

GEOGRAPHY SG PAPER 1

GENERAL REMARKS:

1. Candidates did not read questions or study the diagrams carefully.
2. Knowledge of terminology was poor.
3. Few candidates displayed analysing and interpreting skills. The answers to most questions were to be found in the diagrams, introductory paragraphs or extracts. Candidates in Grades 7 to 12 should be taught how to extract information from the sources provided.
4. Candidates should pay more attention to “action” words in questions. Knowledge of terminology such as the following is important here: *push-pull factors, climatological, physical, pattern, shape, site, land-use zones, and street patterns*.
5. Candidates must be reminded to answer the entire question.
6. Some candidates did not read the instructions and answered all the questions.
7. Candidates are advised to read each question through twice before attempting the answer.
8. Candidates are expected to be able to integrate information from other sections of the syllabus into any of their answers.
9. Some candidates did not number questions correctly, e.g, The first question answered by the candidate is Question 1. The second question answered is Question 3, but the candidate numbers it “Question 2” The third question answered is Question 6, but it is numbered “Question 3”.
10. Candidates were not able to link geographical concepts to the reality of the local environment, e.g. Programme to satisfy basic needs.
11. Candidates’ handwriting was often illegible.
12. Candidates must refrain from writing telegram-style answers; e.g. 6.3.4 “electricity” was incorrect, “expensive electricity” was accepted.
13. There was sometimes a lack of understanding of language, e.g. The Afrikaans word “strem” was assumed to mean “advantages”.
14. As per instructions, each new question should be started on a new page.
15. Units of measurement were misused, e.g. *km.* used instead of *mm.*
16. There was evidence that some candidates still make use of outdated textbooks e.g. “Southern Transvaal” was used instead of “Gauteng”. Candidates should be kept up to date with changes.
17. Educators should note that the heading for each question provides the context in which question is set.

Question 1

- 1.1.1 High cloud cover over the interior was not acceptable. Answers such as the following were not specific enough: “cold fronts present” and “date”.
- 1.1.2 Candidates must know the difference between a mid-latitude cyclone and a cold front.
- 1.1.3 Candidates had the answer correct, but gave the incorrect reason. They often wrote “contour lines” instead of “isobars”.
- 1.1.4 Poorly answered. The direction was often incorrect.
- 1.1.5 Candidates did not refer to the eye of the cyclone, but to the general characteristics of the tropical cyclone.
- 1.1.6 Answers were not specifically related to the letters O and X. Candidates should know what weather changes occur when a cold front passes by.
- 1.2 Generally well answered. But candidates used “direct” instead of “perpendicular” rays of the sun. There were direct rays of the sun in diagrams X, Y and Z, but only in diagram X were there perpendicular rays. Candidates also answered “Yes” to multiple-choice questions 1.2.1, 1.2.2 and 1.2.3.
- 1.3 Candidates did not read the question carefully; they were meant to find the answers in the diagram.

Question 2

In general, poorly answered. Geomorphology appears to be a section that is neglected.

- 2.1.9 It was disappointing to see that candidates did not know about stream piracy.
- 2.2.1 Candidates gave the landform at B, C, D instead of one answer.
- 2.2.5 Candidates did not interpret this question very well and fared very badly in it.

Question 3:

- 3.1.1 Many candidates referred to the shape of the settlement here, instead of the pattern.
- 3.1.2 Poorly answered. We were looking for the disadvantages of nucleated settlements.
- 3.1.3 Some candidates found it difficult to link factors influencing shape, e.g. river, road and mountain.
- 3.1.4 Many wrote "level land" instead of "arable land". The diagram accompanying the question was not consulted.
- 3.1.5 The diagram not consulted. Candidates could not integrate the climatology section here.
- 3.1.6 This section has clearly not been taught at some schools. It is still in the syllabus! Candidates were unable to distinguish between aims and implementation methods.
- 3.2.1 Candidates once again did not read the question and some stated that the couple moved to Steynville.
- 3.2.2 There was limited knowledge of relevant push factors.
- 3.2.3 For pull factors, candidates merely stated the opposite of the factors mentioned above. They showed limited insight.
- 3.2.4 Well answered.
- 3.2.5 Many candidates repeated the statement "decrease in population", which was part of the question.
- 3.2.6 Candidates wrote long paragraphs with information that were irrelevant to the question. Once again, all possible answers were to be found on the diagram.

