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**QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF LEARNER RESPONSES AND EVALUATION OF QUESTION PAPERS: NSC 2021**

|  |
| --- |
| **REPORT 1: EVALUATION OF THE QUESTION PAPER AND MARKING GUIDELINE** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SUBJECT** | **GEOGRAPHY** |
| **PAPER** | **1** |
| **DURATION OF PAPER:** | **3 HOURS** |

**SECTION 1: (General overview of Learner Performance in the question paper as a whole)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| The general performance of the 2021 cohort in Geography P1 was very disappointing, after early indications through google form surveys and meetings suggested otherwise.  The 7-point scale (88% of candidates captured) above reveals a totally different and disappointed outcome as expected.  The 54,6% pass percentage is below the pre-marking predictions. During the marking it became clear that candidates struggled with the following:   * Examining Techniques * Middle and Higher order questions * Deeper understanding of processes * Lack of basic conceptual knowledge * Application of knowledge gained * Integration of processes and content * Generally, to relate to the geography in a more realistic/practical manner * Mapwork skills and Interpretations, including Geographical Information Systems.   The following graphs indicate the Average percentages of the different questions, The Averages of the sub-questions as well as the performance in the Lower, middle and Higher order questions      In questions 1.4 and 2.4 the candidates especially struggled. It seemed the use of the term ridging (1.4.3 and 1.4.4) confused candidates and caused the drop in the marks. The questioning technique of the questions in Question 2.4 seemingly caused problems for candidates.  Question 3 as a whole was extremely poorly answered. Candidates didn’t understand the basic map work skills. | |

**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** |
| (a) General comment on the performance of learners in the specific question. Was the question well answered or poorly answered? |
| With an Average Percentage of 48,1 taken from the Rasch, it indicates that this question was fairly well answered by the candidates. However sub-questions 1.3 to 1.5 had very low Average percentages.  Deeper understanding of processes lacked, and candidates were unable to answer most of Questions 1.3 to 1.5 comprehensively. They could not respond with conviction and understanding to the middle and higher order questions. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Why the question was poorly answered? Also provide specific examples, indicate common errors committed by learners in this question, and any misconceptions. |
| Questions 1.1.3, 1.1.6, 1.1.7 and 1.1.8, was answered below average. Understanding and interpretation of the movement and weather conditions associated with cold/warm fronts was poorly answered. The different questioning technique used might have played a role in the poor responses, however there is a lack in the basic knowledge about the development and associated weather pattern of mid-latitude cyclones. |
| These short objective questions were very well answered. In fact, this sub-question has the highest Average % for the whole question paper. |
| Questions 1.3.1, 1.3.2 and 1.3.5 was reasonably well answered. Learners still make the mistake of not extracting information from the sources when asked to do so. They lost I mark in question 1.3.2, because their responses were not taken directly from the sources provided. The higher marks in question 1.3.5 is due the marking guideline that accommodated responses that related to measures before, during and after the tropical cyclone hit an area/country. It therefore became very general, and candidates benefitted from this.  Questions 1.3.3 and 1.3.4 needed understanding of the strength gained or lost by tropical cyclones. Learners lacked the capacity and understanding to answer these questions adequately. Applying the knowledge gained to the source posted a serious problem for the candidates. |
| This question was a real struggle for a large majority of candidates. In fact, this might be part of the reason why the marks are not what was expected.  Question 1.4.1 and 1.4.2 referred to the thermal low, which seemingly most learners never heard off. This came as a surprise because summer conditions are based on the intensive heating of the South African interior and thereafter the associated weather conditions.  Worst was the concept “ridging” (Q1.4.3 and 1.4.4). As the Average % indicate, candidates were totally lost with this concept.  In question 1.4.5 the candidates listed weather conditions at the weather station of Port Elizabeth instead of describing the weather. Stating the weather is not describing it, and candidates paid a painful prize for NOT understanding the difference, yet they could read the weather conditions from the weather station. |
|  |
| In question 1.5.1, candidates lost ONE mark for not being specific about the pressure systems. It must be emphasised that the development of Berg winds is unique to South African weather, therefor the specific pressure systems (Kalahari high/Coastal Low/Mid-Latitude cyclones) MUST be mentioned. Candidates generalised by just stating “High pressure” and “Low pressure”. Valuable marks were lost here.  Question 1.5.3 was problematic for candidates. They again generalised the development of berg winds, whereas the question required them to use their understanding of air movement against land surfaces as well how the escarpment influences the weather. This higher order question posted a serious problem, because candidates did not grasp the essence of the question.  Question 1.5.4 was very disappointingly answered. This question has been previously examined and candidates should have been better prepared to answer it. They could not distinguish between PHYSICAL, ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL impacts of berg winds. A large portion of the candidates provided responses relating to Economic and Social impact. |

