IQM3007

LEVEL 3 · CONTROLLED ASSESSMENT

INTO QUALIFICATIONS

Business and Accounting

Component 4: Accounting Viva

Viva conditions and preparation guide

Duration 10 minutes	**Total marks** 100
Assessment window Sample assessment	**Assessment set** **Set S of 2026**
Audience **Students**	**Release timing** **at coursework release**

Assessment conditions

- Individual recorded viva: 10 minutes, five questions. The questions are controlled and are not released to candidates in advance.
- Open-resource preparation; closed-resource live viva. No candidate-provided materials, notes, case studies or source documents may be brought to or used during the viva. No calculator or live external assistance.
- The viva is recorded for internal and external moderation.
- Questions use short fictional contexts supplied orally by the assessor. You may ask for the question to be repeated or for neutral clarification. Explain any assumption you use. You do not need to recall a particular real company or prepare a presentation.

Preparation

Practise giving direct explanations, applying concepts to realistic situations, weighing alternatives and supporting judgements. Revise the relevant syllabus; do not seek the controlled question bank.

Revise the Accounting syllabus (LO39–LO60).

How your work is marked

Each criterion is awarded a raw mark using the displayed criterion-specific ranges. The four criterion marks total 100.

Level	Mark range / anchors	Subject Knowledge and Understanding 30 marks Explains relevant accounting concepts, methods and terminology accurately, with sufficient breadth, depth and detail for the question.	Application of Knowledge 30 marks Applies accounting concepts, methods or calculations to the business decision context and explains their relevance.	Critical Thinking and Analysis 20 marks Interprets accounting information, analyses strengths, limitations and implications, considers alternatives and reaches a justified judgement.	Communication 20 marks Gives direct, coherent spoken responses, uses appropriate accounting terminology and responds relevantly to follow-up questions.
Excellent	**30-mark criteria: 24–30** **20-mark criteria: 16–20**	• Comprehensive, consistently accurate and precise accounting knowledge. • well-selected detail demonstrates secure depth of understanding.	• Consistently precise and well-developed application to the decision context. • methods, calculations or examples are relevant and fully explained.	• Sustained interpretation and logical analysis. • implications and limitations are developed, alternatives are weighed and judgement is compelling and justified.	• Consistently direct, coherent and concise. • terminology is precise and responses adapt persuasively to follow-up questions.
Good	**30-mark criteria: 18–23** **20-mark criteria: 12–15**	• Generally accurate and secure accounting knowledge with relevant detail. • minor gaps or imprecision do not undermine the response.	• Relevant and appropriate application that is usually context-specific and developed, with only minor generalisation or omission. • Performance is generally secure, with only minor gaps or unevenness.	• Clear interpretation and analysis with a supported judgement. • implications and limitations are developed, although depth may be uneven.	• Clear and organised communication with appropriate terminology. • follow-up responses are relevant with only minor lapses.
Adequate	**30-mark criteria: 12–17** **20-mark criteria: 8–11**	• Basic, broadly accurate accounting knowledge with partial explanation. • depth is uneven and there are some gaps or imprecision.	• Some relevant application, but contextual links, methods or calculations are generic, uneven or only partly developed. • Performance is broadly adequate but uneven in development or control.	• Some relevant interpretation, but the response is often descriptive. • analytical links and judgement are only partly supported.	• Understandable but uneven communication. • some organisation and appropriate terminology, with partly relevant follow-up responses.
Limited	**30-mark criteria: 0–11** **20-mark criteria: 0–7**	• Fragmentary, superficial or inaccurate accounting knowledge. • weak explanation and little relevant detail.	• Little or no credible application. • methods, calculations or examples are absent, irrelevant or not connected to the decision.	• Little meaningful interpretation or analysis. • assertions are unsupported and there is no credible, reasoned judgement.	• Unclear, fragmented or off-topic communication. • terminology is weak and relevant responses cannot be sustained.

GenAI conditions

Preparation is Level 2 – AI planning. AI may support brainstorming, outlining, initial research orientation and planning. Independently select, read and understand all sources. Your analysis, interpretation, conclusions, recommendations and final spoken responses must be your own. Remain accountable for accuracy, originality and integrity; acknowledge permitted assistance and reference and cite AI tools correctly.