RPS Presentation and Viva teacher reference

Commentary for the matching extracts. Discuss independent judgements before reading the full-response proposals.

Fictional AI-generated material for internal review and teacher standardisation. Proposed marks have not been agreed by human markers.

PV-X1

Rhea gives a conditional thesis and identifies activity and context as relevant. The extract alone is mostly a position statement; source-specific support appears later. The full AO3 proposal is 44/60, within 42–60, conditional on the simulated delivery. Repetition later limits the upper mark.

PV-X2

Sam distinguishes study designs and outcomes before declining to combine findings, then separates interpretation from tested mechanisms. This is reflective understanding of the examiner's questions. Full AO1 proposal 31/40, within 28–40. Presentation hesitation must not automatically lower this listening judgement.

PV-X3

Tariq explains Kross using predictive rather than causal language and identifies what the Hunt intervention adds. These are relevant, accurate answers with an appropriate limit. Full AO1 proposal 30/40, within 28–40, even though his presentation delivery is less fluent. His full AO3 proposal is 36/60, within 36–41.

Whole response totals are Rhea 77/100, Sam 71/100 and Tariq 66/100. These examples deliberately show a narrower range of academic listening quality than presentation delivery. All marks are proposed; the written reconstruction does not establish an actual oral performance.