IQM3008

LEVEL 3 · CONTROLLED STAFF DOCUMENT

Sociology and Psychology

Assessment 1: Presentation and viva

STAFF ONLY · Topic guidance and possible viva prompts

Duration
15-minute presentation plus 1–2 short viva questions

Total marks
100

Assessment window
Sample 2026

Assessment set
Set S of 2026

Audience
Staff only

Release timing
at coursework release

STAFF ONLY · Ask only 1–2 short viva questions after the 15-minute presentation. Do not release possible prompts.

Staff administration

Release the complete twelve-question candidate set together. Candidates can choose any one question from either discipline. Keep this topic guidance and possible viva prompts staff-only.

Schedule the submission deadline before the presentation and enter actual dates through the controlled issue process. Check the chosen question code, slides, source references and AI disclosure; record authenticity concerns through the applicable policy.

Record the 15-minute individual presentation and the following 1–2 short viva questions. Use the viva to probe the candidate's argument, evidence or understanding. Select prompts suited to the submitted work; a question may be adapted neutrally to a source or claim actually used. Do not coach, supply an answer or require all listed possible prompts.

Assess presentation and viva evidence together under AO1 30, AO2 30 and AO3 40. Use the exact DMR performance descriptors and raw ranges, judge each AO independently, and sum the three marks. The viva can confirm, extend or refine the evidence; it has no separate numeric mark or automatic authenticity bonus.

Staff indicative evidence is not an exhaustive checklist. Accept accurate alternative arguments and sources and justified conclusions. Do not require every suggested concept or a predetermined position. Evaluate quality of evidence and reasoning, not agreement with the assessor, source count, slide count, accent or visual decoration.

Record specific evidence and timestamps for each AO, with a focused improvement. Complete the double-marking and moderation record as its controlling instructions require, retaining the first decision. Actual learner, marker and approval entries remain for authorised staff completion.

Apply approved access arrangements. For interruptions, recording failure, late submission or authenticity concerns, follow the controlling assessment policy and document the action; do not invent a local scoring penalty.

Sociology

SOC1 · To what extent can socialisation explain differences in identity across the life course? Compare two agents of socialisation and use evidence from a defined social context.

Learning outcomes: LO25, LO26. AO1, AO2 and AO3.
Define socialisation and identity, distinguish relevant agents and show how norms/values are learned, negotiated or resisted. Use a specified context and life-course transition to compare mechanisms rather than listing agents. Consider individual agency, competing influences and variation within groups; avoid assuming an entire culture has one identity. Assess what the selected evidence can establish and develop a supported extent judgement. Functionalist, feminist or other relevant perspectives may support the argument; no single required combination.

Possible prompts: Why did you select this context?
What evidence most challenges your explanation?
How might your argument change at another life stage?

SOC2 · Evaluate the usefulness of Marxist and functionalist perspectives for explaining unequal educational or employment opportunities in one society. Choose either education or employment as your focus.

Learning outcomes: LO25, LO27. AO1, AO2 and AO3.
Explain each perspective accurately, relate class/stratification to the selected opportunities and use evidence located in a society and period. Compare mechanisms and explanatory strengths, including how institutions may reproduce advantage or allocate roles. Weigh meritocratic claims against unequal resources and recognise limitations in treating either perspective as uniform. Gender, ethnicity or social mobility may test the class explanation when relevant. Do not require a particular national case or assume association establishes causation.

Possible prompts: Which finding best distinguishes the two explanations?
What limitation matters most for your conclusion?
How did you check the evidence about opportunity?

SOC3 · Assess the view that urbanisation weakens social relationships. Use evidence from one urban setting and consider an alternative interpretation.

Learning outcomes: LO25, LO26, LO28. AO1, AO2 and AO3.
Define urbanisation and the type of relationships under discussion. Apply relevant ideas about modernity, industrial change, community, anonymity or new networks to a bounded setting. Compare evidence of weakened ties with new associations, subcultures or forms of solidarity; distinguish changes in form from simple decline. Consider who is represented in the research, the historical comparison and other influences. Conclude conditionally from the evidence rather than assuming every city or social group is alike.

Possible prompts: What do you mean by a weaker relationship?
How does your evidence support an urbanisation explanation?
Who might experience the changes differently?

SOC4 · How useful are modernisation and dependency perspectives for explaining a development challenge in one country? Select a specific challenge and evaluate the evidence for each explanation.

Learning outcomes: LO27, LO29, LO30. AO1, AO2 and AO3.
Define the development challenge and relevant indicators without reducing development to income alone. Explain contrasting internal-change and external-dependence mechanisms, applying both to a country and period. Weigh historical, institutional and international influences with evidence. Recognise variation within each perspective and the difference between a plausible account and demonstrated causal effect. Consider unequal impacts within the country, including women or children where relevant; do not require all possible development indicators.

Possible prompts: Why is your chosen indicator appropriate?
What would the alternative perspective say about your strongest evidence?
Which limitation makes your conclusion provisional?

SOC5 · Evaluate the view that social reactions help produce deviance. Apply labelling theory to one type of behaviour and compare it with a structural explanation.

Learning outcomes: LO25, LO31, LO32, LO33. AO1, AO2 and AO3.
Distinguish deviance from crime and apply labelling, social reaction and possible consequences for identity/opportunity to a defined behaviour. Compare with a functionalist, Marxist or other accurate structural account. Consider who has power to define or enforce norms, evidence of differential treatment, and whether labelling explains initial as well as subsequent behaviour. Evaluate research and alternative causes; avoid treating labelled individuals as inevitably becoming deviant. A supported qualified view is acceptable.

Possible prompts: Does the theory explain the initial behaviour or the response to it?
What evidence would weaken your interpretation?
How does power enter your explanation?

