NCS 2011 CHIEF MARKER'S REPORT

SUBJECT   **HISTORY**

PAPER   **2**

DATE OF   28 / 11 / 2011   **DURATION**   **3 HOURS**
EXAMINATION

SECTION 1:

(General overview of Learner Performance in the question paper as a whole)

Learner performance:
On the whole the candidates did not perform to the standard that we thought that they would perform. When at first the paper were written it seemed that the learners could perform better than the previous years, but after marking it showed little improvement on the previous years performance. Questions 3 and 4 were the most popular of the questions answered, followed by question 1 and then 2.

Reasons for poor results:
Source based questions:
In questions that candidates should take a stance, (i.e. Agree/disagree, accurate/inaccurate, justified/not justified, yes/no, effective/not effective and usefulness/not useful) they are unable to do that and just answer by copying from the source. Simple extraction did not pose a problem to most of learners. It is encouraging that most learners did answer in full sentences or in short paragraphs.

Paragraphs:
Paragraph writing was very poor and in most cases the sources were only copied verbatim.

Extended writing:
Extended writing was average. The open-ended question was answered better than in previous years but second extended writing sources were just copied and only a handful of candidates did analyze the sources in the manner of which was expected.

Suggestion for improvement:
Concepts should be thoroughly taught in order for learners to be able to use them in answering or defining concepts.

Paragraph writing: The skill to write paragraphs is very important and how to extract relevant information and to interpret it in your own words must be exercised. If you are quoting from a source do not do it verbatim but mention "according to the source" and use inverted commas.

History and Language Departments can work together in this regard. Candidates are writing in point form or telegram style. One can make the deduction from this type of answering/ writing the answer. That some educators did not teach candidates the proper method to answer paragraphs.

Extended writing. The structure of extended writing should be emphasized e.g. Making use of Introduction, body and conclusion. Learners must write in full sentences which would lead to a more comprehensive paragraph or an essay.

Much more attention must be given in answering the two different kinds of extended writing. It could help the candidate to supply him/her with the two different matrix and rubric for paragraphs that are being used – they can then familiarize themselves with what is expected from them to obtain better marks. Candidates tend to rewrite the sources directly from the addendum. Most essays are incomplete without a proper introduction, paragraphs and conclusion.

It is apparent from the candidate's answers on extended writing that the chronological order of events/facts needs to be addressed. Candidates know their work but have difficulty in arranging it in the correct chronological order before writing the answer.

Cartoons, Photos and other sources: When candidates do indicate that some cartoons or photo's or other sources are primary or secondary sources – they must give a reason for their answer.. Stating primary or secondary are not enough.

What advice could you give to the educators of this learning area?

Comments that could be useful for teachers and subject advisors:
The source-based questions were answered better than in previous years but candidates still lacked the skills to analyze and report their findings. Learners struggle to extract, interpret and compare sources.

 Language also seems to be a major challenge as learners struggle to express/ translate their historical ideas and perceptions into acceptable answers. In rural areas teachers must refrain from presenting their classes in Xhosa as the learner has to write his/her examination in English and then it is a major challenge for them to express themselves fully or correctly.

Educators have to prepare their candidates to use skills of comparison, extraction of relevant facts, justification and usability of sources. Candidates must be taught how to answer these level 3 questions by taking a stance and then to justify their position in full sentences.

It is of utmost importance that candidates from Grade 10 be exposed to these types of questions and that they start from an elementary stage and advance to a more advanced stage in Grade 11 and 12.

Knowledge of the work is still of utmost importance – it seems that they are under the impression that they do not have to learn and that all answers will be given in the sources. Candidates must learn their work as own knowledge is part of what is expected in the paragraphs and extended writing

Educators must refrain from giving their candidates model answers for the extended writing as the learners are not answering the questions that are put to them, but only write down the facts.

Educators must also set their own test-papers and June-Exams. It was evident from the standardization of markers that some were not able to answer some of the Level 3 questions.

Provincial Curriculum Section must see to it that educators through the province are given the new content for Grade 12. It was made available to all markers at the Marking session.

SECTION 2:

Comment on candidates' performance in individual questions
(It is expected that a comment will be provided for each question on a separate sheet).