Question 4:

- 4.1.1 Physical factors: Candidates were unfamiliar with the terminology
- 4.1.2 Candidates do not know the names of street patterns.
- 4.1.3 Well answered. Some candidates did not use the letters mentioned in question, but instead used those on the diagram.
- 4.1.4 Well answered, but many candidates did not score full marks.
- 4.1.5 Once again diagram interpretation was needed, and not necessarily theory knowledge. Candidates repeated the term "industrial zone" as the answer.
- 4.1.6 As above. Candidates repeated "high-income residential area" as the answer.
- 4.2.1 All answers were to be found on the diagram.
- 4.2.2 Instead of quoting headlines in newspapers, candidates listed names of newspapers, i.e. *Argus* and *Die Burger*.
- 4.2.3 Candidates did not seem familiar with the term "rural-urban fringe".
- 4.3.1- 4.3.3 Candidates did not spend time reading the extract and therefore lost marks that should have been easy to score.
- 4.3.4 These were the only answers not to be found in the extract. Candidates were to apply theory learned in the Urban Problems section. "Other" measures were needed.

Question 5:

- 5.1.1 "Little rain" was not accepted. "Little rain over a long period" was accepted .
- 5.1.2-5.1.5 Leeway was given, but candidates should have been more accurate with their readings taken from the graph.
- 5.1.7 The term "socio-economic consequences" was ignored and generalisations were provided instead.

- 5.3 The Ecology section was poorly answered. Environmental studies should be included in all aspects of the syllabus. Vague statements like “good soil” or “poor soil” should be avoided.

Question 6:

- 6.1.2 Many of the candidates did not know what “spatial pattern” means.
6.1.3 The question was not read carefully. “Population distribution” was asked for, not “economic consequences”.
6.2.1 Poorly answered. The graph and the legend were not properly interpreted.
6.2.4 A condom provides some protection against HIV/AIDS; contraceptives in general do not.
6.3 Regional studies. This should have been an easy section of the paper, but it was poorly answered. The candidates did not have the necessary knowledge.

Question 7:

- 7.1.3 The candidates did not take note of the period of time (1989 – 1999). Current influences were asked for, and not historical facts.
7.2.1 Vague comments like “good economy” are not acceptable. To answer this question the different concepts, definitions and explanations had to be studied and understood.

AARDRYKSKUNDE SG VRAESTEL 1

ALGEMENE OPMERKINGS

1. Kandidate lees nie die vrae of studeer nie die diagramme en aanhalings nie.
2. Kennis van terminologie is oor die algemeen swak.
3. Ontledings- en interpretasie vaardighede van kandidate is gebrekkig. Die meeste van die antwoorde op die vrae was op die diagramme of die inleidende paragraaf of die uittreksels. Leerders moet die vaardighede aanleer hoe om inligting vanaf visuele data te kan lees vanaf Graad 9 tot Graad 12.
4. Kandidate moet meer aandag gee aan “aksie” woorde in die vrae. Kennis van terminologie is hier baie belangrik: i.e. stoot/trek faktore, grondgebruiksones, straatpatrone, ens.
5. Kandidate moet die hele vraag beantwoord en dit korrek nommer soos die numering op die vraestel.
6. Sommige kandidate het alle vrae beantwoord en nie die instruksies gelees nie. Opvoeders behoort dit as deel van eksamentegnieke te onderrig.
7. Dit word aanbeveel dat kandidate die vrae ten minste twee keer deurlees alvorens gepoog word om dit te beantwoord.
8. Kandidate moet in staat kan wees om alle afdelings van die sillabus in verskillende vrae te kan integreer.
9. Sommige kandidate het nie vrae korrek genommer nie, bv. hulle eerste vraag was Vraag 1; hulle tweede vraag was Vraag 3, maar nommer dit as Vraag 2; hulle derde gekose vraag was was Vraag 6 maar hulle nommer dit Vraag 3, ens.
10. Kandidate was nie in staat om geografiese konsepte na die realiteite van die plaaslike omgewing te koppel nie, bv. program om basiese behoeftes te bevredig.
11. Handskrif was in baie gevalle onleesbaar.
12. Kandidate moet telegramstyl antwoorde vermy; bv. 6.3.4 “elktrisiteit” was verkeerd, maar “duur elektrisiteit” was aanvaar.
13. Daar is ‘n gebrek aan basiese taalvaardighede, bv. “strem” was verstaan as voordele.
14. ‘n Nuwe vraag behoort geskryf te word op ‘n skoon bladsy soos aangedui in die instruksies.
15. Metingseenhede is swak gebruik, bv. km. in stede van mm.
16. Daar is agter gekom dat kandidate steeds gebruik maak van ou handboeke, bv. “Suidelike Transvaal” in plaas van “Gauteng.” Kandidate moet op hoogte gehou word van nuwe politieke inligting.