SOC6 · To what extent is restorative justice a useful alternative to imprisonment for one defined type of offending? Evaluate potential outcomes and limitations using sociological evidence.

Learning outcomes: LO31, LO32, LO33, LO34. AO1, AO2 and AO3.
Explain the aims and mechanisms of imprisonment and restorative justice and define the offending context. Compare relevant outcomes such as accountability, repair, reintegration or reoffending; do not assume one measure captures all aims. Evaluate selection, comparability, follow-up and the experiences of victims and offenders. Consider voluntariness, power, suitability and limits on generalisation. Treat effectiveness as an empirical question, without requiring current legal eligibility advice or an assertion that restoration replaces prison in all cases.

Possible prompts: How comparable are the groups in your evidence?
Which outcome matters most to your judgement, and why?
Where might your conclusion not apply?

Psychology

PSY1 • Evaluate how biological and learning explanations contribute to understanding one clearly defined human behaviour. Use evidence to consider the interaction between nature and nurture.

Learning outcomes: LO1, LO2, LO4. AO1, AO2 and AO3.
Define the behaviour narrowly, explain the selected biological and learning mechanisms accurately and apply evidence to both. Distinguish inherited or physiological influence from inevitability; explain how environmental experience may interact with biological processes. Evaluate study design, measurement, generalisability and causal inference. A conclusion should weigh explanatory contributions rather than assign unsupported percentages to nature and nurture. No diagnosis, personal disclosure or treatment advice is required.

Possible prompts: What evidence supports an interaction rather than two separate effects?
What does the design of your selected study allow you to conclude?
What alternative explanation remains possible?

PSY2 • How useful is social learning theory for explaining the acquisition of behaviour? Apply it to one everyday context and compare it with a behaviourist explanation.

Learning outcomes: LO1, LO4, LO21, LO22. AO1, AO2 and AO3.
Explain observation/modelling and relevant cognitive processes, comparing them with direct conditioning or reinforcement in a defined context. Use evidence to analyse what is learned and when behaviour is performed. Evaluate ecological validity, ethical issues and alternative mechanisms; distinguish imitating an observed action from evidence of a stable everyday change. Avoid assuming observed media content inevitably causes matching behaviour. Any accurate relevant research can support the answer; no prescribed study list.

Possible prompts: How does your evidence distinguish observation from direct reinforcement?
Which feature of the study limits application to your context?
What would you predict if the model changed?

PSY3 · Assess the extent to which social explanations account for conformity and resistance to conformity. Use research evidence and a realistic group situation.

Learning outcomes: LO1, LO6, LO8, LO21, LO22. AO1, AO2 and AO3.
Define conformity and distinguish relevant normative/informational processes. Apply features such as unanimity, group size, task uncertainty or social support to the situation. Compare conformity with resistance and evaluate evidence, including procedure, sample, ethics and generalisation. Recognise that a situational explanation can be probabilistic and that absence of conformity is not automatically proof of a particular disposition. Reach a supported extent judgement without requiring unsafe replication or primary research.

Possible prompts: What feature of the group is most important to your explanation?
How might social support change your prediction?
What limits the generalisation from your chosen research?

PSY4 · Compare the multi-store model and working memory model as explanations of short-term remembering. Which gives the more useful account for one everyday task, and why?

Learning outcomes: LO3, LO9, LO21, LO22. AO1, AO2 and AO3.
Explain relevant components and processes accurately, distinguishing the scope of the models. Apply both to an everyday short-term task and analyse what each explains or overlooks. Use evidence such as task performance, interference or dissociation where accurate and relevant; evaluate whether findings discriminate between models and how laboratory tasks generalise. Do not require unsupported precise capacity/duration estimates. A justified context-dependent conclusion can recognise the models answer partly different questions.

Possible prompts: Which aspect of the task is difficult for one model to explain?
How does your selected evidence discriminate between explanations?
What limitation remains in your preferred account?

PSY5 · How well do interference and retrieval failure explain forgetting? Apply both explanations to one learning situation and evaluate relevant research evidence.

Learning outcomes: LO3, LO9, LO10, LO21, LO22. AO1, AO2 and AO3.
Distinguish interference between memories from difficulty accessing a stored memory because useful cues are absent. Apply proactive/retroactive interference or context/state cues where relevant to the selected learning situation. Evaluate evidence, measurement and competing explanations; failure to recall alone does not identify its cause or prove permanent loss. Weigh which explanation fits the evidence under which conditions. Do not turn a study recommendation into a guarantee or infer more than the research design supports.

Possible prompts: What observation would help distinguish the two explanations?
Why is the selected study relevant to your learning situation?
What would make your conclusion less secure?

PSY6 · Evaluate the strengths and limitations of experiments and correlational research for investigating the relationship between distraction and task performance. Use published research and propose a justified approach to a further study; do not conduct the study.

Learning outcomes: LO1, LO3, LO21, LO22, LO24. AO1, AO2 and AO3.
Define measurable co-variables and a clear research question. Compare manipulation/control and design choices in an experiment with measuring naturally occurring covariation. Explain confounding, directionality, causal inference, validity and ethical feasibility in the distraction/performance context. Use published research critically rather than presenting a proposed study as completed evidence. Justify a feasible further design, including variables and one important control or ethical safeguard. No statistical significance test or actual recruitment is required. For PSY6, AO1 credits accurate knowledge of experimental and correlational methods, including manipulation versus measurement, variables, sampling, control, validity, ethics and limits on causal inference. AO2 credits applying these choices and research/data concepts to distraction and task performance, interpreting published findings or data, and justifying a feasible further-study proposal. The proposal is not a completed study; do not require data collection.

Possible prompts: What would stop you making a causal claim from the correlation?
Why does your proposed control matter?
What trade-off does your preferred design introduce?