IQM3009 A1 Teacher marking reference

Todorov narrative theory and equilibrium analysis confidential internal synthetic practice pack

This reference supports discussion of the selected exercise extracts. Marks and bands are proposed documentary judgements, subject to human subject review.

Internal synthetic mock only. Uses current rendered IQM3009 A1 v2 Sample Assessment 1 Candidate Research Pack, which visibly contains six authored sample questions. The selected task is current v2 Q2: “Apply Todorov’s narrative theory to analyse how a chosen media text establishes, disrupts and resolves (or withholds resolution from) an equilibrium. Support the analysis with specific textual evidence.” Source identity is Candidate Research Pack v2.0, rendered candidate PDF, page 2; the six authored sample questions were approved for sample release by Laura Scullionhall on 9 October 2026; this does not select a question for live assessment use. Sherlock: A Study in Pink is a real 2010 BBC episode, selected here only as an illustrative mock case and not as an approved centre case study. Learner aliases, responses, posters, discussion records, observations and any performance are synthetic; none represents authentic learner or audience evidence. The rendered source visibly contains the six authored sample questions and has no visible question insertion placeholder. BBC Writersroom shooting script used as production-text evidence and may differ from broadcast.

Full-response proposed documentary judgements are AI/synthetic and pending human subject review; no poster/discussion mark or authenticity claim.

Teacher reference proposed full response judgements

INTERNAL STAFF USE. These are provisional documentary AI/synthetic judgements on the full written responses only. They are subject to independent human academic review. The extracts in the exercise are partial evidence and do not generate these full-task outcomes. Poster and simulated discussion receive no separate mark and cannot increase a written-task mark. No authenticity, approval, moderation or release outcome is claimed.

S1 full response proposed A 72 100

PROPOSED / INTERNAL / NOT HUMAN-VERIFIED — A, 72/100. One holistic best-fit mark for the written task only; no criterion marks, total or average.

The response answers current v2 Q2 precisely and sustains a clear argument that immediate case resolution coexists with withheld closure in John's story and the serial threat.

Todorov is applied accurately and with discrimination. The response tests the model against overlapping starting conditions, a false lead, uneven knowledge and partial closure.

Analysis is specific and evidence-linked to Lauriston Gardens, the unsuccessful taxi interception, the pill confrontation, John's intervention and Moriarty. It distinguishes production-script evidence from broadcast certainty.

Source use is transparent and relevant. The response does not claim measured audience effects and identifies the need for reception evidence.

Writing is coherent and well organised. A, 72/100 remains a proposed synthetic documentary judgement, not human-verified. Poster and simulated discussion are not separately marked.

S2 full response proposed C 56 100

PROPOSED / INTERNAL / NOT HUMAN-VERIFIED — C, 56/100. One holistic best-fit mark for the written task only; no criterion marks, total or average.

The response addresses the task and maintains a relevant line, but its account of the starting equilibrium and restored order is simplified and uneven.

Todorov is relevant and mostly understood. It recognises the false lead and open Moriarty thread, though the model's stages are presented too neatly in places.

The response refers to specific script details and correctly identifies the innocent Los Angeles passenger. Evidence is adequate but the analysis remains partly descriptive.

The script limitation and absence of audience evidence are acknowledged. The source range and theoretical development are limited.

Writing is clear and organised. C, 56/100 is a proposed synthetic judgement, not human-verified. Poster and simulated discussion are not separately marked.

S3 full response proposed C 51 100

PROPOSED / INTERNAL / NOT HUMAN-VERIFIED — C, 51/100. One holistic best-fit mark for the written task only; no criterion marks, total or average.

The response is complete and consistently relevant, but the answer remains broad and the theory is applied in a basic way.

Todorov's broad movement is identified. The response notes that the story does not return to the same state but gives limited explanation of how separate strands affect the model.

The response uses the body, false lead, taxi-driver reveal and ending as examples. Most points are relevant, though analysis and evidence detail are limited.

The shooting-script caveat and lack of reception evidence are stated. References are present, but source integration remains basic.

Expression is understandable and structured. C, 51/100 is a proposed synthetic judgement, not human-verified. Poster and simulated discussion are not separately marked.

Evidence correction for the taxi pursuit

The script’s pursuit from Angelo’s restaurant does not identify the killer. Sherlock intercepts a taxi carrying an innocent visitor from Los Angeles. This matters because the false lead delays resolution and demonstrates that the investigative attempt does not repair the disruption immediately.

Complete source rubric all bands and supplied descriptors

The source provides no U descriptors for criteria 2–5. Those cells are labelled “Source descriptor not supplied in candidate pack for this criterion” exactly as recorded. No reconstructed U descriptors are used.