QUESTION 1
LEVELS OF QUESTIONS: 9% - L1   40% -L2   51% -L3

1.1

1.1.1   *(Explanation of historical concept)*
Performance of learners:
Excellent
Other specific observations relating to responses of learners :
Some Candidates did give the definition of "Perestroika" in place of "Glasnost"
Comments useful to teachers, subject advisors, teacher development etc
All historical concepts which candidates might encounter in the Chapter should be explained and summarized before teaching starts on the specific part of the chapter.

1.1.2   *(Analyse information)*
Performance of learners:
Poor
Why was question poorly answered?
Most candidates could not interpret the cartoon and could not extract the evidence from the source. They also encountered problems to connect own knowledge to the cartoon.
Suggestion for improvement:
Candidates should start exercising to analyse cartoons from Grade 10.
Comments useful to teachers, subject advisors, teacher development etc
Start each morning with a discussion on the cartoon in the daily newspaper. Analyze this cartoon with the use of questions which you usually encounter in History Question Papers

1.1.3   *(Interpretation of evidence)*
Performance of learners:
Poor - Fair
Why was question poorly answered?:
Some candidates lacked historical knowledge on the challenges that Gorbachev experienced after implementing 'glasnost'
Suggestion for improvement:
In most schools children have the wrong impression that all answers of source-based questions can be extracted from the source and that is why they lack Historical knowledge.
Comments useful to teachers, subject advisors, teacher development etc
Daily questions or small tests, without sources for reverence, where Historical knowledge is being tested

1.2   *(Explanation of information)*
Performance of learners:
Poor
Why was question poorly answered?:
Some candidates did not understand the question and others were only able to give 1 answer.

1.3
1.3.1   *(Extraction of information)*
      Performance of learners:
      Excellent
      as it was a simple extraction from the source

1.3.2   *(Analyse information)*
      Performance of learners:
      Good
      Other specific observations relating to responses of learners :
      Most candidates did link the SACP to the ANC and answered it with that connection

1.4   *(Examine and explain)*
      Performance of learners:
      Poor - Fair
      Why was question poorly answered?:
      Only general answer given, no reference made to sources.   Candidates had to refer
to
      both sources in answering the question and some only referred to 1
      Suggestion for improvement:
      Candidates must be more careful and thorough when reading the questions
      Other specific observations relating to responses of learners :
      Candidates do not refer specifically to the sources that they use in their answers
and
      only list the answers
      Comments useful to teachers, subject advisors, teacher development etc
      Candidates must learn to refer specifically to the source that is being mentioned e.g.
      Source B indicates that ....
      Source C indicates ....
      Teachers must be very strict in applying this method in all scenarios where
      candidates have to use sources for answers.

1.5
1.5.1   (Analyse information*)*
      Performance of learners:
      Average – Good
      Simple analysis of information in the source

1.5.2   *(Analyse information)*
      Performance of learners:
      Poor - Good
      Why was question poorly answered?:
      Most learners referred to Glastnost as the oppressive system and not Apartheid
      Suggestion for improvement:
      Other specific observations relating to responses of learners :
      It seems that some centers taught this chapter only on Russia as focus point and
did
      not link the fall of communism with South Africa
      Comments useful to teachers, subject advisors, teacher development etc
      Teachers must first make sure of the Key-Questions regarding each chapter before
      starting the chapter.

1.5.3 *(Analyse and interpret information)*
Performance of learners:
Poor
Why was question poorly answered?:
Language problem. Candidates need to substantiate the extent to which they agree.
Suggestion for improvement:
Candidates must be more careful and thorough when reading the questions
Comments useful to teachers, subject advisors, teacher development etc
Candidates must learn to answer in full sentences and where they have to, first take a stance if the answer requires it.
1.5.*4* *(Synthesise information)*
Performance of learners:
Average
Why was question poorly answered?
Candidates did not take a stance and only gave an answer. In other cases the candidate took a stance but did not elaborate further.
Suggestion for improvement:
Candidates must first look at the mark allocation of a question before answering
Comments useful to teachers, subject advisors, teacher development etc
When setting tests use the formula for mark allocation as in National Papers, e.g. (1x3) (3) means 1 answer for 3 marks Total 3 marks. This can only indicate that a one word answer is not acceptable and the candidate had to write a few sentences

