

AFRIKAANS LANGUAGE

Paper 8679/01
Speaking

General comments

Candidates were well prepared for the Speaking test. The Examiners put the candidates at ease and prompted them with appropriate questions, which led to spontaneous responses and interesting conversations.

Generally, the marking was carried out to a good standard and the tests followed the format specified in the syllabus.

Comments on individual sections

Section 1 Presentation

Candidates gave well-organised, lively presentations on their chosen topics and included many relevant factual points. Nearly all candidates attained an outstanding degree of accuracy in their pronunciation.

Section 2 Topic conversation

Candidates responded well to input from the Examiner and generally gave answers that were fully relevant to the questions asked. They also showed a sound understanding of grammatical and idiomatic usage. Occasionally, the use of some expressions and the pronunciation of certain words bore traces of candidates' mother tongues, but in most cases this did not impair communication. On the whole, candidates showed they had a very good feeling for Afrikaans and that they were able to elaborate and express their point of view on their chosen topic.

Section 3 General conversation

Several subjects were covered in this part of the test and most candidates were able to express themselves naturally and spontaneously.

Although this unprepared part of the test is typically the most challenging, most candidates were confident and gave relevant explanations and answers to questions without much hesitation. The Examiners prompted the candidates where appropriate and asked relevant questions which often led to interesting discussions.



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. Marks for this question varied widely. In **Question 2** candidates were required to rewrite a given sentence in a different format; some candidates struggled with this task, often changing the meaning of the original sentence in the process of rewriting.

In the two comprehension sections, candidates generally performed better in **Question 4** than **Question 3**. There were a fair number of outstanding marks for both questions.

In **Question 5(a)**, candidates who read the question properly achieved average to good marks. Most candidates scored at least 3-4 marks in **5(b)**, but many lost a mark by not referring to the South African context, as the question required.

For **Questions 3, 4** and **5**, some candidates used text directly copied from the original articles in their final answers. Although this does mean that they occasionally identified the correct information within the repeated paragraph, they cannot realistically expect to gain many marks for language usage when the exercise requires them to 'answer in your own words'. This was especially the case in **Question 5** where, due to the total of 10 marks given for content in **Question 5(a)**, the loss of language marks was all the more noticeable.

Overall, weaker candidates performed better than in the previous year, and stronger candidates slightly less well. As previously suggested, further attention should be given to: (a) candidates' understanding of Afrikaans idiom (imagery being a vibrant aspect of the language), (b) correct sentence construction and application of grammar, and (c) making sure candidates understand what is expected from each question by reading very carefully. Candidates should be encouraged to answer in their own words as much as possible in order to maximise their chance of being awarded good marks for language; answering in their own words also provides the Examiners with an opportunity to consider positively their interpretation of the text and question.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Many candidates scored between 3 and 5 marks in total for this question. Candidates are reminded that this type of question requires a single-word answer. A very small number of candidates ignored this question completely, or only answered the question partially, choosing to focus on the comprehension and essay questions instead, thus losing valuable and relatively easy-to-score marks. Conversely, a handful of candidates wrote their own, often detailed definitions to the words given, thereby wasting valuable time.

- (a) The vast majority of candidates correctly identified *kriminele*.
- (b) A reasonable percentage of candidates answered this question correctly.
- (c) The vast majority of candidates answered this question correctly.
- (d) A reasonable percentage of candidates answered this correctly.



- (e) A large proportion of candidates correctly identified *toentertydse*, although there was a tendency among weaker candidates to choose *argeoloë*.

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 fairly large number appeared to pay very little attention to the meaning of the resultant sentences. Sentences were occasionally merely transposed from the question paper to the answer sheet.

- (a) This question was answered reasonably well by most candidates.
- (b) Some candidates, in rewriting, indicated that the children had physical disabilities with their hands, misinterpreting *wat hul hande nie daarvan kan weerhou nie*.
- (c) A wide variety of reasonable interpretations of *ordentelike* was accepted, resulting in most candidates receiving a mark here.
- (d) Weaker candidates struggled with their grammar and often failed to grasp the concept expressed, or transposed the sentence without changes.
- (e) Most candidates scored a mark for this question. Some candidates lost the mark by implying that the individual was separating himself from the world on purpose/as a personal choice.

Question 3

Although a fair number of candidates scored exceedingly well, some candidates struggled with this question. A small number of candidates answered every question in this section with direct quotations from the text instead of using their own words.

