

GENERAL

1. ALL questions must be answered. A number of candidates left out some questions.
2. Candidates MUST read the instructions at the beginning of the question paper.
3. Each question must be started on a new page. Spaces must be left open between questions and subsections of questions.
4. Candidates must not use pencils, not even for calculations.
5. Answers must be numbered according to the numbering used in the question paper.
6. Candidates' handwriting must be neat – it was very difficult to read the answers of some candidates.
7. Many marks were lost owing to careless reading by candidates. Candidates give one-word answers to questions that clearly require them to "discuss" or "explain". Reading and analysis of questions must be taught and practised.
8. Answers must be tabulated where tabulation is required.
9. Candidates must use correct subject terminology. Slang is unacceptable.
10. Note that some questions ask for a certain number of answers, e.g. Name THREE ...
11. Note that the numbering indicates when questions are asked on the same topic. Candidates should, therefore, read longer questions very carefully.
12. Candidates tended to repeat the same sentences and facts when a question requires them to explain or discuss.
13. Candidates could not identify the verb in the question. It is suggested that they underline the verbs in questions.
14. Ensure that candidates hand in the loose answer sheet. They can staple it to the back of the answer book.
15. Principals must make special arrangements with the Department for candidates with serious reading and writing disabilities.

SECTION A

QUESTION 1

- Candidates must follow the instructions for the question, e.g. 1 cross per question. Candidates must not use circles or ticks.
- The questions on housing (1.1.8 & 1.1.9) were poorly answered.
- Candidates found questions 1.1.10 – 1.1.12 (data response) very difficult. .
- In general, questions 1.2 and 1.3 were well answered.

SECTION B

QUESTION 2

- 2.1 Candidates confuse bulimia and anorexia. Candidates mentioned similarities, instead of differences. Candidates gave incomplete answers, e.g. "gets rid of food", but did not say how. They stated "eat lots of food", but did not refer to "bingeing".
- 2.2
- 2.2.1 Candidates mentioned "sugar" but gave no explanation. A number of candidates stated that blood glucose levels are low, instead of high. Candidates also mention "insulin", but demonstrated no additional knowledge. Some candidates also described the two types of diabetes, instead of describing the illness itself.

- 2.2.2 Generally well answered, but candidates lost marks by using words like “sufficient” or “enough” instead of a **lot** of water, **less** sugar, etc. “Regular exercise” is not an eating habit!
- 2.3 Candidates could not differentiate between food types, food groups and nutrients. The question clearly indicated “foods to help prevent anaemia”.
- 2.4
- 2.4.1 Careless reading resulted in some candidates naming advantages instead of examples. Candidates did not know the meaning of “crops” as they give types of meats as answers! A number of candidates gave the answer to 2.4.2 at 2.4.1.
- 2.4.2 Even though the answers to the question were in the information provided, a number of candidates could not find the answers.
- 2.5 Very poorly answered. Little or no knowledge of lactose intolerance.
- 2.6 Very poorly read. Poor interpretation of the question. Candidates discussed how to prevent and manage HIV/ AIDS, instead of referring to its impact on the economy.

SECTION C

QUESTION 3

- 3.1.1 – 3.1.3 Occupation, status and uniform were often explained without references to clothing.
- 3.2 Generally well answered, but many candidates still gave one-word answers or vague phrases. Very few candidates referred to brand loyalty and distorted value systems. A few candidates explained the illustrations without answering the question.
- 3.3 Candidates confused questions 3.3 and 3.4 or gave the same answers for both questions. They often suggested what items to buy, instead of giving guidelines.
- 3.4 Candidates focused on personal grooming and non-verbal communication, but did not refer to clothing. Many candidates wrote about “not wearing revealing clothing”, “no tattoos” or “not over- accesorising”. Candidates mentioned rules for dressing for the interview, but did not explain how it impressed the interviewer.
- 3.5 Generally very poorly answered. Candidates had no knowledge of the negative impacts of cotton and wool on the environment. Many candidates gave the characteristics of wool and cotton, instead of explaining the impact on the environment. A number of candidates also wrote about the uses of cotton and wool or the impact of cotton and wool on the economy.

SECTION D

QUESTION 4

- 4.1 Candidates confused the implications of renting with the buying of a home.
- 4.2 There were gaps in candidates' terminology. For example, candidates wrote “tax” instead of “municipal rates and taxes”, and “water and electricity” instead of “connection of water and electricity”.

- 4.3 Well answered. 4.3.3. Some candidates explained how to save water, instead of how to save electricity.
 - 4.4 Candidates explained how a contract should be read, but give little information about the information that should appear in the contract.
 - 4.5 Well answered. Some candidates wrote about specific shops or types of furniture, instead of purchasing transactions.
-
- 4.6 Careless reading in evidence. Candidates gave guidelines for the purchasing of groceries. Candidates focused on recycle and re-use. The English word “waste” and the Afrikaans word “rommel” were not interpreted in the same way.
 - 4.7 Careless reading in evidence. Candidates wrote about how to recycle waste, instead of why it should be recycled.

SECTION E

QUESTION 5

- 5.1 & 5.2 Candidates had very little knowledge of employment contracts and the Labour Law. Candidates did not understand the questions. They confused these topics with organisations that can be used for consumer protection. Many candidates think that the Labour Law is an organisation that can be contacted in case of a dispute.
- 5.3 Candidates confused 5.3 and 5.4. Candidates mentioned single words, but did not discuss them. Answers were often repeated. Qualities were mentioned, but not discussed or linked to entrepreneurship. A number of candidates gave general qualities that are not necessarily linked to entrepreneurship, e.g. positive, friendly.
- 5.4 Candidates listed guidelines and words, but did not give adjectives and adverbs. For example, they wrote “promotion” instead of “good marketing”. They also stated that the product must be cheap, but not that the price must be competitive.
- 5.5 Very poorly answered. A number of candidates did not even attempt the calculations. Calculations were often done in pencil or not shown at all. Many candidates wrote only the final amount, even though marks were awarded for the calculations. Many candidates forgot to subtract 10 from 100.
- 5.6 General errors that occurred:
 - (a) Candidates did not choose a product.
 - (b) Candidates listed information that should appear on a label, instead of criteria for packaging.
 - (c) Candidates focused on the product instead of the packaging.
 - (d) Some candidates evaluated the muffins in the picture. Many candidates stated that the packaging must be attractive and “see-through”.

