IQM3009 A1 Teacher marking exercise

Todorov narrative theory and equilibrium analysis confidential internal synthetic practice pack

The selected synthetic extracts below form an unmarked exercise. Apply the supplied assessment criteria, record evidence and propose marks or bands before consulting the separate teacher reference.

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.

Four contiguous, sentence-complete passages selected verbatim from response paragraphs as unmarked exercise extracts, each 100–180 words. Each includes the exact task and all five source criteria; no extract implies or supports a whole-response mark by itself.

Teacher exercise four selected unmarked extracts

INTERNAL STAFF USE. The four passages below are synthetic extracts from complete synthetic responses. They are selected for comparison and are not authentic student evidence. No applied band or mark appears here. Apply current rendered v2 Q2 and the full source rubric as an unmarked exercise. A passage alone cannot establish a whole-task result.

Current rendered 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.

Apply the five published criteria to each extract: focus on the question and fulfilment of task; accurate application of relevant theory; quality of analysis and evaluative judgement; use of evidence, sources and referencing; academic organisation and written expression. Record evidence and a provisional band discussion. Do not assign whole-response marks from extracts alone.

Extract 1 — S1, Lauriston Gardens (verbatim excerpt):

Todorov's stages are not a checklist that every scene must satisfy. "Recognition" and "attempt to repair" can be useful descriptions of Sherlock noticing a pattern and pursuing the cab driver, but those labels are analytic shorthand rather than words the episode supplies. The chase from Angelo's restaurant is especially important because it frustrates a straightforward movement from clue to successful solution. Sherlock and John intercept a taxi, only to find an innocent visitor from Los Angeles. Their mistake briefly extends the disruption: the characters have acted on an incomplete inference, and the audience learns that apparent progress can be wrong. This sequence makes investigation a process of testing and revision. It also develops John's role from observer toward participant. A neat Todorov summary might compress the false lead into "attempt to repair," but a closer account notices that repair is uncertain and can generate further disorder before it succeeds.

Extract 2 — S1, closing sequence (verbatim excerpt):

The shooting script's ending supplies partial rather than total closure. A shot is heard before Sherlock can complete the pill test; the script cuts to a gun clattering on the floor in John's room and later confirms Sherlock's inference that John fired. The immediate threat is removed and the killer dies, so the case reaches a practical endpoint. John and Sherlock also begin a new partnership, which can be understood as a changed equilibrium: John has found a purpose and Sherlock has acquired a companion. At the same time, Sherlock never verifies whether he chose the safe pill. The driver names Moriarty as the person who warned him, opening a larger conflict. The ending resolves the present danger but withholds certainty about Sherlock's decision and the identity or motives behind the wider threat. The narrative therefore provides closure for the crime plot while creating disequilibrium for the serial plot. The episode's final state is changed, not simply restored.

Extract 3 — S2, Lauriston Gardens (verbatim excerpt):

The disruption becomes clearer at Lauriston Gardens. Jennifer Wilson is dead and the police are there. Sherlock notices that she has a pink coat and looks at clues such as the damp coat and a dry umbrella. He says the woman has travelled from somewhere else and that she was not married. The body makes the story feel like a crime, and Sherlock's observations start the investigation. The script shows that Sherlock can notice things that other people miss. John asks questions and writes some of the deductions down. This is a point where the problem is recognised. The theory helps because it separates the beginning from the part where the story changes. Sherlock's explanation also tells the audience what the clues mean, although some of the things he says are guesses. The story does not explain every clue in the same amount of detail.

Extract 4 — S3, Todorov application (verbatim excerpt):

Todorov is useful because I can put the parts in order. There is a starting problem, a murder, Sherlock trying to fix it, and then the killer being stopped. John changes as well because he goes from not knowing what to do to helping in a case. The theory is less useful if I say the story goes back to normal, because John and Sherlock are different and Moriarty is not explained. The beginning is not all normal either, because John has already returned from the army and is seeing a therapist. The story has a new situation, not exactly the same one as before. The theory can help explain this if the equilibrium can change.

Exercise record: For each extract, note evidence under the five criteria; discuss strengths and limitations; then state what additional whole-response evidence would be required before proposing a mark. Leave all mark decisions blank in this exercise.

Source rubric complete transcription for internal marking practice

The source provides the five criteria and six performance-level rows. The U row contains a focus descriptor only; the four remaining U cells are explicitly identified as not supplied. No missing descriptors have been reconstructed.

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.