

AFRIKAANS LANGUAGE

Paper 8679/01
Speaking

Key messages

To do well in this examination candidates should:

- engage in natural and spontaneous discussions
- use a wide range of syntax and vocabulary correctly
- take the lead in the conversations.

General comments

- Most Examiners put their candidates at ease from the outset with general comments and appropriate questions, often leading to good responses.
- Most chosen topics were sufficiently engaging, appropriately aligned with the suggested topics in the syllabus and closely suited to the candidate's interests and ability.
- A small number of topics were too easy for an examination at this level. This invariably inhibited the candidates affected as well as their scores.
- The conversations resulting from the topics were usually appropriately guided.
- The recordings were mostly of a good quality.

Comments on specific issues

- Examiners should help candidates (and Cambridge Moderators) by clearly announcing the transition from the topic conversation to the general conversation.
- Examiners and candidates must keep within the specific timings for each section as stipulated in the syllabus.
- Topics should correlate with the broad topic areas given in the syllabus and be relevant to the countries where Afrikaans is widely spoken (i.e. Namibia and/or South Africa).
- To obtain full marks in any section (e.g. for accuracy) candidate responses should contain only few errors and be of an appropriate register.
- Examiners could improve the recording quality (and the conduct of their examinations) by ensuring microphones are positioned near the candidate and ensuring outside noises are kept to an absolute minimum. In a small number of cases the intrusion of sounds from outside the examination room was significant and disruptive.

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
- communicate the answers to comprehension questions as clearly, precisely and concisely as possible in their own words
- proofread answers carefully.

General comments

In **Question 1** candidates were required to find synonyms within specific portions 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 mainly from candidates not understanding the vocabulary used in the sentences and/or limitations of grammar at an advanced level.

Questions 3 and 4

The comparative and contrastive questions produced some fairly good answers. Some of the weaker responses showed signs of struggle with the more advanced vocabulary used in the questions.

Some candidates copied large parts of the texts as their answer, with little or no attempt to tailor the response to the question in their own words. In a few instances this resulted in answers that made little to no sense. Candidates should only quote directly from the text when instructed to do so in the question using quotation marks.

Candidates who used their own words in response to **Questions 5 (a) and 5 (b)** generally scored reasonable marks. Many candidates expressed their own opinions clearly and sincerely in answer to **Question 5(b)**.

Examiners suggest that extra attention be given to:

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

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Candidates needed to find correct synonyms within a specified part of the text. The synonyms had to be written down accurately.

- (a) Some candidates provided '*verstand*' (noun) instead of the required verb '*verstaan*'.

- (b) Some struggled to find the correct word '*verstand*', often providing '*kennis*' (line 5) instead, which did not match '*intellek*' in this context.
- (c) Generally well answered by the candidates.
- (d) Very well answered by most of the candidates.
- (e) Many candidates incorrectly used '*verbeter*'; this did not fit '*sterker*' in this context.

Question 2

Some weaker scripts used the passive voice in answer to all questions in this exercise.

- (a) Some candidates did not provide the passive voice in the past tense required.
- (b) Most candidates managed to provide the infinitive form. Writing '*aan te leer*' with minimal spacing or as one word was accepted as a minor spelling mistake, giving candidates the benefit of the doubt for knowing the correct infinitive form.
- (c) Most candidates coped well with rewriting the sentence in the active voice.
- (d) This required reconstructing in the past tense. Many candidates struggled, however, often resorting to the passive voice.
- (e) Many handled the transformation from direct into indirect speech very well.

The verb *sal* had to be included in the reconstruction; using *kan* and *gaan* did not quite work in the context. There were fewer instances of candidates merely removing the quotation marks than in previous years.

Question 3

Candidates are advised to read the questions carefully, especially with reference to specified paragraphs. Some answers may appear to overlap, but, by consulting the correct paragraphs, different aspects of content become clearer.

Answers should always be based on the text and not on general knowledge.

- (a) This question was generally answered well if the candidate understood the meaning of '*gevolge*'.
- (b) Most candidates coped well by selecting and using the relevant words within their own sentences. Weaker responses copied the last five lines of the paragraph referred to and scored no marks.
- (c) This question was well answered by candidates who understood the nuances of the text.
- (d) This question was answered reasonably well by most candidates, provided they understood the meaning of '*riglyne*'.
- (e) This question required an explanation of the metaphor used in the final paragraph and an understanding of how it related to the content of the text as a whole. There were many comprehensive answers in some stronger scripts but weaker responses struggled to express a synoptic understanding of the text.

Question 4

As in the previous exercise, some candidates rarely used their own words and struggled to convey their understanding of the text adequately.

- (a) Generally answered very well. Most candidates understood a two-part answer was required as signalled by the words '*en ook*'.

- (b) This question required a certain amount of discernment of the writer's beliefs/feelings about multilingualism and the correlation with the father's experiences and manipulation of language to convey the candidate's meaning. This proved challenging in the case of small number of weaker scripts.
- (c) Candidates coped well with this question, provided they took on board that a two-part answer indicated by 'en' was required.
- (d) Many candidates understood the meaning of 'toekomsdroom' but could not always relate it to the whole passage.
- (e) This question was reasonably well answered by candidates who used their own words to explain Nelson Mandela's views in relation to the main thrust of the text. Weaker answers were restricted to citing Nelson Mandela without attempting to explain their meaning in the context in which the author quoted him.