A* — 80-100

Criterion	Source descriptor
Focus on the question and fulfilment of task	Responds to the question with outstanding precision and control throughout. The task is fully met and the line of argument is consistently focused, relevant, and sustained.
Accurate application of relevant theory	Applies theory with excellent accuracy, insight, and discrimination. Theoretical concepts are selected and used with a high degree of relevance and control.
Quality of analysis and evaluative judgement	Demonstrates sophisticated, perceptive analysis and highly effective evaluative judgement. Arguments are well reasoned, convincing, and critically aware throughout.
Use of evidence, sources, and referencing	Uses evidence and sources with excellent range, relevance, and control. References are integrated effectively and academic conventions are used accurately throughout.
Academic organisation and written expression	Writing is exceptionally clear, coherent, and well structured. Academic register is consistently appropriate, and terminology is used precisely and effectively throughout.

A — 70-79

Criterion	Source descriptor
Focus on the question and fulfilment of task	Responds to the question very effectively and with clear control. The task is fully met with only minor lapses in precision or scope.
Accurate application of relevant theory	Applies theory accurately and effectively. Theoretical concepts are clearly relevant and used with confidence.
Quality of analysis and evaluative judgement	Demonstrates strong analysis and clear evaluative judgement. Arguments are well developed and supported, with clear critical awareness.
Use of evidence, sources, and referencing	Uses relevant evidence and sources very well. Referencing is clear and generally accurate, with only minor lapses.
Academic organisation and written expression	Writing is clear, well organised, and coherent. Academic register is appropriate and terminology is used accurately in most places.

B — 60-69

Criterion	Source descriptor
Focus on the question and fulfilment of task	Responds well to the question and addresses the task securely. Focus is generally clear, though some points may be less fully developed or slightly uneven.
Accurate application of relevant theory	Applies relevant theory competently and with generally secure understanding. Some aspects may be less precise or less fully integrated.
Quality of analysis and evaluative judgement	Demonstrates sound analysis and relevant evaluation. Arguments are generally clear and reasoned, though not always fully developed.
Use of evidence, sources, and referencing	Uses relevant evidence and sources appropriately. Referencing is mostly accurate, though there may be some inconsistency or limited range.
Academic organisation and written expression	Writing is generally well organised and clear. Academic register is mostly appropriate, with some lapses in control, style, or terminology.

C — 50-59

Criterion	Source descriptor
Focus on the question and fulfilment of task	Responds adequately to the question and meets the task in a satisfactory way. Focus is evident but may be uneven, with some descriptive or loosely relevant material.
Accurate application of relevant theory	Applies theory in a basic but broadly relevant way. Understanding is sufficient, though there may be simplification, partial misunderstanding, or uneven relevance.
Quality of analysis and evaluative judgement	Demonstrates some analysis and some evaluation. There is a reasonable attempt to make judgements, though these may be descriptive, asserted, or unevenly supported.
Use of evidence, sources, and referencing	Uses some relevant evidence and sources. Referencing is present but may be inconsistent, limited, or partly inaccurate.
Academic organisation and written expression	Writing is adequately organised and understandable. There is some appropriate academic style, though expression may be uneven or imprecise.

D — 40-49

Criterion	Source descriptor
Focus on the question and fulfilment of task	Responds only partially to the question. The task is met in a limited way, with significant loss of focus, underdevelopment, or drift into description.
Accurate application of relevant theory	Shows limited or insecure application of theory. Concepts may be partially understood, weakly connected to the task, or used inaccurately.
Quality of analysis and evaluative judgement	Demonstrates limited analysis. Evaluation is weak, underdeveloped, or largely assertive.
Use of evidence, sources, and referencing	Uses limited evidence or weak source support. Referencing is incomplete, inconsistent, or frequently inaccurate.
Academic organisation and written expression	Writing shows limited organisation or clarity. Expression, structure, and terminology are often insecure or inconsistent.

E — 30-39

Criterion	Source descriptor
Focus on the question and fulfilment of task	Responds weakly to the question. The task is only minimally met and the response lacks clear direction or relevance.
Accurate application of relevant theory	Shows very limited understanding of theory. Application is minimal, confused, or largely inappropriate.
Quality of analysis and evaluative judgement	Demonstrates very little analysis or evaluation. Response is mainly descriptive or fragmented.
Use of evidence, sources, and referencing	Makes minimal use of evidence or sources. Referencing is very weak or largely absent.
Academic organisation and written expression	Writing is poorly organised and frequently unclear. Academic style is weak and terminology is used inaccurately or very minimally.

U — 0-29

Criterion	Source descriptor
Focus on the question and fulfilment of task	Does not address the question adequately. The task is not met or is seriously misunderstood.
Accurate application of relevant theory	Source descriptor not supplied in candidate pack for this criterion.
Quality of analysis and evaluative judgement	Source descriptor not supplied in candidate pack for this criterion.
Use of evidence, sources, and referencing	Source descriptor not supplied in candidate pack for this criterion.
Academic organisation and written expression	Source descriptor not supplied in candidate pack for this criterion.