

QUESTION 1

- 1.1 Moderately well answered.
Learners performed well many learners obtained moderately good marks
- 1.2 Poorly answered. Many learners did not understand the basic terminology in Evolution and Environmental Studies. Language seems to be a problem. Learners did not understand the terms.
- 1.3 Well answered. Learner performed better than expected.
- 1.4 1.4.1 Very poorly answered. Most learners do not know how to formulate a hypothesis.
1.4.2 Poorly answered. Did not understand the term relationship.
1.4.3 Very poorly answered. Most learners cannot explain, justify or provide reasons for the previous answer.
1.4.4 Very well answered.
1.4.5 Very poorly answered. Most learners cannot explain, justify or provide reasons for the previous answer.
- 1.5 1.5.1 Well answered answered.
1.5.2 Moderately answered.
1.5.3 Poorly answered. Did not understand the term relationship.
1.5.4 Very poorly answered. Most learners cannot explain, justify or provide reasons for the previous answer.
- 1.6 1.6.1 Poorly answered
1.6.2 Poorly answered, learners could not read a geological time- scale.
1.6.3 Very poorly answered. Reading from geological time scale was problematic.

QUESTION 2

- 2.1.1 Most centers demonstrated very poor understanding of Darwin & Lamarck. Many learners gave definitions without referring to the eg. In the Question paper; understanding of the nature of science does not come through.
- 2.2.1 Poor application of math operations; learners equate “times (multiplication/ division) with “difference”
- 2.2.2 Many candidates could have found the use of both words “feet” and “toes” confusing; Diagram had “toes” while the question referred to “feet”
- 2.2.3 Moderately answered. Many learners referred to other adaptations not included in the memorandum.
- 2.3.1 Relatively well answered. But many candidates answered “predation” instead of Natural selection; should perhaps have been accepted since diagrams do not sufficiently/ clearly discriminate between natural selection and predation.

2.3.2 Well answered because of the acceptance of variations in answers.

2.3.3 Very well answered.

2.4.1 Definitions poorly answered;

QUESTION 3

3.1.1 Poorly answered – few strong centers knew the content.

3.1.2 Moderately answered – it was a memory recall question; learners did not prepare work well enough.

3.2 Memo was limited. Learners should know that gills are not gill slits etc.

3.3.1 Very poorly answered. In the Afr question paper “bronne” was misinterpreted the question. Question was very vague and badly or clumsily stated.

3.3.2 Poorly answered. Many learners do not understand the concept of speciation.

3.4.1 Well answered. Drawings provided valuable assistance.

3.4.2 Well answered. They could use the diagram to explain the ‘same structures and different functions’

3.4.3 Very well answered. Memo very lenient.

QUESTION 4

4.1.1 Well answered.

4.1.2 Quite a few learners attributed typhoid to “high rainfall”. Poorly answered by many centers. Learners at quite a few centers only scored one mark because they did not qualify their reason.

4.1.3 Learners at quite a few centers had relationship reversed: “high typhoid, high rainfall.” Learners forfeited marks because of use of the term (proportional).

4.1.4 More centres seem to cope with the drawing of the graph. The headings of the graph need practice. We had majority of centres that failed to interpret the instructions given with the regard to the type of graph, the period for the graph ,eg:

- Many centres have learners who constructed graph consisting of rainfall and typhoid bars.
- From quite a few centres, learners had a rainfall on the y-axes and typhoid on the x-axes.
- We had quite a few centres that used the values given for typhoid in the table to construct the y-axes, thus lacking skills on how to construct the scale of the graph.
- We had majority of centres that failed to interpret the instructions given with the regard to the type of graph, the period for the graph.
- Some centres had drawn line-graphs, and pie-charts.

- 4.1.5 The word 'strategy' was mis-interpreted by learners from many centres. They therefore interpreted the question as household purification of water.
- 4.2.1 Poorly answered. The question did not relate to the answers in the memo, thus learners from the majority of the centres were not able to score maximum marks. This question was poorly phrased.
- 4.2.2 Poorly answered. The three words: "strategies", "resources" and "employed" were misunderstood by third-language learners.
- 4.2.3 Moderately answered. Again, a language problem for many learners.
- 4.3 Very poorly answered. In general, essay writing skills for a large majority of centres were poor. Much practice is needed if the skill is to be mastered.

GENERAL COMMENTS

- Definitions poorly stated generally
- Exam technique needs to be improved upon
- Understanding/ explain/ describe/ state should be emphasized
- Poor / inadequate knowledge of terminology is a concern
- Candidates should use principles of marking – e.g. Where letters asked accept only the letters and not description.