Vraag 1

- 1.1.1 Hoë wolkbekking oor die binneland is nie aanvaarbaar. Antwoorde was nie spesifiek genoeg nie, bv. “koue fronte teenwoordig” en “datum”.
- 1.1.2 Leerders moet die verskil tussen ‘n genatigde sikloon en ‘n koue front weet.
- 1.1.3 Leerders het die antwoord korrek, maar die rede verkeerd. Hulle het dikwils kontoerlyne, in stede van isobare geskryf.
- 1.1.4 Swak beantwoord. Rigting is dikwels verkeerd.
- 1.1.5 Leerders het nie na die “bog” van die sikloon verwys nie, maar na die algemene kenmerke van die tropiese sikloon.
- 1.1.6 Antwoorde was nie spesifiek in verband gebring met die letters O en X nie. Leerders behoort die weersverandering te weet indien ‘n koue front verby beweeg.
- 1.2 Oor die algemeen goed beantwoord. Kandidate gebruik “direkte” in stede van “loodrete” sonstrale. Direkte sonstrale is in diagramme X, Y en Z, maar slegs in diagram X is dit loodreg. Kandidate het ook “ja” geantwoord op keuse vrae, naamlik in 1.2.1, 1.2.2 en 1.2.3.
- 1.3 Kandidate het nie die vraag gelees nie, bv. vrae vanaf die diagram is nie gevolg in die vraag nie. Al die antwoorde is op die diagram – dit is ‘n vaardigheid wat kandidate moet hê.

Vraag 2

Oor die algemeen is hierdie vraag swak beantwoord. Mens kan aflei dat Geomorfologie 'n afdeling is wat afgeskeep word.

- 2.1.9 Dit is teleurstellend om te sien dat kandidate nie stroomrooie ken nie.
- 2.2.1 Kandidate gee hier die landvorme by B, C en D, in plaas van een antwoord.
- 2.2.5 Leerders het nie die vraag baie goed interpreteer nie en het dus swak gevaar.

Vraag 3

- 3.1.1 Baie kandidate het na die buitelynvorm verwys in plaas daarvan om na die patroon te verwys.
- 3.1.2 Swak antwoord. Ons het gesoek na die nadele van die kern nedersettings.
- 3.1.3 Sommige kandidate het dit moeilik gevind om die faktore wat buitelynvorm beïnvloed het te identifiseer, bv. rivier, pad en berg.
- 3.1.4 Baie skryf "gelyke land" in plaas van ploegland of bewerkte land. Die diagram van die vraag was nie geraadpleeg nie.
- 3.1.5 Die diagram was nie geraadpleeg nie. Hulle kon nie die klimatologie afdeling hier interpreteer nie.
- 3.1.6 Die afdeling was duidelik nie in sommige skole onderrig nie. Dit is steeds deel van die sillabus. Leerders was nie in staat om te onderskei tussen doelwitte en implementering nie.
- 3.2.1 Leerders het weereens nie die inleidende paragraaf en vraag gelees nie en sommige meld dat die paartjie na Steynville getrek het.
- 3.2.2 Stootfaktore – beperkte toepaslike kennis.
- 3.2.3 Trekfaktore- leerders het slegs die teenoorgestelde van laasgenoemde genoem. Het nie insig getoon.
- 3.2.4 Baie leerders het die stelling herhaal "afname in bevolkingsgetalle", wat deel van die vraag was.
- 3.2.5 Die diagram is weereens nie gebruik nie. Kandidate het lang paragrawe geskryf met feite wat irrelevant tot die vraag was. Alle antwoorde was op die diagram te vinde.