|  |
| --- |
| **QUESTION 2** |
| (a) General comment on the performance of learners in the specific question. Was the question well answered or poorly answered? |
| The Average percentage according to the Rasch scores is 44,7. There is a similar trend as to that of Question 1. Lower order questions (2.1 and 2.2) reasonably well answered. Where specific processes are examined (Questions 2.3 to 2.5), candidates failed to respond adequately. Candidates also seems to know the processes but cannot relate it to reality nor could they integrate different processes, e.g., Question 2.5, where river capture and rejuvenation was combined by the examiners. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Why the question was poorly answered? Also provide specific examples, indicate common errors committed by learners in this question, and any misconceptions. |
| The poorly answered questions (2.1.3, 2.1.5, 2.1.6 & 2.1.8) refers to specific geomorphological processes, either erosion or deposition. Candidates know the stages (Question 2.1.2), but don’t understand what the main features, characteristics and processes within each stage is.  Question 2.18 was especially poorly answered because candidates did not understand the word/term ‘migrate’. This highlights the poor geographical vocabulary of our candidates. |
| As the Average percentages indicate, the question was answered fairly. Question 2.2.6 concentrated on the landform caused by headward erosion. Yet again deeper understanding of processes could not be answered by all candidates. |
| All candidates should have answered question 2.3.1 correct because the answer was provided in the diagram (Source). The fact the only 62.5% of learners responded correctly is testament that our learners do not interact with the sources comprehensively before they attempt the questions.  Middle and Higher order questions of 2.3.2 and 2.3.3, where underlying rock structure and flow of the tributaries were examined, was extremely poorly answered. In fact, candidates totally misunderstood 2.3.2 and provided characteristics rather than underlying rock structure of the drainage patterns.  Candidates did not have a clue on how to approach question 2.3.3 and could not answer this question at all. |
|  |
| The whole of question 2.4 was a disaster. Candidates did not know what a flood plain is, let alone answer questions about the flood plain. Other candidates who had an idea of flood plains failed to analyse the diagram properly and lost a lot of marks.  Most candidates were confused or did not understand the following term/concepts:   * 2.4.1 – geomorphological process * 2.4.2 – gradient * 2.4.4 – physical (natural) impact   Because the learner’s geographical vocabulary is poor, their responses was bad and totally wrong.  The candidates again provided responses regarding Economic and Social impacts instead of Physical impacts in paragraph question 2.4.4. Further, they didn’t know how to approach this question. |
|  |
| Candidates was unable to identify the conditions necessary for river capture (Question 2.5.2).  Candidates that understood river capture could draw a reasonable accurate representation of the area after river capture (question 2.5.3). However, most candidates failed to obtain full marks due to sketches flipped or mirrored. Other candidates simply did not understand what to do here and just draw lines with the labels indicated.  Some candidates responded YES/NO to question 2.5.4 instead of Z/Y. This indicate that there is still a language barrier in especially ENGFAL learners. Code switching during teaching and learning is damaging to candidates as they don’t grasp the essence of the questions in English.  Candidates ignored the action/instructional word “Explain” in question 2.5.6 and stated the changes without explaining it. A repeat of Economic and Social responses occurred also in this question. |