1.6 *(Highlight usefulness)*
Performance of learners:
Poor
Why was question poorly answered?:
Candidates had to select either Source 1C or 1D and support their response with relevant evidence.
Most rewrote the source and did not refer to "Usefulness" of it. Most only gave 1 reason. Candidates did not choose a particular source, they merely commented. Most candidates that answered poorly did not know what was meant by the word "useful"
Suggestion for improvement:
Explanation of Historical skills should be priority.
Comments useful to teachers, subject advisors, teacher development etc
All tests and examination papers should include these Level 3 questions

1.7 *(Interpretation, analysis and synthesis of evidence – paragraph*
Performance of learners:
Average
Why was question poorly answered?:
Candidates tend to copy from sources. They lack the skill of paragraph writing. Some still use the bullet-form. Some candidates did not answer the question and only explained the differences between "glasnost" and "perestroika" and did not link it to the talks between the National Party government and the ANC.
Suggestion for improvement:
The skill to write paragraphs is very important and how to extract relevant information and to interpret it in your own words, must be exercised.   If you are quoting from a source do not do it verbatim but mention "according to the source" and use inverted commas.
Comments useful to teachers, subject advisors, teacher development etc

	The rubric states that the evidence has to be in an organized paragraph to obtain a higher mark. It is of utmost importance that the Language Teachers and History Teachers work together to help candidates mastering this skill.
1.8	**Extended writing**
1.8.1	**Performance of learners:** Average **Why was question poorly answered?:** Most learners referred back to the Cold War in Europe and discussed USA vs. USSR ideology. Some candidates wrote on the policies of Gorbachov and their impact on Russia and not on South Africa Some candidates mixed the information from Question 1.8.1 and Question 3.6.1.
1.8.2	**Performance of learners:** Very poor. (Only few candidates attempted this question.) **Why was question poorly answered?:** Only a few candidates attempted this question and did not obtain a good mark Candidates copied directly from the sources and could not analyze the sources and compare it with each other.
QUESTION 2	
	LEVELS OF QUESTIONS: 7% - L1 40% -L2 53% -L3
2.1	
2.1.1	*(Extraction of evidence)* **Performance of learners:** Average **Why was question poorly answered?:** Candidates could only extract "the collapse of the Soviet union " as answer.
2.1.2	*(Extraction of evidence)* **Performance of learners:** Good An easy extraction of evidence
2.1.3	*(Comparing and Interpretation of evidence)* **Performance of learners:** Average - Poor **Why was question poorly answered?:** Candidates could not compare the two economic perspectives **Suggestion for improvement:** Focus on Historical concepts
2.1.4	*(Extraction of evidence)* **Performance of learners:** Poor **Why was question poorly answered?** No specific reason **Other specific observations relating to responses of learners :** Candidates randomly extracted answers and none were correct

2.1.5 *(Explaining of historical concepts)* **Performance of learners:** Poor **Why was question poorly answered?:** Cannot define historical concepts **Comments useful to teachers, subject advisors, teacher development etc** Teachers should focus on teaching and explaining historical concepts 2.1.6 *(Evaluation of source for justification)* **Performance of learners:** Average **Why was question poorly answered?:** Candidates did not take a stance and also got most facts incorrect – it was evident that most learners did not have any or little historical knowledge on this chapter
2.2 2.2.1 *(Interpretation and evaluation)* **Performance of learners:** Poor **Other specific observations relating to responses of learners :** Most came too the conclusion that he was greedy 2.2.2 *(Interpretation of evidence)* **Performance of learners:** Poor **Why was question poorly answered?:** Answered around the word poverty – not included in memo 2.2.3 *(Interpretation of source)* **Performance of learners:** Good It was an easy extraction and interpretation from the source
2.3 2.3.1 *(Interpretation and evaluation)* **Performance of learners:** Poor **Why was question poorly answered?:** Cartoon was difficult to interpret and learners were also put off by the cartoon being dated to 2010 which is way out of the period which they had to learn in this chapter. 2.3.2 *(Interpret and evaluate)* **Performance of learners:** Poor **Why was question poorly answered?:** No stance was taken by the learners. 2.3.3 *(Evaluating the usefulness of source)* **Performance of learners:** Poor **Why was question poorly answered?:** This seems to be very difficult for the learners to answer. They argued that it was a primary source as it was published in December 2010 and could not link it with the fall of communism and Egypt. Struggled with the concept "usefulness'

