A.   FOLLOWING OF INSTRUCTIONS:

Many candidates did not follow the clear instructions in the question paper. This proved to be a frustrating aspect of the marking process as many candidates lost marks in the process.

1.   The question paper instructs "Answer only SIX questions".
    -    Many candidates answered ALL EIGHT questions.
    -    Some of them would have scored higher marks in the answers the markers had to delete as, in such cases, only the first six questions are marked.

2.   The question paper instructs "Answer all the questions in FULL sentences unless instructed otherwise". Questions in which candidates were requested to provide explanations were responded to in point form and these candidates lost marks.

3.   The question paper instructs "Number and answer subsections separately". In some cases numbering was incorrect.

4.   The question paper instructs "Start the answer to each question on a new page". Many candidates did not follow this instruction.

B.   PERFORMANCE OF CANDIDATES IN VARIOUS QUESTIONS

This analysis is based on the performance of full-time candidates.

1.   QUESTIONS IN WHICH CANDIDATES FARED WELL.

Question 1 (Compulsory)

    -    Question 1 contained TRUE-or-FALSE questions, item-matching questions and word-choice questions.
    -    These benefited weaker candidates, who were able to score some marks.
    -    However, questions that require candidates to define criminological terms were poorly answered, e.g. decriminalisation, jurisdiction, prosecution, *in camera*.

Question 2 (Optional short questions)

    -    A popular question
    -    Weaker candidates benefited as the questions did not require explanations.
    -    However, some candidates were not familiar with:
        (a) the different types of releases (2.10) and
        (b) the presiding officials in the different types of courts (2.9). Many candidates do not understand the term *presiding official* and described the courts instead.

Question 4 (The consequences of crime)

    -    A popular question which was thoroughly prepared by candidates.
    -    Candidates demonstrated a very good knowledge of this theme.
    -    In some cases, candidates achieved full marks (50/50).

Question 5 (The classification of criminals)

- A popular question which was thoroughly prepared by candidates.
- Candidates demonstrated a very good knowledge of this theme.
- A few candidates confused the gangster criminal with the different types of juvenile gangs, forfeiting many marks in the process.
- In some cases, candidates achieved full marks (50/50).

2.   QUESTIONS IN WHICH CANDIDATES FARED POORLY.

Questions that required candidates to define criminological terms,
e.g. decriminalisation, jurisdiction

Questions that were phrased differently from those in question papers of previous years proved challenging.
e.g.   Previous years: Describe the different types of defective discipline.
         This year: Describe THREE ways in which a child may react to over-strict discipline. (3.5)

         Previous years: Explain the role of the school in the prevention and
                              combating of crime.
         This year: Explain why it is important that the school curriculum should
                        meet the needs of the child.

Question 3 (Causes of crime)

- A challenging question set in an unfamiliar way and requiring specific content that tested knowledge.
- Weaker candidates and second-language candidates were not able to extract information relevant to the question.
- Instead, they gave responses related to the question, but which did not answer the question.
    e.g. Question 3.5 specified certain behaviour resulting from over-strict discipline.
    Candidates wrote about the different types of defective discipline (e.g. inadequate, inconsistent and over-strict), instead of explaining how a child might react to over-strict discipline.

Question 6 (The prevention and combating of crime)

- A popular question.
- Some questions proved challenging as they were phrased differently from those of previous years and required specific content.
    e.g. Question 6.4
    Previous years: Explain the role of the school in the prevention and combating
    of crime.
    This year: Explain why it is important that the school curriculum should
    meet the needs of the child.
- Many candidates wrote about the role of the teacher, which is related to the paragraph on the school, but does not answer the question, which specifically required candidates to concentrate on what a curriculum should provide.

Question 7 (The administration of justice)

- Not a popular question.
- A very poor performance in general. Candidates were not well-prepared for this question.
- This can be ascribed to the fact that candidates generally do not like to prepare this theme as it is long and they find it uninteresting. It therefore needs greater input from teachers.

- In Question 7.1 candidates were not adequately prepared to give reasons for the establishment of community police forums. (This question is seldom tested in the exams)
- Candidates also struggled with Question 7.2, which tested their knowledge of the parole system, particularly the aims of the parole system.
- Many candidates also confused the methods of rehabilitation with the vocational training programmes offered by the Dept. of Correctional Services.(Question 7.5), forfeiting many marks in the process.

Question 8 (Pathological phenomena)

- A poor performance generally.
- Markers agreed that this was a question in which candidates could have scored well.
- However, candidates were not familiar with the examples and effects of sedatives, solvents, stimulants and hallucinogens. (Question 8.1.1 and 8.1.2)
- Candidates also confused the effects of alcohol abuse on the drinker with the effects on the drinker's family. (Question 8.2)
- Most candidates were, however, very familiar with the different types of prostitutes.

C.   LANGUAGE PROBLEMS

- It is evident that most part-time candidates have serious language deficiencies.
- Poor spelling and grammar were widespread among both English- and Afrikaans-speaking candidates this year and it is alarming to note that such candidates have reached Grade 12.
- These problems were exacerbated by the fact that many Afrikaans-speaking candidates wrote in English.

Examples: inaf = enough
                judch/ jits/ gerges = judge walfe = welfare merda = murder

The list is endless!