

AFRIKAANS LANGUAGE

Paper 8679/01
Speaking

There were too few candidates for a meaningful report to be produced.

AFRIKAANS LANGUAGE

Paper 8679/02
Reading and Writing

Key messages

To do well in this examination the candidate should:

- Focus on the specific requirements of each question, including paragraph references
- Communicate the answer as clearly and precisely as possible in their own words in **Question 3**, **Question 4** and **Question 5**.

General comments

Question 1 and Question 2

In **Question 1** candidates were required to find synonyms within a specific portion of the text to match the given word(s) in the question. In **Question 2** candidates were required to rewrite sentences to show their ability to manipulate syntax correctly in the target language.

Examiners found a reasonable spread of marks across **Questions 1** and **2**. Weaker marks for **Question 2** resulted from candidates not understanding the vocabulary used in the sentences or from them not being able to adapt the sentences to the required format.

Questions 3 and Question 4

The texts used for the comprehension questions appeared to be within the candidates' field of interest. The comparative and contrastive questions produced some good answers. Some of the weaker candidates struggled with the vocabulary used in the texts and the questions, nevertheless.

For **Questions 3** and **4**, a few candidates copied large parts of the texts as their answer with no attempt to tailor their response to the question in their own words. It should be stressed that quoting directly from the text should only be done where it is specifically requested (e.g. *Noem...*) and that quotation marks should be used in such instances. Candidates who use their own words provide Examiners with the opportunity to assess their competency in the target language.

Questions 5(a) and 5 (b)

Candidates who used their own words generally did quite well. Many candidates expressed their own opinions very clearly. Examiners do suggest that extra attention be given to:

- correct sentence construction and punctuation (including diacritical marks)
- developing the skill of answering in one's own words.

Candidates who cross out and replace answers or need to extend their answers may use the extra blank pages provided at the end or additional answer paper. However, candidates are requested to leave a suitable instructions as to where to examiner may find the (rest of the) answer to ensure that replacements and/or additions are not overlooked.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Candidates needed to find the answers within the part of the text indicated in the rubric instruction.

- (a) Many candidates gave the correct word.
- (b) A few candidates struggled to find the correct word having interpreted *wyse* to mean 'wise' and answering with *kennis*.
- (c) Generally well answered despite two words being provided for a single word answer.
- (d) A very few candidates provided two-word answers instead of the required single word.
- (e) Many answered this correctly.

Question 2

A few weaker candidates struggled with some of the sentence structures showing a tendency to provide the *lydende vorm* (passive voice) as an answer for every sentence.

- (a) Most candidates understood this to be the simple *verlede tyd*.
- (b) Many candidates produced the correct sentence transformation here.
- (c) A few candidates confused the words *se* and *sê* and attempted *direkte rede* instead of the *lydende vorm*. This stresses the importance of knowing the usage of diacritical marks in Afrikaans.
- (d) This question required converting *lydende* into *bedrywende vorm*. This was generally understood but often answered in the wrong tense which was not accepted.
- (e) Many handled the required transformation from *direkte* into *indirekte rede* very well.

Question 3

Candidates are advised to read the questions carefully, especially paragraph references. Answers should also be based on the texts, not on general knowledge.

- (a) This straightforward question was generally answered very well.
- (b) A few candidates did not seem to understand '*vreemd*' which lead to incorrect answers.
- (c) Quite a few candidates confused the answers required for (b) and (c) as these questions referred to the same paragraph. Those who followed sequential logic of the paragraph scored well on this question.
- (d) This question was answered well.
- (e) Many candidates missed the crux of the question contained in the separable verb *aansluit*. They only gave the message of the song but did not relate the song and its message back to the text.
- (f) Many candidates missed – or took insufficient note of – the instruction '*hoe verander ...*' which implied that a 'before-and-after' answer was needed.

Question 4

As with **Question 3**, candidates are reminded to use their own words in answering comprehension questions.

- (a) Generally well answered, provided the candidates could understand the connection between the role of a mother in providing and sustaining life and the role of the earth in providing and sustaining life.

- (b) Some candidates missed the fact that this was a two-part question, resulting in only half an answer being given.
- (c) Many candidates coped very well with this question, also because they used their own words.
- (d) Many candidates misunderstood the main thrust of the question. This question sought a discussion of the character of the speaker involved in the incident, not merely their actions.
- (e) This question was reasonably well done by those candidates who used their own words.