2.4	*(Interpretation, analysis and synthesis of evidence – paragraph* **Performance of learners:** Poor **Why was question poorly answered?:** Most just copied the source
2.5	**Extended writing**
2.5.1	**Performance of learners:** Poor **Why was question poorly answered?:** Candidates lacked general knowledge on this chapter
2.5.2	**Performance of learners:** Poor **Why was question poorly answered?:** Learners do not have the analytical knowledge or skills to answer these questions and most just copied from the sources.

QUESTION 3
LEVELS OF QUESTIONS: 7% - L1   49% -L2   43% -L3

1.3.1	
3.1.1	*(Extraction of evidence)* **Performance of learners:** Excellent Well answered as it was a simple extraction from the source
3.1.2	*(Extraction of evidence)* **Performance of learners:** Excellent Simple extraction
3.1.3	*(Extraction of evidence)* **Performance of learners:** Good **Why was question poorly answered?:** Some candidates transcribed an answer that was not relevant from the source
3.1.4	*(Comparing evidence of written and visual source)* **Performance of learners:** Poor **Why was question poorly answered?:** Candidates struggled with supporting the written source with the visual source. Candidates did not understand the meaning of 'support' in historical terms **Suggestion for improvement:** Educators should teach learners to master these skills by starting with comparisons between sources ni Grade 10. Candidates must also answer these questions by referring to both sources individually and then make the connection between them.

3.2
3.2.1 *(Interpretation and evaluation of evidence)*
    Performance of learners:
    Good
    Answers extrapolated from the source

3.2.2 *(Interpretation of evidence)*
    Performance of learners:
    Well,
    As they could interpret the key role that Mandela and De Klerk played in the negotiations.

3.2.3 *(Interpretation and analysis of visual source)*
    Performance of learners:
    Poor
    Why was question poorly answered?:
    Candidates did not take a stance and most mentioned only 1 of 2 examples.
    Learners could identify the obvious (Black and White) but they could not discern the symbolism (sunbeams).

3.3
3.3.1 *(Interpretation and evaluation of evidence)*
    Performance of learners:
    Good – Excellent
    They could interpret which answers to quote from the sources.

3.3.2 *(Interpretation and evaluation of evidence)*
    Performance of learners:
    Good
    Other specific observations relating to responses of learners :
    Most learners opted for Boipatong and Chris Hani's assassination.

3.3.3 *(Evaluation and interpretation of evidence)*
    Performance of learners:
    Average - Well
    Information available in the extract

3.3.4 *(Evaluation and interpretation of evidence)*
    Performance of learners:
    Poor
    Why was question poorly answered?:
    Candidates failed to identify the "right-wing" South Africans
    Suggestion for improvement:
    Candidates should be taught what is meant by the "right-wing and left-wing" in political context.
    Other specific observations relating to responses of learners :
    Some candidates gave the opposite answer - seems that they could not interpret the question

3.4	*(Comparing of evidence)* **Performance of learners:** Poor **Why was question poorly answered?:** Candidates lack skill to compare different sources. The candidates also did not know the meaning of the word "limitations" **Suggestion for improvement:** Learners should be drilled in certain historical concepts. **Comments useful to teachers, subject advisors, teacher development etc** Subject advisers to assist educators with compiling sources where educators can practice these skills and then teach it to learners.
3.5	*(Interpretation, analysis and synthesis of evidence – paragraph* **Performance of learners:** Poor **Why was question poorly answered?:** Most candidates lack the skill to write a paragraph and they could also not extract the relevant information from the sources on the Grootte Schuur Minute **Suggestion for improvement:** Educators should ask the Language teachers to assist with this skill of paragraph writing.
3.6	**Extended writing**
3.6.1	**Performance of learners:** Average Some candidates wrote everything they knew on the process of negotiations (Road to Democracy) **Why was question poorly answered?:** Most learners answered this question and they went way back to when Botha got a stroke, and up to the conclusion of Black South Africans voting for the first time. They tend to give too much background information and less on the question itself. Candidates who got poor marks were those who still write in bullet-form and with sub-headings **Suggestion for improvement:** Teachers should ensure that they drill their learners on the structure of an extended Writing **Other specific observations relating to responses of learners :** Some candidates wrote everything they knew on the process of negotiations (Road to Democracy) It was evident that some centres had "model" answers prepared and that is why not very good marks where obtained as the question was not fully answered.
3.6.2	**Performance of learners:** Poor **Why was question poorly answered?:** Learners transcribed from the sources and some did not know the content of the question. **Suggestion for improvement:** **Other specific observations relating to responses of learners :** Candidates struggled to analyse and argue using the sources and come to independent conclusions

