



EXAMINATIONS AND ASSESSMENT CHIEF DIRECTORATE

Home of Examinations and Assessment, Zone 6, Zwelitsha, 5600
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA, Website: www.ecdoe.gov.za

2019 NSC CHIEF MARKER'S REPORT

SUBJECT:	BUSINESS STUDIES
PAPER:	1
DURATION OF PAPER:	3 HOURS
DATES OF MARKING:	30/11/2019 TO 14/12/2019

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

- The total number of candidates that wrote the NSC Business Studies P1 2019 November Examination in the Province of the Eastern Cape is 23531 (NSC – 22850 and SC – 681).
- The performances of the candidates in the Business Studies November 2019 examinations have improved compared to 2018, although there is a need to improve the quality of the results.
- The candidates are experiencing challenges with regards to understanding the application of the key cognitive verbs such as advise on the impact and questions relating to the application of facts.
- The achievement of candidates as at 09:00 on 14/12/2019 are as follows:

YEAR	NO. OF CANDIDATES	L1 %	L2 %	L3 %	L4 %	L5 %	L6 %	L7 %
2019	22850	36.2	22.1	18	12.1	7.3	3.3	1

-

SECTION A

- Candidates performed very well in Section A, with an average of 63.4% according to the randomly selected 100 scripts recorded.
- The decision was taken at the Marking Guideline discussion that in Section A Question 1.1.2, C or D would be accepted as alternative responses because the question was ambiguous. Candidates were not adversely affected by this decision as the marking guideline made provision for alternative responses.



SECTION B

- The average performance of candidates in Section B is 42.06%.
- In Section B, Questions 3 and 5 were the most popular questions, followed by Questions 4 and 6.
- The candidates' performances varied in Sections B from low, moderate to high, depending on the examination centres.
- This was evident, as some candidates did not answer some of the questions or they were unable to address the specific requirements of the questions in Section B.
- There is a marked improvement in the quoting from the scenarios in the paper.
- Candidates could quote in full or provide the essence of the quotes, which is acceptable.

SECTION C

- The average performance of in Section C is 62.9%.
- In Section C, Questions 8 and 9 were the most popular questions, followed by Question 7.
- There was an improvement in the answering of the essay questions compared to 2018.
- Candidates however, forfeited marks for the Introduction, Conclusion and Originality.

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?
Question 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The candidates' performances varied from, moderate to high in sub-section 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3.
(b) Why the question was poorly answered? Also provide specific examples, indicate common errors committed by learners in this question, and any misconceptions.
Question 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Question 1.1.2: was ambiguous, but the marking guideline made provision for alternative responses.• Question 1.2.3: The candidates confused the responsibility of the employer with that of the health and safety representative.• Question 1.3.3: Candidates confused option 'I' with the distractor option 'A'.
QUESTION 2
(a) General comment on the performance of learners in the specific question. Was the question well answered or poorly answered?
Question 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The candidates' performances were poor to moderate in most centres.• Question 2 was not a popular choice question.
(b) Why the question was poorly answered? Also provide specific examples, indicate common errors committed by learners in this question, and any misconceptions.
Question 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 2.2 – candidates could not explain role of SETA's. They were vague in their responses and indicated that SETA's are responsible for training.• 2.4 – candidates confused the purpose of the LRA with the EEA and their responses were also incomplete.• 2.6 – candidates could not identify the two pillars in the scenario, therefore forfeiting marks for the motivation.• 2.7 – candidates could not apply how these PESTLE factors may pose a challenge to businesses, instead they explained these two factors.• 2.8 – candidates could not explain the ways businesses may comply with the EEA, instead they gave the purpose of the Act and they generalised facts.• Where split marking is applied in Section B, most candidates did not achieve

two marks per fact as their responses were incomplete or vague.

QUESTION 3

(a) General comment on the performance of learners in the specific question. Was the question well answered or poorly answered?

Question 3:

- The candidates' performances were poor to moderate in most centres.
- Question 3 was a popular question among candidates.

(b) Why the question was poorly answered? Also provide specific examples, indicate common errors committed by learners in this question, and any misconceptions.

Question 3:

- 3.2 – candidates provided an explanation of unit trusts, instead of providing its advantages.
- 3.5.2 – candidates explained the term liquidation, instead of liquidity.
- 3.6.1 – candidates wrote 'under-insurance', instead of 'average clause'.
- 3.7 – candidates explained facts on non-profit, public and private companies, instead of the advantages non-profit companies.
- 3.8 – general answers were provided, instead of facts contained in marking guideline.
- Where split marking is applied in Section B, most candidates did not achieve two marks per fact as their responses were incomplete or vague.