Question 5 (a)

Candidates who used the blank pages to organise their thoughts and plan their answer tended to fare well in finding the similarities and differences between the two texts. This resulted in well explained and well structured responses with little repetitiveness.

Similarities earned one mark each, while well-explained differences earned two marks. Candidates should avoid tagging on phrases like '*maar nie in die ander teks nie*' as sufficient for a well-explained difference.

A few candidates still misjudged what constituted as meaningful differences between the two texts by citing minor incidental discrepancies, such as dates, sources and numbers of paragraphs, instead of focusing on textual content.

Candidates who used their own words tended to achieve better marks than those who copied large sections which were often irrelevant to what is required, even if their own vocabulary was basic and straightforward.

Question 5(b)

Candidates who understood that the question referred to high school learners and not the government generally handled this question well, including through giving some sound suggestions.

AFRIKAANS LANGUAGE

Paper 8679/03
Essay

Kernboodskap

Ten einde goed in hierdie eksamen te vaar, behoort die kandidate:

- menings en argumente met bewyse te motiveer
- hul opstelle te proeflees.

Algemene kommentaar

Van die kandidate is verwag om oor een van die opdragte wat in die vraestel verskaf is, te skryf. Hulle moes nie net hul taalvermoë toon nie, maar ook hul vermoë om 'n bepaalde argument te struktureer en hul standpunt(e) ten opsigte van 'n spesifieke beskouing te motiveer. Punte is daarom toegeken vir sowel taalvermoë (24) as inhoud (16). Kandidate met 'n swakker taalvermoë was dikwels nie daartoe in staat om hul standpunte duidelik te formuleer nie, terwyl kandidate met 'n meerdere taalvaardigheid uiteraard in staat was om 'n hoër punt te behaal weens hul vermoë om hul opstel meer sinvol rondom 'n bepaalde beskouing te struktureer.

Vanjaar was daar 'n goeie verspreiding ten opsigte van die opdragte wat deur die kandidate gekies is. Nogtans het waarskynlik meer kandidate die opdrag oor *Daaglikse lewe* (**Opdrag 1**) beantwoord, gevolg deur *Omgewing* (**Opdrag 5**), *Kos en drank* (**Opdrag 2**) en steeds met 'n beduiende verteenwoordiging: *Werk en werkloosheid* (**Opdrag 3**) en *Sosiale en ekonomiese ontwikkeling* (**Opdrag 4**). In die algemeen is al die opdragte goed hanteer, maar dit was tog opvallend dat daar vanjaar meer kandidate was wat die opdrag verkeerd geïnterpreteer of gedeeltelik beantwoord het as wat dit die geval was in voorafgaande jare. In die breë is dit veral in **Opdrag 5** (*Omgewing*) waar sommige kandidate gesukkel het aangesien hulle net oor ekologiese kwessies en klimaatsverandering geskryf het sonder inagneming van die bydrae wat die individu (elke persoon) kan lewer 'om die aarde te red'. Aansluitend hiertoe was dit **Opdrag 2** (*Kos en drank*) waar heelwat kandidate oor 'n gesonde leefstyl en eetgewoontes geskryf het sonder om die kwessie van sosiale interaksie en onderlinge kultuurverskille aan te spreek. Gevolglik het dié opstelle die indruk gewek van 'n vooraf bereide skryfstuk en was die inhoud derhalwe swak.

Oor die algemeen was die kandidate goed voorberei vir hierdie stelwerkvraestel. Nie net het die kandidate 'n relatief goeie begrip vir die gekose opdrag getoon nie, maar in die beter opstelle was daar ook 'n duidelike inleiding met 'n toepaslike gevolgtrekking in die slotparagrafe te bespeur. Iets wat wel onrusbarend is, is opstelle wat nie vooraf beplan is en waar daar nie die moeite gedoen is om dit skematies uiteen te sit nie. Die gevolg was 'n ongestruktureerde opstel waarin dieselfde gedagtes en beskouings deurentyd herhaal is.

Kommentaar oor spesifieke opdragte

Opdrag 1

'Dit is belangrik dat ouers meer tyd met hul kinders spandeer.' Voel jy ook so?

