

GENERAL

- Candidates must take note of the mark allocation for each question, so that they do not write too much or too little.
- Candidates must read all the instructions in the exam paper carefully.
- Candidates had a problem interpreting the questions correctly - note the differences between "explain", "discuss" and "compare".
- The language ability of some candidates was very weak; they could not write properly structured sentences.
- Questions were often not answered in context.
- The numbering of the questions was much better than in the past.
- Some candidates left out questions, especially questions at the bottom of a page or top of a new page.
- Candidates did not answer each question on a new page.
- Pencils must not be used.
- Candidates did not use the correct subject terminology.
- Candidates repeated the question instead of answering the question. They adapted words from the question and used them as answers.
- Candidates should leave a space between questions.
- Candidates struggled to interpret the case studies and the data provided.

SECTION A

Question 1

- Candidates left questions open and did not answer all questions.
- Candidates used ticks instead of crosses in the multiple-choice questions.
- More than one option was sometimes selected, which resulted in no marks being allocated.
- Candidates did not come to the right conclusion in 1.1.3 – there was some confusion as to when Sipho lost his job.
- By comparison with the long questions, the short questions were very easy.

Question 2

2.1 GI was mentioned specifically in the exam guidelines, yet some centres had no idea what it was. Others answered this question very well.

- "Glycaemic index" was confused with "glucose intolerance".
- Candidates often used the definition taught in Life Sciences.
- Candidates use terms such as "sugar levels" instead of "blood sugar levels".
- Candidates confused advantages of low GI with examples.
- Candidates gave too many one-word answers. Answers should be in full sentences with at least one finite verb, e.g. Eat more fibre because it ...

2.2 Candidates found it difficult to interpret the table. They had to select and justify, using the information in the table.

2.3 Candidates lacked a basic knowledge of nutrients and their functions.

2.4 Candidates' knowledge of food security was very limited. They confused it with food hygiene, or with security in the context of food terrorism.

They struggled to understand and use information from the case study.

2.5 Candidates gave very general answers, instead of referring to the cartoon.

Question 3

- 3.1.1 Generally well answered. "**Distinguish**" means "**point out the difference(s) between**".
- 3.1.2 Candidates gave generalised answers instead of basing them to the specific picture.
- 3.1.3 Very well answered.

- 3.2 Very poorly answered. Candidates could not distinguish between synthetic and natural fibres. Some candidates did not even attempt to answer the question. Some candidates even discussed the impact on the consumer or economy.

- 3.3.1 The definition of "inflation" was well answered. The definition of the "CPI" differs in the various textbooks, and very few candidates actually referred to the time aspect.
- 3.3.2 Candidates answered this question fairly well – but some candidates selected only the letters or options, and did not justify their answers. They dealt with the topic of saving very well.

- 3.4 A higher-order question. Only a very small percentage of candidates could answer it correctly. Many candidates could not link the words "self-esteem" or "lifestyle" to clothing. They simply gave definitions of the words. The question was very vague.

Question 4

In this question the candidate's frame of reference strongly influenced their answers.

- 4.1 Candidates did not know the definition. They gave the definition of a general loan, and only a few mentioned the bank, a property or house in their answer.
- 4.2 Candidates did not **compare** full title ownership and sectional title. They answered very generally. Candidates are strongly recommended to draw a comparison table in future.
- 4.3 Candidates did not know enough about insurance. The terminology used in the different textbooks is very confusing. Many candidates referred only to short- and long-term insurance and explained these terms.
- 4.4 Fairly well answered.
- 4.5 Candidates could not use the information provided to make a choice. The question was very badly phrased. Some candidates provided an analysis, but did not make a choice.
- 4.5.1 Very well answered.
- 4.5.2 Well answered.

- 4.6 Many answers focused on saving money and time, instead of the impact on the environment.

Question 5

- 5.1 Candidates answered the WHY and not the HOW. The question was not clear and candidates gave generalised answer. Too many concepts were included in one question.
- 5.2 This question was not interpreted in context. "Raw products" does not refer only to raw vegetables.
- 5.3 Generally well answered, although candidates did not always take the information provided into account. Candidates repeated the question in the answer.

- 5.4.2 Candidates did not justify the statement.
- 5.4.3 The characteristics of good entrepreneurs were mentioned here instead of strategies.

- 5.5 Some calculations were still incorrect, but were, generally speaking, better done this year.