- (a) There was a clear division between the stronger and weaker candidates, where the former explained the word succinctly, while the latter often suggested that a *meeloper* was an actual person. Although a number of candidates across the range suggested that graffiti as *meeloper* was something which was the first step towards a criminal lifestyle, this was not accepted as a correct answer; the candidate had to show an understanding that it was concurrent with or an indicator of a criminal lifestyle.
- (b) For (i), most candidates identified the saying correctly. Confusingly however, and for no reason that the Examiners could establish, a surprising number of candidates transposed the saying in *paragraph 1 of Text 2*, rather than identifying the saying from the text in question. **Question (ii)** posed more problems for weaker candidates due to their not understanding the word *dwaas*.
- (c) Most candidates scored two marks here.
- (d) Many candidates failed to achieve the mark.
- (e) Only a few candidates had problems with answering this question, most gaining at least one mark of the two available, and the majority achieving both.
- (f) There was an equal split between candidates who answered this question excellently and those who failed to explain the meaning adequately.
- (g) There was an array of possible answers available from which to choose and many candidates were awarded full marks. Thus candidates did very well overall, with weaker candidates able to boost their totals substantially if they attempted this question.



Section B

Question 4

As mentioned above, candidates generally did better in this comprehension exercise than **Question 3**.

- (a) Most candidates achieved both marks available.
- (b) Many candidates were awarded both marks, and a majority one mark.
- (c) Weaker candidates struggled with this question, with a large percentage suggesting *slagspreuk*, indicating that they did not understand the meaning of this word in itself. Some candidates misread the question and incorrectly identified the humour intended by the graffiti-artists themselves rather than that implied by the author of the article.
- (d) This question allowed for wide-ranging answers, so that most candidates achieved at least one of the two marks available. Second-language speakers often did not know the saying, and a minority of these wrote fairly convoluted answers involving references to horse-riding during the Anglo-Boer war.
- (e) This question was answered poorly by a fairly large number of candidates. That said, a few candidates, regardless of language ability, interpreted and answered the question superbly.
- (f) Most candidates achieved both marks here, although weaker candidates had severe problems with grammatical structure when paraphrasing or roughly transcribing from the text, often changing the meaning of the sentences to say the opposite, thereby losing the mark.
- (g) While many candidates gained one mark here, a fair number neglected to address the question fully, losing sight of the requirement that *two* reasons be provided.
- (h) Although a substantial minority of candidates repeated the text verbatim, the vast majority who answered this question were awarded at least one mark, and many gained both.

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. As in previous years, there was a high incidence in some Centres of candidates copying large amounts of text exactly from the given comprehension pieces for both **Questions 5 (a)** and **(b)**. Candidates were unlikely to score high on content *or* language by doing this, and, as the second question calls for a completely personal response, most candidates who took this approach gained a mark of zero for **(b)**. Of the small number of candidates who did not finish this question, most ignored **(a)** rather than **(b)**. Some candidates also lost valuable marks by providing lists of points rather than the discussion asked for in the question.

- (a) Candidates usually achieved good marks for this question when they attempted it, and a number of candidates summarised the agreements between the texts exceptionally well. Examiners accepted answers where candidates did not provide a direct comparison and focused on each text separately, as long as there was an indication that they identified the overlapping issues. However, marks were lost where candidates repeated their answers from **Question 3(g)** without additional elaboration or referencing. A small minority of candidates misread the question and provided an answer detailing points on which the two authors disagreed.
- (b) Candidates generally scored well on their personal responses, gaining an average of 3 or 4 marks for this question. Good-quality answers provided a very personal statement with references to a number of possible areas related to the topic in hand, including art, culture(s), politics, freedom of expression, different types of media, crime, and conflicting ideas from different generations. Some candidates included very up-to-date and relevant commentary about the potential influence of graffiti during the Soccer World Cup in 2010. As the question expressly asked for their opinion on the role of graffiti in modern South Africa, candidates were expected to make at least some reference to the country and/or its people, and it is felt that too many neglected to do this as a result of their not reading the question carefully.

AFRIKAANS LANGUAGE

Paper 8679/03

Essay

General comments

Most candidates displayed good writing skills and demonstrated the ability to argue persuasively and draw logical conclusions. In contrast to previous years, virtually all candidates wrote essays that were relevant to the topic of their choice; only a very small number of candidates wrote essays which bore little relevance to the particular essay question. Generally, candidates demonstrated an improved ability to plan and structure their essays compared to previous years. Apart from a strong indication that candidates had given the questions more thought before writing this session, it was clear that candidates were well prepared for the task, for which the teachers at the Centres ought to be commended. It is hoped that these positive developments will be carried across to future sessions.

Comments on individual questions

Question 1 *Die jeug*

Candidates answered this question well and most placed the responsibility to reduce teenage drinking primarily on the parents and the pub owners.

Question 2 *Toerisme*

The responses to this question were mostly good. Candidates gave detailed, well illustrated, lively descriptions using a wide range of vocabulary and idioms to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of tourism.

Question 3 *Besoedeling*

Candidates wrote well-structured, interesting essays, sustaining Examiners' interest with relevant factual points to support their point of view.

Question 4 *Wetenskaplike en mediese vooruitgang/ontwikkeling*

Only a very small number of candidates selected this topic. They produced interesting essays which showed flair and imagination and suggested persuasive solutions to prevent the outbreak of an epidemic in poorer countries.

Question 5 *Kos en drank*

The response to this question was, on the whole, excellent, and candidates used a wide range of vocabulary and idioms to argue their point and draw logical conclusions.

