

AFRIKAANS LANGUAGE

Paper 8679/01

Speaking

There were too few candidates this session to enable a meaningful analysis of the overall performance.

AFRIKAANS LANGUAGE

Paper 8679/02
Reading and Writing

General comments

In **Question 1** candidates were asked to find a word in the text with a similar meaning to the example given. Candidates generally did very well on this question. In **Question 2** candidates were required to rewrite a given sentence in a different format; a large number of candidates struggled with this task, often changing the meaning of the sentence in the process of rewriting.

In the two comprehension exercises, candidates generally performed better on **Question 4** than **Question 3**, and seemed to misinterpret a number of questions from the last-mentioned question. There were a fair number of outstanding marks for both questions.

Many candidates did not answer **Question 5(a)** in two parts, and there was occasional repetition of an answer in both (i) and (ii). Most candidates scored well in **5(b)**, but many failed to read the question properly, missing the vital aspect of referring to the view of other countries on South Africa's culture which negatively affected their total.

For **Questions 3, 4 and 5**, a surprisingly broad contingent of candidates often directly lifted large parts from the original text as their final answers. Although this does mean that they very occasionally identify the correct information within the repeated paragraph, they cannot realistically expect to gain marks for language usage when the question requires them to 'answer in your own words'.

Overall, Examiners would suggest that attention should be given to: (a) candidates' understanding of the various sayings in Afrikaans (idioms being an important aspect of the language), (b) correct sentence construction and application of grammar in the questions with short answers (where accuracy and imparting understanding is important), and (c) making sure they understand what is expected from each question by reading carefully.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Many candidates scored between 3 and 5 marks on this question. Some candidates correctly identified the words needed for (c) and (d) but applied them to the wrong definition. A very small number of candidates ignored this question completely, choosing to focus on other parts of the exam instead, thus losing valuable marks.

- (a) A fairly large number of candidates had trouble correctly identifying the word *voorwaarde*.
- (b) Some candidates lost the mark by identifying two words ('stel belang') instead of the single word required (*belangstellende*). Moreover, the word in the question was given in its adjectival, not verbal form.
- (c) A large percentage of candidates answered this correctly.
- (d) A large percentage of candidates answered this correctly.
- (e) The vast majority of candidates correctly identified 'hofdrama'

Question 2

There was a strong disparity between candidates with strong language skills and those with less understanding of Afrikaans grammatical structure. While many candidates had no problems with rewriting the given sentences, a large number appeared to give very little attention to the meaning of the resultant sentences.

- (a) Was answered adequately by most candidates
- (b) This question caused real problems for some candidates and many indicated, in rewriting, that receiving the offer caused the writer to lose hope. It is possible that the majority of these candidates did not understand the saying *op moedverloor se vlakke*.
- (c) A fairly large number of candidates were unaware of the meaning of the word *saans*, resulting in some confusing rewritings.
- (d) While causing some problems, many candidates did well on this question
- (e) Most candidates scored a mark on this question

Question 3

A number of candidates struggled with this question, although there were also many who scored exceedingly well.

- (a) Most candidates gained at least one of the two marks available.
- (b) Only a small number of stronger candidates correctly understood the meaning of the saying.
- (c) There were a few different interpretations of and answers to this question, and those who attempted an answer usually received a mark. Unfortunately some candidates confused 'Sitting Bull' with the English saying 'sitting duck'.
- (d) Most candidates gained at least one of the two marks available.
- (e) Very few candidates had a problem with this question, although it was clear that a small number did not understand what a *regter* was, and attributed the dilemma to Gavin Hood.
- (f) There was a range of answers to this question and most candidates gained at least one mark here.
- (g) The majority of candidates who attempted this question was able to provide a good explanation of the statement given.
- (h) There were an array of character traits available from which to choose and there were many full marks awarded to this question, so the candidates did very well overall. However, weaker candidates showed misunderstanding of the term *karaktereienskappe*, with the result that they listed the characters and actors in the film.

Section B

Question 4

As mentioned above, candidates generally did better in this comprehension exercise than **Question 3**. The major stumbling block was the definition of given words, while candidates excelled in grasping onto the fact that African film has much more to offer the world than America thinks.

