



NATIONAL SENIOR CERTIFICATE EXAMINATION  
2013

**LIFE ORIENTATION  
COMMON ASSESSMENT TASK  
SECTION B**

Time: 1 hour

30 marks

---

**SECTION B**

In the Life Orientation Common Assessment Task Section A you explored a variety of topics linked to the theme Freedom of Speech and Human Rights.

Read the following quotation and answer the question which follows:

'The media's the most powerful entity on earth. They have the power to make the innocent guilty and to make the guilty innocent, and that's power. Because they control the minds of the masses.' *Malcolm X*

To what extent could the media be considered 'the most powerful entity on earth' as suggested by Malcolm X?

Your response should take the form of an essay of between 500 and 600 words.

**Assessment Rubric**

	<b>Criteria</b>
<b>90 – 100%</b> <b>(27 – 30)</b>	To award an A+ (90 %), a candidate must perform beyond and including the assessment criteria of an 80 – 89%. The candidate's demonstration of analysis, interpretation and evaluation must, in all respects, be presented with rigour and insight beyond an A. 90% is awarded to the exceptional candidate only and should be done so with due consideration. An A+ is the exception.
<b>80 – 89%</b> <b>(24 – 26)</b>	The response integrates and encompasses analysis, interpretation and evaluation in a mature and insightful facilitation of argument. Depth and substance of argument reveal analytical process and perspective. The argument is strengthened by articulate perspectives which are supported by an astute and exemplary selection of examples. The process of evaluation unequivocally supports candidate's stance with rigour and insight. Substantiation of stance includes complex reasoning involving synthesis of information.
<b>70 – 79%</b> <b>(21 – 23)</b>	The response integrates and encompasses analysis, interpretation and evaluation in a fluent and convincing manner but lacks the distinct lucidity and insight of an A. The argument demonstrates an analytical and systematic thought process. The argument is supported by coherent articulate statements which are supported by a relevant and insightful selection of examples. The process of evaluation supports candidate's stance/claims.
<b>60 – 69%</b> <b>(18 – 20)</b>	The response displays analysis, interpretation and evaluation but tends to be laboured at times. Analytical thought process is evident but tends to be supported by statements which sometimes lack coherence and discerning evidence. Examples are generally well selected but fail to be integrated into systematic argument or discerning observations. The process of evaluation is not always clear. The candidate's changes his/her stance/claims or fails to provide convincing argument.
<b>50 – 59%</b> <b>(15 – 17)</b>	The response displays an attempt at analysis and interpretation but tends to lack logic and systemic evaluation and remains sketchy or not grounded by evidence. While there are elements of an analytical process, the candidate tends to talk about the question as opposed to answering the requirements of the actual question. Fails to adequately grapple with the heart of the question at hand. An attempt is made to support elements of argument but statements are vague and do not show a logical thought process – tends towards verbosity which clouds articulate argument. Undiscerning examples are provided which fail to provide adequate support to argument. The candidate takes no clear stance or fails to articulate stance clearly.
<b>40 – 49%</b> <b>(12 – 14)</b>	The response displays limited analysis, interpretation or evaluation at a superficial level. The candidate tends to define concepts and terms relating to the quotation and question as opposed to responding to the actual question in a meaningful way. The candidate displays a limited ability to integrate information and develop an argument. Some examples are provided but tend to show little logical connection to the candidate's stance.
<b>30 – 39%</b> <b>(9 – 11)</b>	The response shows minimal analysis, interpretation and evaluation and tends to recite remembered facts. While knowledge of basic vocabulary is evident, an integration of this vocabulary into analysis, interpretation and evaluation is mostly absent. Candidate's ability to distinguish between aspects of information, compare and evaluate its content and defend and explain his/her position is limited. Statements made are repetitive and lack clarity. Limited examples are provided and their relevance to argument/stance is unintelligible at times.
<b>0 – 29%</b> <b>(0 – 8)</b>	The candidate does not understand the question and there is little or no development of ideas and/or the response fails to analyse, interpret or evaluate information relevant to the question. The response is unfocused and lacks structure. Irrelevant examples or no examples are given to support argument/stance or no stance is presented. Tends to be a garbled stringing together of ideas.