QUESTION 4 LEVELS OF QUESTIONS: 16% - L1   40% -L2   44% -L3

4.1
4.1.1   *(Extraction of evidence)*
        Performance of learners:
        Excellent.

4.1.2   *(Explanation of concept)*
        Performance of learners:
        Poor
        Why was question poorly answered?:
Candidates are battling with Historical concepts and could not give any examples in their answers.
        Suggestion for improvement:
Educators should start with defining concepts before teaching the content of the chapter.
Comments useful to teachers, subject advisors, teacher development etc
Teach candidates to give an example, if possible, after defining the concept

4.1.3   *(Interpretation of evidence)*
        Performance of learners
        Good
Other specific observations relating to responses of learners :
Candidates recognized Tutu immediately   but Borriane was unknown to them

4.1.4   *(Interpretation of evidence)*
        Performance of learners:
        Excellent
Simple extraction of answer within the source
        Other specific observations relating to responses of learners :
        Most are extracting the whole paragraph from the source as an answer.

4.2
4.2.1   *(Extraction of evidence)*
        Performance of learners:
        Excellent
Other specific observations relating to responses of learners :
Some learners battled with word 'motivated"

4.2.2   *(Interpretation and analysis of evidence)*
        Performance of learners:
        Poor
        Why was question poorly answered?:
Learners battled to interpret the question and could not interpret it in their own words.

4.2.3   *(Interpretation and analysis of evidence)*
        Performance of learners:
        Poor
        Why was question poorly answered?:
Candidates did not take a stance and could not put the viewing of a film in Historical context. Unable to comprehend the terminology of 'effective vs non affective'

4.3
4.3.1   *(Interpretation of evidence)*
   Performance of learners:
   Poor.
   Why was question poorly answered?:
   Candidates could not interpret the symbolic features in the cartoon
   Suggestion for improvement:
   More exercises in interpreting cartoons.
   Other specific observations relating to responses of learners :
   Difficulty with the term 'role-players'' they only recognized Tutu.

4.3.2   *(Interpretation and evaluation of evidence)*
   Performance of learners:
   Poorly answered
   Why was question poorly answered?:
   Candidate did not take a stance. and could not interpret the source.
   Suggestion for improvement:
   Candidates must be more exposed to cartoons and the interpretation there-off.

4.3.3   *(Interpretation of evidence)*
   Performance of learners:
   Poorly answered
   Why was question poorly answered?:
   Candidates only concentrated on the killings. They did not interpret the beaker
   (Poison) and the jar.   The tyre with "necklacing" was also unknown to most.
   Other specific observations relating to responses of learners :
   Few candidates explained elements separately as well as their functions in regards
   to atrocities that happened

4.4   *(Explain the usefulness)*
   Performance of learners:
   Average - Good
   Why was question poorly answered?:
   Some candidates did not understand the word 'Usefulness" Some used both
   sources instead of one.

4.6   **Extended writing**
4.6.1   **Performance of learners:**
   Average performance
   Why was question poorly answered?:
   Candidates did not answer the question and concentrated on the successes and
   failures of the TRC while they had to concentrate on the workings of the
   organization and the different committees of the TRC and how they functioned.

4.6.2 **Performance of learners:**
Poor
Why was question poorly answered?:
Candidates lacked the skill to work with sources and most did not know their work.
Other specific observations relating to responses of learners :
Some candidates answered the question as if they are answering 4.6.1.

SIGNATURE OF EXAMINER/MODERATOR: _____