

# 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. The majority of candidates asked the examiners questions, and many remembered to do so without being prompted.

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 without undue hesitation. 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 topics 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 words in the text with a similar meaning to the words given in the sub-questions, and the best candidates achieved full marks for this question. In **Question 2**, candidates were required to explain succinctly the meaning of a given word by using it in a sentence. As can be seen from the notes below, some candidates answered this question well and where marks were lost it was usually because candidates did not follow the instructions given.

In the two comprehension sections, candidates generally performed marginally better on **Question 3** than **Question 4**, and there were some outstanding marks for both questions. Candidates who did less well tended to struggle with questions which tested implicit comprehension of the text and the language.

Candidates who followed the instructions did well on **Question 5**. In order to score good marks for **5(b)**, candidates needed to refer to the South African context, and those who failed to do so lost marks.

In **Questions 3, 4** and **5**, the candidates who did best followed the instruction to 'answer in your own words'. Where candidates did less well it was often because they had directly transposed large parts of the original text as their final answers and therefore could not be awarded marks for language usage. This tended to happen mostly with **Question 5(a)**.

There was an overall improvement in the performance of weaker candidates. As in previous years, Examiners would suggest that attention be given to: **(a)** candidates' understanding of the various idioms in Afrikaans, **(b)** correct sentence construction and application of grammar, and **(c)** making sure they understand what is expected from each question by reading carefully. Examiners would also encourage them to answer in their own words as much as possible in order to maximise their chances of being awarded marks for language; answering in their own words also provides the Examiners with an opportunity to consider positively the candidate's interpretation of the text and question.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A**

#### **Question 1**

Candidates scored on average between 2 and 4 marks in total for **Question 1**. An overall improvement was noted in candidates' responses to instructions in comparison to last year, with only a handful providing too many words or giving their own explanation of the words. More candidates attempted to answer all the sub-questions in **Question 1** than in previous years.

- (a) Some candidates were inclined to answer "*samelewing*" while others answered "*gebied*".
- (b) Many candidates answered this question correctly.
- (c) Many candidates answered this question correctly.
- (d) A common error was where candidates misidentified "*geen*" as the answer.
- (e) Many candidates answered this question correctly.



## Question 2

Where marks were lost it was because candidates had merely transposed the sentence in which the original word or phrase occurred, or did not adequately explain the meaning in their own words, even if they wrote sentences that were grammatically correct.

- (a) This question was answered well by most candidates.
- (b) Some candidates interpreted *voorkoms* as indicating 'the future', confusing it with *toekoms*.
- (c) Some candidates thought that *vrouemodes* were female catwalk or photo models.
- (d) Many candidates answered correctly.
- (e) Most candidates who attempted this question received a mark.

## Question 3

In general, candidates did well in this question. Candidates should be advised to answer the question in their own words; those who answered every question in this section with direct quotations from the text were limited to lower band marks for language.

- (a) For (i), most candidates correctly identified the saying. Points were awarded for (ii) as long as (i) was answered correctly and there was enough indication that candidates understood the true meaning of the saying even if they struggled somewhat with expressing it in (ii).
- (b) Most candidates scored two marks here.
- (c) Many candidates answered this question correctly. Others had misunderstood the second paragraph of the text and thought that *Jan Rap en sy maat* were fashion designers.
- (d) Many candidates were able to gain one mark by correctly identifying that men no longer needed to dress in safari-suits. Candidates should avoid directly lifting incomplete phrases from the text that do not precisely answer the question, as no credit can be given if they do so.
- (e) A few candidates mistook this question to mean how female fashion influenced male fashion.
- (f) Stronger candidates scored well on both (i) and (ii). For (i), Examiners accepted answers which suggested that modern ideas about fashion were somehow different from, rather than expressly in opposition to, older styles, as long as these answers were expressed clearly. In order to gain a mark for (ii), candidates were required to obtain the information for their answer from the sentences indicated by the question. Some candidates answered (ii) incorrectly by writing 'Ralph Lauren'.
- (g) Most candidates correctly identified the author's positive tone for (i). There was a wide selection of answers to choose from for (ii) and those who attempted the question usually gained all three marks available.

## Section B

### Question 4

Many candidates did well in this question. As with **Question 3**, some candidates copied sections of the text directly into their answers and therefore could not be awarded marks for use of language.

- (a) There was an equal split between candidates who achieved both marks and candidates who were unable to explain the saying. Some candidates suggested it meant that fashion styles change quickly, which was contextually incorrect.
- (b) Some candidates lost marks here because they re-wrote the sentence from which the quote was taken rather than answering in their own words.