QUESTION 4

(a) General comment on the performance of learners in the specific question. Was the question well answered or poorly answered?

Question 4:

- The candidates' performances were poor to moderate in most centres.
- Question 4 was a popular question among candidates.

(b) Why the question was poorly answered? Also provide specific examples, indicate common errors committed by learners in this question, and any misconceptions.

Question 4:

- 4.2 – candidates confused the role of the health and safety representatives with the responsibilities of the employer.
- 4.3 – candidates could not identify the diversity issues from the scenario and therefore also forfeited marks for the motivation.
- 4.4 – candidates' responses were vague and they confused the Delphi technique with nominal group and force-field analysis techniques.
- 4.5 – candidates' responses were vague.
- 4.6.2 – candidates discussed the impact of CSI on communities instead of the

business.

- 4.7 – candidates' responses were vague.
- 4.8.1 and 4.8.2 candidates were unable to suggest strategies to deal with these unethical practices, instead they explained them and gave punitive strategies that only carried a maximum of two marks.
- Where split marking is applied in Section B, most candidates did not achieve two marks per fact as their responses were incomplete or vague.

QUESTION 5

(a) General comment on the performance of learners in the specific question. Was the question well answered or poorly answered?

Question 5:

- The candidates' performances were poor to moderate in most centres.
- Question 5 was popular among candidates.

(b) Why the question was poorly answered? Also provide specific examples, indicate common errors committed by learners in this question, and any misconceptions.

Question 5:

- 5.2.1 – candidates confused the examples of job description and job specification from the scenario with one another.
- 5.3 – candidates discussed the advantages of the SDA, instead of its implications on the Human Resources Function.
- 5.5; 5.7; 5.8; 5.9 – these four sub-questions relate to quality – candidates confused the answers related to the various questions on quality with one another and their responses were vague and generalised.
- Where split marking is applied in Section B, most candidates did not achieve two marks per fact as their responses were incomplete or vague.

QUESTION 6

(a) General comment on the performance of learners in the specific question. Was the question well answered or poorly answered?

Question 6:

- The candidates' performances were poor to moderate in most centres
- Question 6 was not a popular question among candidates.

(b) Why the question was poorly answered? Also provide specific examples, indicate common errors committed by learners in this question, and any misconceptions.

Question 6:

- 6.2.3 – candidates' responses were generalized and vague.
- 6.3.1 and 6.3.2 – candidates could not identify the two types of business investment opportunities; for shares they mentioned the different types of shares which is not an acceptable response.

- 6.5 – candidates wrote facts on democratic leadership style, instead of situational leadership theory.
- 6.6 – candidates could not state the two criteria for successful team performance.
- 6.8 – candidates responded to the advantages of creative thinking.
- 6.10 – candidates could not identify the reason for termination of the employment contract from the scenario and therefore also forfeited the mark for the motivation.
- 6.11 – candidates gave the aspects and advantages of induction, instead of the purpose of induction.
- Where split marking is applied in Section B, most candidates did not achieve two marks per fact as their responses were incomplete or vague.

QUESTION 7

(a) General comment on the performance of learners in the specific question. Was the question well answered or poorly answered?

Question 7:

- The candidates' performances were poor to moderate in most centres.
- There is an improvement in the performances of the candidates in the essays compared to 2018.
- Question 7 was popular among candidates.

(b) Why the question was poorly answered? Also provide specific examples, indicate common errors committed by learners in this question, and any misconceptions.

Question 7:

- 7.2 – candidates' responses were vague and incomplete, e.g. formulate, implement and evaluate a strategy, which was awarded one mark each.
- 7.4 – candidates could identify Porter's Forces, but its applications were poorly answered.
- 7.5 – candidates elaborated on the steps in problem-solving, instead of steps in evaluating a strategy.
- In all the essays, most candidates forfeited marks for the introduction and conclusion.
- Originality remains a challenge as candidates forfeited two marks as they could not provide current examples.
- Where split marking is applied in Section C, most candidates did not achieve two marks per fact as their responses were incomplete or vague.

