

**General comments**

- Many candidates did not read the questions carefully and, as a result, did not provide what was required.
- Many candidates did not follow instructions.
- Candidates often did not write legibly.
- Answers were poorly spaced, e.g. every question was not started on a new page and lines were not left open between answers.
- One-word answers were often given where an explanation was required.

**QUESTIONS 1 AND 2 (SHORT QUESTIONS)**

- These questions were, generally speaking, well answered.
- Many candidates left blank spaces instead of attempting answers.
- Some candidates made two crosses where only one was required.
- The question on goals (2.2.4) was poorly answered.

**QUESTION 3**

3.1 "Evaluate" means decide whether it is good or bad (positive or negative). Candidates must use the terms "good" and "poor" and then give two examples from the menu.

Very few candidates understood what was meant by "balance". (Instead of heavy dishes and light dishes, they referred to texture, food groups, nutrients, etc.) Contradictions came up time and again, e.g. a menu cannot be both balanced and unbalanced, it cannot possess a good colour scheme and also be described as boring or dull.

Candidates are required to name specific examples of dishes on the menu e.g. green spinach, green salad, etc.

3.2.

3.2.1 Well answered.

3.2.2 Candidates did not understand the term "liaison" and, as a result, they could not identify the correct ingredient.

3.2.3 There is confusion amongst candidates concerning "accompaniments" and "garnishes". Spices were often mentioned as accompaniments.

3.3 Candidates did not know what a haybox was, and therefore did not understand that a haybox was not an appropriate way of preparing soup, because it cannot supply the heating temperature needed to boil soup. They usually discussed the general advantages of this cooking method.

3.4

3.4.1 Well answered.

3.4.2 (a) Not well answered. Candidates discussed gelatine in general, not relating to this specific question.

(b) Fairly well answered.

**QUESTION 4**

4.1 Most candidates did not know what a roulade was.

- 4.2 Definitions and terms
  - 4.2.1 Well answered.
  - 4.2.2 Most candidates remembered to “dip into boiling water”, but did not add “dip into ice water”.
  - 4.2.3 The majority of candidates used the word “drain”, and did not describe the process.
- 4.3 Most candidates did not know the food systems.
- 4.4 Well answered.
- 4.5
  - 4.5.1 Many candidates confused this question with choux paste.
  - 4.5.2 (a) Well answered.  
(b) Well answered.
- 4.6 Most candidates could not answer this question at all.

#### **QUESTION 5**

- 5.1.1 Candidates showed insight in answering this question, but had difficulty in providing reasons.
- 5.1.2 Candidates did not link the diseases to the context of the question (obesity).
- 5.2 Candidates did not read the question carefully.
- 5.3.1 Candidates evaluated in terms of food groups and nutrients, and not their suitability to an obese child. They did not analyse the menu, just rewrote it.
- 5.3.2 Choose well.

#### **QUESTION 6**

Many candidates did not know the family types and family stages.

- 6.1 Answered well
- 6.2 The question was interpreted incorrectly. Candidates referred to the developmental tasks of the whole family and not the stage that Sarah and her child find themselves in.
- 6.3 Once again, there were generalizations. Candidates also gave one-word answers instead of explanations. They should have taken into account that each answer was allocated 2 marks.

#### **QUESTION 7**

- 7.1 Answered reasonably well, except that candidates wrote “room looks spacious” instead of “the illusion of space is created”.
- 7.2 Candidates did not name the activity areas, they named the rooms instead. Candidates were not able to make recommendations with regard to the placement of the rooms.
- 7.3 Candidates do not know their colour harmonies. They struggled with the examples and could not distinguish between warm and cold colours.
- 7.4 General safety measures were mentioned, but these were not applicable to Esther's situation in the case study. (Esther is handicapped.)
- 7.5 Candidates were asked to suggest ways to warm the room, not create the illusion of warmth in the room.

#### **QUESTION 8**

- 8.1 Candidates did not know the advantages of a budget and therefore wrote down their own ideas, which often resulted in repeating the same idea several times in different ways, or giving the steps involved in budgeting.
- 8.2 Well answered.
- 8.3 Candidates knew the main difference between the life policy and the endowment policy, but could not explain why the endowment policy would be the better choice.
- 8.4 Badly answered. Many candidates did not evaluate the project. Instead, they evaluated the father's action and the value of that.

## **QUESTION 9**

- 9.1.1 Well answered
- 9.2 Many candidates did not understand the demands of work and thus could not identify examples from the case study.
- 9.3.1 Candidates continue to provide Maslow's list of needs in the wrong order e.g. 1. Self-actualisation.
- 9.3.2 The candidates answered the examples very badly because they did not take the phrase "did not master" into consideration, but gave generalised answers instead. Note that the question referred to SARAH'S needs.
- 9.4 Candidates did not know the steps in the decision-making process. Candidates wrongly repeated the advantages and disadvantages, when they were asked to EVALUATE. Candidates wrote the answers in future tense and not in present tense. Evaluation happens after the decision has been made, so candidates must avoid words like "can" and "will".

## **GENERAL COMMENTS**

Many candidates did not know their work and one wondered how the whole class could make the same mistakes.

Many candidates did not have the insight required of a Higher Grade class.

There were candidates who did not answer the questions correctly because they do not understand the questions. This is cause for concern.