- (c) Candidates generally did well in this question.
- (d) For this question, candidates were required to show they had understood the extent of the need implied by the word *broodnodig*. Some took it to mean literally to be 'in need of bread'. Others misinterpreted the term *plaaslike*, suggesting that it referred to someone from a farm. In order to gain the mark for (ii) candidates were required to rephrase all aspects of the given sentence adequately (including the notion of *bowenaal*), and the better candidates managed to do this.
- (e) A good number of candidates scored full marks.
- (f) For this question, candidates needed to read the text carefully in order to answer the question correctly, and the majority of candidates from across the ability range managed to do so.
- (g) Almost all candidates who attempted this question achieved both marks available.
- (h) Candidates also managed to score well here.

### Question 5

As in previous years, where candidates answered the questions appropriately they usually scored well, and were able to achieve good marks for the content of their answers and their language usage. Candidates should avoid copying large amounts of text word for word from the reading passages for both **Questions (a)** and **(b)**; they are unlikely to score good marks for content and language by doing so, particularly in the second question, which calls for a personal response. Candidates should also be encouraged to provide a discussion, as asked for in the question; those who simply provided a list of points lost marks.

- (a) Many candidates achieved good marks for this question, and a number of candidates summarised the agreements between the texts exceptionally well. Marks were awarded where candidates did not provide a direct comparison and focused on each text separately, as long as there was an indication that they had identified the overlapping issues. It was also important that candidates attempted some form of discussion, and those who simply provided a list of points could not be awarded high marks.
- (b) Candidates generally scored average marks for their personal response. Some weaker candidates were unsure of the meaning of the word *inheemse*, which they mistakenly interpreted as meaning 'exotic' (*uitheems*). It was very important that this question was answered with reference to South Africa, and good-quality answers provided a personal statement with references to a number of possible areas associated with the topic, which mostly included art and culture, and often included freedom of expression, intergenerational conflict, and politics. Some excellent answers referred to the recent soccer World Cup and the resultant exposure of South African fashion to the rest of the world.



# AFRIKAANS LANGUAGE

---

Paper 8679/03

Essay

## General comments

In general, candidates demonstrated good writing skills and most provided relevant essays. It was clear that many candidates had planned their work effectively.

A small number of candidates wrote essays on the broad topic heading, which limited the focus and relevance of their answers and therefore cost them potential marks.

Most candidates showed a good ability to argue persuasively, although there were some who included irrelevant ideas and used idioms that were not appropriate to the context, which detracted from the flow and the overall quality of their writing.

## Comments on individual questions

### Question 1

*Menslike verhoudings.*

*Hedendaagse tieners word tot 'n groot mate bloedgestel aan groepsdruk. Gee jou opinie.*

Many candidates answered this question well and demonstrated the ability to organise their thoughts in a logical sequence. Most explained that the responsibility rested with the teenagers themselves, but that they also needed the support of their parents and other adults to resist peer pressure.

### Question 2

*Stedelike en plattelandse lewe*

*Vind jy die ligte van die stad aanloklik of verkies jy die vars lug van die platteland?*

The responses to this question were usually good, and many candidates gave detailed, well-illustrated, and lively descriptions, using a wide range of vocabulary and idioms to compare and contrast life in the city with that in rural areas. A large number of candidates were able to articulate and elaborate on the deeper meaning of the question posed in this task. Only a few candidates interpreted the language used in the question (specifically *die ligte van die stad* and *die vars lug van die platteland*) rather too literally, and wrote essays which were limited in scope and relevance.

### Question 3

*Gesondheid en fiksheid*

*Stem jy saam dat Liggaamlike Opvoeding verpligtend moet wees op skool? Waarom?*

A number of candidates wrote interesting essays, suggesting how this subject would benefit candidates and provide solutions for a healthier lifestyle. Most candidates demonstrated the ability to manipulate the structure of their sentences by changing the word order for stylistic effect or if the grammar of the sentence demanded it. There were a number of excellent essays in which a variety of ideas were proposed to engage the interest of students who were sceptical about the importance of physical exercise rather than forcing the issue on them.



A few candidates focused mainly on people's lifestyles in general with insufficient reference to the school context, which rendered their essays only partially relevant to the topic.

#### Question 4

*Gelyke geleentede*

*Kan almal in jou land op gelyke vlak met mekaar kompeteer? Gee jou opinie.*

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

A few candidates faltered because they did not take sufficient notice of the phrase *op gelyke vlak*. It is vital that candidates read the entire question carefully before they plan and write their essays.

#### Question 5

*Die omgewing*

*Word daar genoeg gedoen om besoedeling in jou omgewing te bekamp?*

Many candidates wrote well-structured, interesting essays with relevant factual points, and gave their own response by suggesting practical solutions to the problems in their area. A number of candidates, however, did not focus on their area, and wrote about pollution in general, which had a negative impact on the assessment of the content of their essays.