QUESTION 8
(a) General comment on the performance of learners in the specific question. Was the question well answered or poorly answered?
<p>Question 8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The candidates' performances were moderate in most centres. • Question 8 was a popular question among candidates.
(b) Why the question was poorly answered? Also provide specific examples, indicate common errors committed by learners in this question, and any misconceptions.
<p>Question 8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8.3 – candidates could identify some of the principles of insurance, but the explanations were vague. • 8.4 – candidates responded to general facts on presentation, not focusing on impact of a PowerPoint presentation. • 8.5 – candidates confused the ways to improve on the next presentation with the handling of feedback, as they were confused by the preamble in the table of Question 8 in the question paper. • In all the essays, most candidates forfeited marks for the introduction and conclusion. • Originality remains a challenge as candidates forfeited two marks as they could not provide current examples. • Where split marking is applied in Section C, most candidates did not achieve two marks per fact as their responses were incomplete or vague.
QUESTION 9
(a) General comment on the performance of learners in the specific question. Was the question well answered or poorly answered?
<p>Question 9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The candidates' performances were poor to moderate in most centres. • Question 9 was a popular question among candidates.
(b) Why the question was poorly answered? Also provide specific examples, indicate common errors committed by learners in this question, and any misconceptions.
<p>Question 9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9.2 – most candidates could identify the stages of team development, but they swapped the explanations for the various stages and some could not explain them (description). • 9.4 – the handling of conflict answers was linked to the causes of conflict identified in 9.3, instead of the facts stated in the marking guideline and some candidates gave the steps in problem-solving. • 9.5 – vague statements were given by candidates instead of relating facts.

- In all the essays, most candidates forfeited marks for the introduction and conclusion.
- Originality remains a challenge as candidates forfeited two marks as they could not provide current examples.
- Where split marking is applied in Section C, most candidates did not achieve two marks per fact as their responses were incomplete or vague.

QUESTION 10

(a) General comment on the performance of learners in the specific question. Was the question well answered or poorly answered?

Question 10:

- The candidates' performances were poor in most centres.
- Question 10 was not popular among candidates.

(b) Why the question was poorly answered? Also provide specific examples, indicate common errors committed by learners in this question, and any misconceptions.

Question 10:

- All aspects of the essay on Total Quality Management remains a challenge, especially the impact of TOM elements on a large business.
- In all the essays, most candidates forfeited marks for the introduction and conclusion.
- Originality remains a challenge as candidates forfeited two marks as they could not provide current examples.
- Where split marking is applied in Section C, most candidates did not achieve two marks per fact as their responses were incomplete or vague.

QUESTION 1 – 10

(c) Provide suggestions for improvement in relation to Teaching and Learning

- Teachers must be guided by the CAPS and the Examination Guidelines when teaching a topic. The Examination Guideline must always be consulted.
- Chief Marker's Report must be discussed with all teachers to avoid repeating mistakes.
- Subject Advisors and teachers involved in the marking processes of the grade 12 final examinations must provide feedback sessions on the marking guideline and marking processes in their districts, e.g. the use cognitive verbs and questions that require application must be clarified.
- Teachers must remind learners that incomplete/vague facts will result in the forfeiture of marks.
- Model scripts that are issued to learners should also form part of this discussion so that teachers could prepare learners for their final examinations.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide resources, e.g. Mind the Gap in English and Afrikaans to all under-performing schools.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workshops must be conducted by subject advisors on the Quality of Performance Topic to narrow gap experienced by teachers. • Essays questions, e.g. facts for introduction and conclusion and originality examples must be brainstormed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A common, prescribed resource is recommended.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previous Question papers and Marking Guidelines must be used by teachers when preparing learners for the final examinations, e.g. classwork and homework should be taken from previous questions papers to familiarize learners on how questions are set.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Examination Guidelines for 2020 onwards should be streamlined for essays in a three-year cycle, i.e. topics and content to be taught for essay assessment should be indicated, e.g. Legislation – five Acts must be assessed for essays and four Acts for Section B only.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Originality, teachers must brainstorm relevant and recent examples with the learners, e.g. allowing them to Google recent examples on the internet.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make teachers and learners aware that lower cognitive questions are assessed in Section B and that under-performing learners should study concepts and headings as well to obtain marks, e.g. principles of insurance (headings only) and Porter’s Five Forces (headings only).
<p>(d) Describe any other specific observations relating to responses of learners and comments that are useful to teachers, subject advisors, teacher development etc.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facts that are vague or incomplete are of huge concern. Learners must be reminded that incomplete/vague facts will result in them forfeiting marks.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the essay questions, it is noted that candidates could not be awarded any marks for originality because of a lack of current examples or trends.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Quality of Performance topic remains a challenge, as candidates are confusing the facts to the various questions.