1 – “Marginal,” 0 – “No idea/NA”
8. Demonstrates understanding that Table 3 is needed to test for statistically significant differences in results of A&V vs. ECO220	3		3 – “Good,” 2 – “OK,” 1 – “Poor,” 0 – “No idea/NA”
9. Identifies that the hypothesis test is of a difference between population means (with unequal variances) where the research hypothesis is that the mean money passed by a sex <i>differs</i> (two-tailed) across the two studies (i.e. the P-values are for this test)	4		4 – “Excellent,” 3 – “Good,” 2 – “Marginally Passing,” 1 – “Poor,” 0 – “No idea/NA”
10. Demonstrates understanding of how to interpret the P-values	3		3 – “Good,” 2 – “OK,” 1 – “Poor,” 0 – “No idea/NA”
11. Notes that males behaved similarly in the two studies across all eight budgets (although somewhat more generous in ECO220); No statistically significant differences (at 5% significance level)	4		4 – “Excellent,” 3 – “Good,” 2 – “Marginally Passing,” 1 – “Poor,” 0 – “No idea/NA”
12. Notes that females behaved differently in the two studies for most of the eight budgets (budget 8 is the exception). Females were significantly (both statistically and economically) more generous in ECO220 and especially when the points benefit to the other participant is high (budgets 1 – 3).	4		4 – “Excellent,” 3 – “Good,” 2 – “Marginally Passing,” 1 – “Poor,” 0 – “No idea/NA”
13. Recognizes that sampling error is a TERRIBLE explanation for the differences for females. Possible systematic differences in sampled populations: studies more than 15 years apart, U.S.A. vs Canada, and students in different programs and years of study (e.g. ours is exclusively second-year stats and includes students in Commerce (three-streams), not just economics).	4		4 – “Excellent,” 3 – “Good,” 2 – “Marginally Passing,” 1 – “Poor,” 0 – “No idea/NA” (Award at most 1 mark if answer suggests sampling error as a plausible explanation)
14. Recognizes that the differences in funding (grant versus donation) may have impacted the results: e.g. maybe people more generous after witnessing fellow students and Prof. Murdock put money in the jar. But that it is remarkable how similar the results are for males and for Budget 8 for females.	4		4 – “Excellent,” 3 – “Good,” 2 – “Marginally Passing,” 1 – “Poor,” 0 – “No idea/NA”
15. Explains we do fail to replicate some of the original findings and that the concerns raised in TK71 do NOT apply because we did a large replication study, reported the size of differences, and found significant differences for females, which contradicts A&V (2001) conclusion that “when it is cheap, men are more altruistic.”	4		4 – “Excellent,” 3 – “Good,” 2 – “Marginally Passing,” 1 – “Poor,” 0 – “No idea/NA”
Writing: Are arguments well-structured and coherent: is it obvious how each paragraph relates back to the main question? Is the message clear and concise?	5		5 – Yes! (excellent given 90 mins.); 4 – Writing occasionally detracting from your comprehension; 3 – Writing detracting at several points but s/he is clearly trying to make her/himself understood; 2 – Writing frequently an impediment to comprehension but s/he appears to be trying; 1 – Writing a major impediment to comprehension throughout; 0 – Entirely incomprehensible