Vraag 4

- 4.1.1 Fisiese faktore: terminologie was onbekend.
- 4.1.2 Kandidate ken nie die name van die straatpatrone nie.
- 4.1.3 Goed beantwoord. Sommige kandidate het nie die letters in die vraag gebruik nie maar wel die wat in die diagram voorkom.
- 4.1.4 Goed – baie het hier volpunte behaal.
- 4.1.5 Weereens was interpretasie van die diagram nodig, en nie noodwendig teoretiese kennis nie. Het die industriële sone as antwoord herhaal.
- 4.1.6 Soos laasgenoemde: Het hoë-inkomste residensiële gebied as antwoord herhaal.
- 4.2.1 Alle antwoorde was op die diagram te vinde.
- 4.2.2 In plaas daarvan om die koerantopskrifte te noem, het sommige kandidate name van koerante, bv. Argus, Die Burger, ens. gelys.
- 4.2.3 Leerders was nie bekend met die begrip landelike-stedelike oorgangsones nie.
- 4.3.1 – 4.3.3. Leerders het nie tyd spandeer om die uittreksel te lees nie, daarom het hulle maklike punte verbeur.
- 4.3.4 Dit was die enigste antwoorde wat nie in die uittreksel te vinde was nie. Leerders moet teorie wat in stedelike probleme afdeling is, toepas. "Ander 'maatreëls was benodig.

Vraag 5

- 5.1.1 “Min reën” was nie aanvaar nie. Min reën oor ‘n lang periode is aanvaar.
- 5.1.2– 5.1.5 Ruimte is toegelaat, maar kandidate behoort meer akkurate lesings vanaf die grafiek te lees.
- 5.1.7 Die terminologie “socio-ekonomiese gevolge” is geignoreer en algemene antwoorde is gegee.
- 5.2 Die Ekologie afdeling is swak gedoen. Omgewingstudies behoort in alle aspekte van die sillabus ingesluit te word. Algemene verklarings soos goeie/swak grond behoort vermy te word.

Vraag 6

- 6.1.2 Baie van die kandidate het nie geweet wat ruimtelike patroon behels nie.
- 6.1.3 Die vraag is nie deeglik geles nie. “Bevolkings verpreiding” is gevra en nie die “ekonomiese gevolge nie,”
- 6.2.1 Swak beantwoord. Die grafiek en die byskrifte was nie deeglik interpreteer nie.
- 6.2.4 ‘n Kondoom is ‘n hulpmiddel teen MIV/VIGS; voorbehoedmiddels is in die algemeen is nie ‘n hulpmiddel teen MIV/VIGS nie..
- 6.3 Streekstudies. Dit behoort ‘n maklike deel van die afdeling van die vraestel te wees, maar is swak beantwoord. Die kandidate het nie die nodige kennis gehad nie.

Vraag 7

- 7.1.3 Die kandidate het nie aandag gegee aan die tydsverloop (1989 – 1999) nie. huidige invloed is gevra en nie historiese feite nie.
- 7.2.1 Algemene kommentaar soos “goeie” ekonomie is nie aanvaarbaar. Wees spesifiek. Om die vraag te beantwoord moet die verskillende konsepte, definisies en verduidelikings bestudeer en verstaan word.