

GENERAL:

- The second national paper for Business Economics HG was a considerable improvement on the paper of 2006.
- The paper was set according to the national Senior Certificate guidelines for assessment.
- The whole syllabus was covered and questions were set according to Bloom's Taxonomy.

AREAS TO IMPROVE ON FOR 2008:

- There was a deterioration in the handwriting and neatness of candidates. Pride in their work was lacking. Candidates must be encouraged to break their answers down into components or paragraphs, with suitable headings. This will benefit them with the awarding of insight marks in Section B.
- Spelling is a serious problem and a concerted attempt needs to be made by education departments to improve the reading and spelling abilities of all learners.
- Candidates must differentiate between instructions such as *name*, *list*, *mention*, *explain* and *discuss*.
- Candidates need to be taught how to answer a question which requires them to state their own point of view or to substantiate their answer.

QUESTION PAPER 2007:

SECTION A:

The correcting of a FALSE statement needs attention.

SECTION B:

QUESTION 2

The majority of the candidates answered only part of the question and referred only to the factors that will influence pricing. When other facts were given, they were all given as one component, without any suitable headings. This created a problem for the markers. This popular question was not well answered.

QUESTION 3

The candidates misinterpreted the question with the result that they obtained very poor marks. Instead of discussing the factors that need to be considered in deciding on a particular form of ownership, they selected a form of ownership and described it in detail.

QUESTION 4

The question on fire insurance was very popular and was well answered.

QUESTION 5

The candidates who attempted this question did not obtain good marks because they did not understand the various functions of the SARB. In most cases only the headings to the functions were given.

SECTION C:

QUESTION 6

This question was very popular with the candidates. Question 6.2 was answered poorly and it was evident that the section on the product mix had been neglected by teachers.

QUESTION 7

This was a popular question which produced good answers. However, Question 7.2 was problematic as candidates did not understand the question and gave a wide variety of answers. It seems that the section on work study was also neglected in the classroom.

QUESTION 8

This question on the financial function produced the following problems:

- 8.1.3** The candidates could not explain how the factors determining the requirements for working capital related to Astrapak.
- 8.2.4** Vague answers were given to the question on effective stock management.

QUESTION 9

- 9.1** Candidates who did not follow the instruction of "write down only the letter" of the correct response were penalised.
- 9.5** In the discussion of the disadvantages of the organisational structure, candidates did not give enough detail to earn 3 marks per disadvantage.
- 9.6** The discussion on the necessity and methods of control were poorly answered. Candidates could not relate the definition of "control" to the business world.

QUESTION 10

- 10.1.1** Candidates confused the sub-clauses of the "name clause" with the contents of the memorandum of association.
- 10.1.4** Candidates could not identify the beneficiary of each preference share.

QUESTION 11

Where candidates answered all the questions, only the first FIVE responses were marked.

- 11.6** The candidates could not give suitable influences which affect decision-making by management. This question was answered very poorly.