|  |
| --- |
| **QUESTION 3** |
| (a) General comment on the performance of learners in the specific question. Was the question well answered or poorly answered? |
| The mark is Question 3 was generally poor. Candidates scored below average marks due to:   * Failure to measure correctly or providing the correct true bearing * Not understanding the concept of scale * Applying climate and geomorphological knowledge * Not understanding basic GIS concepts and its importance   The lack of map skills and interpretation is the difference between a pass and fail result. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Why was the question poorly answered? Also provide specific examples, indicate common errors committed by learners in this question, and any misconceptions. |
| The poor performance in question 3.1.4 is due the lack of correct measurement and the use of the appropriate scale to determine the distances in meters. Some candidates measured correct but use the scale of the topographic map to convert to meters. Other candidates just calculated the area on the topographical map instead of the area on the orthophoto map.  Question 3.1.5 required the candidates to compare the scales of the topographic and orthophoto maps. They simply stated the scales and was severely penalised, for not reading the question correctly.  Again, the use of the protractor is lacking in question 3.1.6, because candidates just estimated the true bearing as a result lost 2 marks as this answer was linked to 3.1.7. |
| Theoretical application questions (3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.5, 3.2.6 and 3.2.7) could not be comprehensively answered at all. There is a common agreement between markers that map work was neglected during teaching and learning. The saying that every lesson is a map work lesson was not followed, because candidates did not have a clue on how to identify land forms (question 3.2.5), interpret wind direction (question 3.2.2), Flow direction of rivers and the reasons for it (questions 3.2.6 and 3.2.7). |
| The answering of Geographical Information systems was a disaster. Candidates don’t know nor understand the processes of buffering (question 3.3.3) and data layering (3.3.4 & 3.3.5). |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Provide suggestions for improvement in relation to Teaching and Learning |
| Varied teaching techniques should be employed by educators, like drawings, video presentations and power point presentations.  The use of graphs and especially infographics in all content has become very important as learners really struggled to use all the information adequately.  It seemed that learners rushed into answering the question paper and should be taught to analyse all information/sources first. Therefore, go to the sketches/infographic/graph and clarify your understanding about the topic being tested in a question.  The deeper understanding of processes should be emphasised as learners struggled with relating content to real-life situations.  Frequent revision and testing of Physical Geography in important because these topics are already finalised in term 1. Learners struggled to recall basic content.  A lot of resources are available, so educators should plan how to utilise them properly throughout the year.  All content and topics as prescribed in the Exam guidelines must be adequately covered during the academic year. If topics have not been examined in the past few years, it does not mean it will not be examined.  Teaching must be innovative and creative as the rigid and structured manner of teaching is clearly disadvantaging our learners. An integrated approach is advised.  Teachers should always bear in mind that whatever process is taught, learners should understand the practical and real-life implication, either positive or negative. That is what OUTCOMES BASED EDUCATION is all about.  High skills imply that all types of teaching methodology must be explored e.g., group work, case study analysis, fieldwork, collecting and analysing data, etc.  The ‘old’ method of ‘talk and chalk’ should be integrated with new technology like power points, video, etc., to make sure the learners observe drawings, as this skill is totally neglected, and learners lost marks in Question 2.5.3. |

|  |
| --- |
| (d) Describe any other specific observations relating to responses of learners and comments that are useful to teachers, subject advisors, teacher development etc. |
| There is a definite need to integrate both physical and geographical features. Providing evidence for observations and findings must be re-emphasised. The ‘WHY’ question when analysing sources should be instilled into learners. They should frequently ask ‘WHY’ in order to clarify sources and processes.  The is a definite gap between teaching methodology and assessment. Assessment tasks, tests and exams seemed to raise the bar higher and higher, whereas teaching methodology is stagnating. This difference is clearly indicated by the answers/responses of candidates to the innovative questions posed by examiners.  Monthly revision must be implemented by educators.  Subject advisors must try to standardise the SBA tasks and make sure that all tasks are CAPS compliant and with the correct cognitive balance  Lessons plans should be clearly outlines, to make sure that all the work/content are covered throughout the year.  Content gap workshops by subject advisors should be frequently held, in order to build capacity in educators.  The use of old question papers in revision is imperative.  Learners frequently provides half of the responses need for total marks. This just illustrates the lack of examination grooming by educators. E.g., (2 x 2) = (4) means TWO facts for TWO marks each. The candidates generally provided ONE fact.  The use of geographical language is problematic.  Educators must explain and relate concepts properly. These concepts provide the basis for the ‘language of geography’. This will improve the candidates grasp of concepts and how to apply them. Geography educators need to expose candidates to contemporary extracts, where they can practice the art of comprehending and synthesizing from the extracts.  Fieldwork for all grades must be compulsory – hence candidates will have primary information regarding land uses, issues, and solutions/strategies.  Many educators at the marking centre believe common text books would remedy many of the inconsistencies in teaching. This is possibly something that subject advisors need to look at.  We cannot over emphasise the need for workshops, to gain a common understanding of processes and the way it should be taught. |