ASSESSMENT 3 · MAJOR ASSIGNMENT · STUDENT COPY

UNIT 2 · THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES & SOCIAL FORCES

Development Theory in Action

Apply a theory of development to a real or fictional life — and analyse the social forces shaping it

CURRICULUM	CATEGORIES	TOTAL	CITATION
B + C strands	**All competencies**	**45 marks**	**APA**

What this assessment is. You've spent Unit 2 learning two big things: how people *develop* (the theories and lenses of Strand B) and how they're *shaped by social forces* — norms, roles, and institutions (Strand C). This assignment brings those together. You'll take one person — real, composite, or from media — and analyse their development using a theory *and* the social forces acting on them. That combination is the whole point: theory in action, in a real social world.

Choose your format

Pick **one** of the two options below. Both are marked with the same rubric and ask for the same skills — choose the one you'll do your best thinking in.

OPTION A

The Case Study

Analyse the development of a real or composite individual. Use the case provided below, *or* substitute your own (someone you know — no real names — or a composite you build). The person must have enough life detail to analyse across more than one life stage.

OPTION B

The Media Application

Choose a well-developed character from a film, TV series, novel, or documentary, and analyse *their* development. Pick a character whose life we see change over time, so there's real development to work with. Name the source in APA.

Your task — the same for both options

In a structured response of roughly **600–900 words**, analyse your chosen person's development by doing all four of the following:

1. **Apply a developmental theory or lens (Strand B).** Choose *one* from Unit 2 — a developmental perspective (e.g., psychodynamic/Erikson, sociocultural/Bronfenbrenner, humanist/Maslow), or, if your person is an adult, an adult-development theory (Erikson's later stages, Levinson, Neugarten, Mead). Explain what the theory says is happening in this person's development.
2. **Analyse the social forces shaping them (Strand C).** Identify and explain at least *two* of: the norms/values/expectations influencing their decisions (C1.1), role conflict they experience (C1.2), or the institutions socializing them (C1.3).
3. **Integrate — make theory meet social world.** Show how the developmental theory and the social forces *connect*: how do the norms, roles, or institutions help explain what the theory predicts (or complicate it)? This integration is where the strongest marks live.
4. **Support with evidence, cited in APA.** Use at least **two credible sources** (a research finding, a demographic trend, an expert source) to support your analysis — drawing on the literature-review work from your ISP Phase 2. Cite all sources in APA.

About sources & APA: This is where your ISP Phase 2 literature review pays off — the credible sources you gathered and assessed with the Trend Lens are exactly what you cite here. Use APA format (as in Unit 1, Lesson 6). Getting the structure right matters more than perfect punctuation at this stage; full polish is expected by your final ISP paper.

Provided case for Option A — "Maya"

Maya is 24. She grew up in a household where money was tight, and "get a stable job" was the constant message from her parents — a value she absorbed early. She was the first in her family to attend university, where she discovered a passion for documentary filmmaking, a field her parents see as risky. After graduating, she took a secure but unfulfilling office job to help support her younger siblings, while making short films at night. She still lives in the family home — like many in her city, she can't yet afford to move out — and feels the pull between being a dependable daughter, an aspiring filmmaker, and an independent adult. Lately she's been questioning who she is becoming.

You may analyse Maya, or substitute your own subject (Option A) or a media character (Option B). The case gives you enough to work with across all four task parts.

How you'll be marked

This assignment is worth 45 marks. All competencies are measured on this assessment. Use this rubric as you write: aim for the "Thorough" column.

Criterion	Limited (50-59%)	Some (60-69%)	Considerable (70-79%)	Thorough (80-100%)

Area 1 /15 · analysis & integration	Names a theory and a force, but doesn't really analyse; little or no integration.	Some analysis of theory and forces; integration attempted but unclear.	Considerable analysis; clearly connects theory and social forces.	Thorough, insightful analysis; theory and forces are integrated so each deepens the other.
Area 2 /15 · organization & terms	Disorganized; vague or misused course terms.	Some structure; course terms used with some accuracy.	Well organized; accurate, confident use of course vocabulary.	Polished, fluid structure; precise, sophisticated use of terms; clear voice.
Area 3 /15 · evidence & APA	Little/no evidence; sources missing or not credible; APA absent.	Some evidence; at least one credible source; APA attempted.	Solid evidence; two credible sources applied; APA mostly correct.	Evidence is well-chosen and clearly supports the analysis; sources credible and well-integrated; APA correct in structure.

Before you submit:

- I chose one format (A or B) and one subject with enough life detail to analyse.
- I applied one developmental theory/lens from Strand B and explained what it says is happening.
- I analysed at least two Strand C social forces (norms/values, role conflict, or institutions).
- I integrated them — I showed how theory and social forces connect, not just listed both.
- I supported my analysis with at least two credible sources, cited in APA.
- My response is roughly 600–900 words and organized clearly.

A note as you write. You may see your own family, choices, or experiences in this material — that's natural in a course about families and development. Write about whatever subject you're comfortable analysing; a composite or media character is completely fine and earns the same marks. The assignment marks your *analysis*, never your personal life.