



NATIONAL SENIOR CERTIFICATE EXAMINATION
2014

**LIFE ORIENTATION
COMMON ASSESSMENT TASK
PART B**

EXAMINATION NUMBER

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Time: 1 hour

30 marks

PART B

QUESTION 1

Consider the following quotation:

'Sport is a microcosm* of society. The same social issues that exist in larger society also exist in sport.'

[(Adapted from <www.ncssm.edu/elc/content/.../MoralSignificanceExcerpt-Boxill.doc>)]

Discuss whether you agree or disagree with the quotation above. Provide specific relevant examples to support your argument. You may use your own opinion as well as aspects from CAT Part A to substantiate your viewpoint. Your response should take the form of an essay of between 500 and 600 words.

Glossary

* Microcosm: A *microcosm* is a small society, place or activity which has all the typical features of a much larger one and so seems like a smaller version of it.

[<<http://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/microcosm>>]

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC: CAT PART B

	Criteria	Marks
90 – 100%	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.	27 – 30
80 – 89%	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 process of evaluation unequivocally supports candidate's stance with rigour and insight. Substantiation of stance includes complex reasoning involving synthesis of information. The specific selection of examples, which communicate comprehensive understanding and insightful commentary, add value to the response as a whole. The response is strengthened by articulate perspectives, which are supported by astute and exemplary selection of examples integrated into the argument as a whole.	24 – 26
70 – 79%	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 astute selection of examples. The process of evaluation supports the candidate's stance/claims. An interesting and appropriate selection of examples which contribute successfully to the argument as a whole through meaningful integration.	21 – 23
60 – 69%	The response displays analysis, interpretation and evaluation, but tends to be stilted at times. Argument/analytical thought process is evident but tends to be supported by statements which lack discerning evidence at times. The process of evaluation is not always clear. The argument demonstrates a systematic thought process but does not provide a convincing analytical argument of a 70% or the candidate tends to change his/her stance resulting in conflicting claims. Examples are generally well selected but are not entirely integrated into systematic argument/or discerning observations.	18 – 20
50 – 59%	The response displays an attempt at analysis and interpretation, but tends to lack logic and systemic evaluation. 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 adequate logical thought process – tends towards verbosity which clouds articulate argument. The candidate takes no clear stance/claims are not clearly articulated. Some examples selected are appropriate but at times are not effectively integrated. Examples do not provide adequate additional quality and insight to the argument.	15 – 17
40 – 49%	The response displays limited analysis, interpretation or evaluation at a superficial level. Response remains sketchy or not grounded by evidence or convincing argument. 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. Examples are provided but predominantly tend to lack a logical integration into the response or a connection to the candidate's stance.	12 – 14
30 – 39%	The response shows minimal analysis, interpretation and evaluation and tends to recite facts. 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. Predominantly undiscerning examples are provided which fail to provide adequate support to argument and lack effective integration – relevance to argument is confusing.	9 – 11
0 – 29%	The candidate has not understood the question and there is little or no development of ideas and/or the response fails to analyse, interpret or evaluate relevant information. The response is unfocused and lacks structure. Tends to be a garbled stringing together of ideas. No/random/irrelevant selection of examples bearing little or no relation to the question – relevance to argument/stance is unintelligible at times = 0.	0 – 8