Soos reeds genoem: Hierdie was die meer gewilde keuse onder die kandidate. In die algemeen het die kandidate die opdrag goed verstaan en is die vraagstelling wel beantwoord. 'n Beduidende aantal kandidate het egter sonder die nodige beplanning en gepaardgaande besinning begin skryf. Veralgemenings het vry algemeen voorgekom sonder om die kernaspek van die stelsin – dat ouers *meer* tyd met hul kinders moet spandeer – aan te spreek. Uiteraard sou kandidate ook kon wys op enkelouerskap, leefstylkeuses en omstandighede soos werkklas as moontlike oorsake van onvoldoende tyd saam tussen ouer en kind; ook die nadele van emosionele verwaarloosing en die voordele verbonde aan 'n gesonde selfbeeld danksy 'n meer

betrokke (aandagtige) ouerskap. Van die swakste punte wat vir hierdie komponent toegeken was, was meestal weens onvoldoende taalvermoë waar ongrammatikale sinskonstruksies, gebrek aan woordeskat (met gepaardgaande gebruik van Engelse woorde) en ongeorganiseerde gedagtegang, asook die herhaling van reeds gestelde idees.

Opdrag 2

‘Alle kulture het gebruike rondom kos en drank. Die mens is immers ’n sosiale wese en daarom is dit belangrik om saam te eet en te kuier.’ Stem jy saam?

’n Beduidende aantal kandidate het ten gunste van hierdie onderwerp gekies. Kandidate wat goed presteer het in die beantwoording van hierdie opdrag het buiten die voor die hand liggende kommentaar ten opsigte van sosialisering en eetgewoontes ook gewys op die onderlinge kultuurverskille ten opsigte van sosialisering waar kos en drank ter sprake is. In die sommige gevalle is laasgenoemde helaas nie voldoende aangespreek nie; dikwels het die kandidaat geskryf oor gesonde eet- en leefstylgewoontes sonder om genoegsaam aandag te gee aan die kwessie van sosialisering soos die opdrag vereis.

Opdrag 3

‘Om te kan werk, is ’n lewensreg. As jy werkloos is, word jou selfbeeld en menswaardigheid aangetas.’ Is hierdie mening geregverdig?

Hierdie opdrag het besonder interessante opstelle tot gevolg gehad aangesien dit meestal tot ’n gebalanseerde betoog aanleiding gegee het. Die impak wat werkloosheid het op die betrokke persoon se selfbeeld en menswaardigheid is deeglik aangespreek. Interessant genoeg was daar uiteenlopende menings oor die kwessie van werk as ‘lewensreg’. In die breë het die kandidate wat ten gunste van hierdie onderwerp gekies het, wel deurdagte en genuanseerde opstelle gelewer; in hoofsaak omrede die opdrag hom leen tot ’n veelvlakkige, gestruktureerde betoog en gevolglik het dié kandidate selde ’n probleem gehad om aan die vereiste woordtelling te voldoen.

Opdrag 4

‘Een van die grootste uitdagings wat die samelewing tans moet hanteer, is om sosiale en ekonomiese ongelykhede uit te skakel.’ Bespreek.

Tot ’n groot mate is presies dieselfde kommentaar ten opsigte van Opdrag 3 ook hier van toepassing, alhoewel nie al die kandidate daarin kon slaag om al argumente sinvol te struktureer nie. Gevolglik het daar weer die tendens van herhaling van idees ten einde aan die vereiste woordtelling te voldoen, ontstaan. Die kandidate wat wel by magte was om die onderwerp sinvol te beredeneer, én hul opstelle effektief kon struktureer, het uitstekende punte behaal.

Opdrag 5

‘Om die aarde te red, moet elke persoon ’n bydrae lewer.’ Wat is jou mening?

Soos reeds genoem was hierdie opdrag die naasgunsteling. Ongelukkig is dit ook die opdrag waar die meeste mistastings voorgekom het. ’n Getal kandidate het oor besoedeling, klimaatsverandering en ander ekologiese kwessies geskryf, sonder om aandag te gee aan die rol wat die individu kan speel in die bekamping daarvan. Die indruk is daarom dikwels gewek dat dit voorbereide opstelle is; ook is dit die onderwerp waar daar die herhaling van dieselfde voor die hand liggende idees in voorgekom het. Ná ’n aanvanklike sterk standpuntinname was die kandidaat nie in staat om die argument verder sinvol te ontwikkel nie en gevolglik het herhalings en lukrake segging vry algemeen voorgekom. Nogtans is van die beste punte behaal deur die kandidate wat hierdie opdrag sinvol en gestruktureerd aangepak het.