- (a) A large number of candidates were unable to define the meaning of *gerieflikheidshalwe* adequately.
- (b)(i) The majority of candidates correctly identified *minagting* or *agtergrond* as the correct answer
- (ii) Similarly, a large percentage of candidates gained a mark here on the basis of correctly answering (i).

- (c) Most candidates gained one mark of the two available but few correctly understood the irony of the word *verwerdig*.
- (d) This question was quite poorly answered. Many candidates incorrectly associated the English word 'stiff' with *stief* in *stiefkontinent*, often giving positive explanations for the word even though the text itself clearly implies a negative perception.
- (e) Examiners were flexible with interpretations of and answers to this question, and almost all candidates deservedly gained the one mark here if they made a good attempt at answering the question.
- (f) Most candidates answered very well.
- (g) While many candidates gained one mark here, a fair number neglected to answer the question fully, only noting the appropriate textual evidence and leaving out any interpretation of the writer's attitude about America's appreciation of Africa.
- (h) Although only a large minority of candidates scored full marks on this question by referring both to the dual nature of Africa (harshness and beauty) and its ability to tell a real story, virtually all candidates who attempted the question gained at least one mark.
- (i) Candidates answered this question very well.
- (j) While the majority of candidates who understood the question gained at least one mark, some appeared to have trouble with the word *verklaar*, possibly understanding it to mean 'identify'. Many candidates therefore only repeated the title of the piece (*Afrika word mondig!*) without attempting to explore its meaning or relevance. It would be useful in future if candidates are fully aware of the meaning of popular command words such as *verklaar*, *verduidelik*, *omskryf*, *beskryf*, or *identifiseer* to insure that they can gain as many marks as possible and not lose any unnecessarily.

Question 5

Where candidates answered the questions appropriately they usually scored well, and were able to achieve very good marks for the content of their answers and their language usage. There was a high incidence from some Centres where candidates copied large amounts of text word-for-word from the comprehension texts. Candidates were unlikely to score high marks for content or language by doing this, and, as the second question calls for a completely personal response, most candidates gained zero on **(b)**. A small number of candidates did not finish this question.

- (a) (i) and (ii)** The majority of candidates answered the subsections together, as one question. Although Examiners did not mark negatively for doing so, candidates who did not answer **(i)** and **(ii)** separately often gained fewer marks. This is because they did not explore both questions adequately, concentrating on either one or the other and often writing less than those candidates who separated the questions in line with how they appear on the question paper. Candidates who scored high marks were usually able to extract more from the text with regard to **(ii)**.
- (b)** Candidates generally scored exceedingly well on their personal responses to this question, gaining an average of 3 or 4 marks on this question. Providing a personal agreement or disagreement with the statement given in the question was often helpful in leading to good-quality answers. Candidates who gained full marks explored a variety of different cultural aspects (peoples, languages, history, music, art, sport, local traditions, natural resources) and often contrasted these with the largely political and tourist-driven views the world has of South Africa.

AFRIKAANS LANGUAGE

Paper 8679/03

Essay

General comments

Most candidates displayed good writing skills and showed a good ability to argue, draw conclusions and maintain coherence within their essay.

A small number of candidates nevertheless wrote essays that had little bearing on the task set for the topic of their choice. It should be stressed that candidates need to read the questions under the topic headings carefully in order to be able to produce essays that are fully relevant. Candidates risk losing a substantial number of marks if they do not take this on board.

Comments on general questions

Question 1

Candidates generally addressed the topic well and gave detailed arguments on whether young people could or could not benefit from the company of the older generation. They used a wide range of vocabulary and idioms to back up their views.

Question 2

Most candidates responded well to this topic and argued for and against celebrities being entitled to their privacy. The best candidates were able to present both sides of the argument before giving their own views. Some essays, however, focussed too much, or in some cases, entirely, on the candidate's own opinion. This often resulted in work that was repetitious.

Question 3

Many candidates only managed to present a rather limited range of ideas on this topic. Some candidates appeared not to have grasped what was required and wrote essays on their school, failing to notice they were asked specifically to discuss career guidance.

Question 4

Most candidates wrote interesting essays showing flair and imagination with practical suggestions for solving the medical problems in Africa.

Question 5

The response to this question was generally excellent and most candidates gave detailed and lively descriptions. They demonstrated their ability to present their arguments and to draw relevant and often persuasive conclusions.