

## GENERAL COMMENTS

2021 has come to an end, a very difficult year for all the role players especially the teachers and the candidates. Covid19 is still prevailing in the country, but with all the measures in place, 2022 can be a wonderful year, a year in which determination to be successful will be the order of the day.

The candidates did fairly well in this examination taking the situation in the country into account. However, it was expected to be better. Evidently one could see that some teachers have put the maximum effort in to prepare their candidates for this examination, not that all teachers did not do their work, because there are also other factors playing a role; like the most important one, is the candidate willing to walk the extra mile to his /her own success. On the other hand, teachers need more training in how to interpret and present the syllabus.

Teachers should study the Examiner's Reports and make themselves aware of the content of this important document, problem areas are pointed out to which attention should be given to.

This was the second year the syllabus was tested and yet candidates did not perform as expected. Paper 2 is exactly a repetition of paper 3, but on a specific topic. That is why good marks are expected from all candidates.

There were no changes in syllabus or assessment criteria. The only reason could be that most candidates chose Question 2 (Resistant Materials), as well as Question 1 (Design Communication) which appeared to be much easier for them. Only a few candidates opted to do Question 3 (Technology).

It is recommended that centres should make a thorough study of the syllabus and the assessment criteria to prepare the candidates well in advance for the examination, because candidates lost marks for little things like line work, shading, colouring, enhancing, evaluation, testing, etc.

Centres should make sure that candidates are fully prepared and informed about the options available and make them aware of the syllabus requirements for each of these options.

It was also evident that some candidates answered two or all the question options in the question paper and did not choose. This is unacceptable, because it is expected of all candidates to read and understand what is expected from them at this level of their studies. This is where the teacher comes in to teach them through tests and mock-examination.

Some learners use pencil to answer all the questions instead of using a black or blue pen. Almost 50% of the candidates did not number their questions. These are some of the factors that could disadvantage a candidate. In the instructions to candidates, it is pointed out that the answers should be done on the provided A3 drawing sheets, it was not done by some candidates, they wrote in the official answer book. The answer book is not suitable to answer Design questions in, therefore A3 drawing sheets are specially designed for these types of questions. Another area that can be improved, is the handwriting. There are some candidates of which one cannot read it at all. Vocabulary is not assessed, but concepts should make sense in a way to be awarded marks.

## Comments on specific questions

- (a) Most of the candidates answered this question satisfactorily, but there is still place for improvement in some cases. A few candidates could not list additional specification but rather list tool names or they tend to give generic specifications. It was also expected of the candidates not to generalize, for example, when referring to materials, a specific material should be identified (timber, plastic, metal is not good enough) and the reason why the specific material was suggested should be well documented, referring to its particular properties, uses, availability and environmental impact.
- (b) This part of the question paper was answered fairly well overall. Quite a few candidates could not give a correct answer and a range of miss matching of joining methods example welding of plastic or using wood glue to joint plastic together. This is a clear indication candidates do not have the knowledge to distinguish between the correct method to join parts.
- (c) Although the sketch work of most of the candidates was satisfactorily done in three different ways, they failed to include reasonable information by way of notes, labeling color enhancement, rendering and evaluation. It was expected of the candidates to evaluate each idea against the specifications. Some Candidates demonstrated that they had a wider perspective of the potential problem and could propose unique and innovative solutions while also opening up the possibilities for further development.

- (d) Most candidates scored good marks, but most of them performed only fairly. Each idea should be evaluated and advantages should be stated to make the best choice for the final solution to be developed. The selection should be clear and stated with valid reasoning.
- (e) Quite a few candidates did well in this question, but there is still much room for improvement. Candidate should be able to give a final drawing or drawings by using different drawing techniques, pictorial, orthographic or isometric. Work should be further detailed by rendering and coloring and where there might still be some information lacking. Labeling, dimensions and notes should be used to produce a complete and well-structured presentation.
- (f) Most of the candidates tended to list materials without showing evidence that these materials were considered based on their particular properties. Only by listing and evaluating these particular properties can be enough information to select an appropriate material for a specific function to be done. Instead they made the list longer by adding tools and equipment to be used, which was irrelevant, because it was not required as part of the answer.
- (g) This part question needs much attention on how the school workshop can be used as practical class room. Candidates are required to show case skills and knowledge during the presentation of practical's and should also expose candidate's knowledge on the available equipment and tools used as well as the safety aspect at the school. Most of the Centre failed to give clear answer to how to go about making the final solution in school workshop. Since a big number of candidates preferred to make their products at home, little exposure is to their disposure.