Question 5

The language mark for this exercise covers both **Question 5(a)** and **Question 5(b)**, therefore candidates who used their own words in both questions tended to benefit more than those who did not.

- (a) Candidates who used the blank pages to plan and prepare their thoughts appeared to fare better with finding the relevant similarities and differences between the two texts. This often resulted in well-explained and well-structured responses with little, if any, repetitiveness.

Relevant similarities earned one mark each, while well-explained relevant differences earn two marks. Candidates should avoid tagging on phrases like '*maar nie in die ander teks nie*' as this is insufficient for a well-explained difference between two texts.

A few weak responses offered differences that were irrelevant to the question by, for instance, referring to dates, sources and the number of paragraphs or lines used.

Candidates who used their own words, no matter how simple, almost invariably achieved better marks than those who copied large (often irrelevant) sections from the source texts.

- (b) Candidates who understood that the question related to high school learners, not the government or the educational system in general, usually handled the question well, including by offering some sound suggestions for promoting multilingualism.

AFRIKAANS LANGUAGE

Paper 8679/03
Essay

Kernboodskappe

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 of 'n argument sinvol te voer nie, terwyl kandidate met 'n beter 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.

Sommige kandidate het gesukkel met ongrammatikale sinskonstruksies, gebrek aan woordeskat (met gepaardgaande gebruik van Engelse woorde) en lukrake gedagtegang, asook die herhaling van reeds gestelde idees.

Vanjaar was daar 'n besonder goeie verspreiding ten opsigte van die opdragte wat deur die kandidate gekies is. Nogtans het waarskynlik meer kandidate die opdrag oor *Die jeug (Opdrag 1)* en *Die media (Opdrag 2)* beantwoord; gevolg deur *Vrytydsbesteding (Opdrag 4)* en *Wetenskaplike en mediese vooruitgang (Opdrag 5)* en steeds met 'n beduiende verteenwoordiging kandidate wat ten gunste van *Gelyke geleenthede (Opdrag 3)* gekies het: Oor 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 **Opdrag 5** (*Wetenskaplike en mediese vooruitgang*) wat die kandidate laat struikel het aangesien baie kandidate bloot oor tegnologiese vooruitgang geskryf het, of wanneer wel oor mediese vooruitgang geskryf is, is daar nagelaat om oor die druk wat 'n al hoe ouerwordende samelewing op die ekonomie en ekologie plaas, te besin. Aansluitend hiertoe is **Opdrag 2** (*Die media*) waar heelwat kandidate uitsluitlik oor die rol van sosiale media geskryf het sonder om die invloed van ander media, hetsy gedrukte of elektronies, in die vorming van menings en gepaardgaande invloed op gedrag aan te spreek. Gevolglik het dié opstelle die indruk gewek van 'n voorbereide skryfstuk en het derhalwe tekortgeskiet ten opsigte van inhoud.

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 die groot aantal opstelle wat nie vooraf beplan en skematies uiteengesit is nie. Die gevolg was 'n ongestruktureerde opstel waarin dieselfde gedagtes en beskouings gereeld herhaal is ten einde die vereiste woordtelling te bereik.

'n Laaste opmerking: 'n Ander (kleiner) probleem was die onvanpaste en onjuiste gebruik van idioome en/of spreekwoorde; moontlik omrede kandidate '*idiomatiese taalgebruik*' as riglyn assosieer met idioome terwyl dit inderwaarheid betrekking het op die idiolek (eie segging) van 'n bepaalde taalgroep. In hierdie opsig hou '*idiomatiese taalgebruik*' verband met woordorde, dubbele ontkenning, korrekte voorsetsels, ensovoorts. 'n Onvanpaste en onnatuurlike segging doen eerder afbreuk aan die betrokke opstel as dat dit bydrae tot die gehalte daarvan.

Kommentaar op spesifieke vrae

Opdrag 1

'Die jeug is meer gereed vir die toekoms as wat hul ouers se generasie is.' Voel jy ook so?

Soos reeds genoem: Hierdie was 'n gewilde keuse vir die kandidate. Oor die algemeen het die kandidate die opdrag goed verstaan en is die vraagstelling wel beantwoord. Ongelukkig het 'n beduidende aantal kandidate sonder die nodige beplanning en gepaardgaande besinning begin skryf. Die gevolg hiervan was 'n ongestruktureerde opstel waar bepaalde stellings nie net op lukrake wyse gemaak is nie, maar ook gereeld herhaal is. Veralgemeenings het vry algemeen voorgekom sonder om die kernaspek van die stelsin – dat die jeug beter op die toekoms voorberei is as hul ouers – aan te spreek. Interessant genoeg was dit dikwels die kandidate wat verskil het van die stelsin, wat die beter punt behaal het. Sommige kandidate wat wel met die stelling saamstem, het selde verder as die uitdagings van hedendaagse tegnologie gedink. Sekerlik is daar heelwat ander vaardighede waaroor die individu moet beskik om die eise van die toekoms te bowe te kom?

Opdrag 2

'Die media het 'n groter invloed op mense se menings en gedrag as enigiets anders' Wat is jou mening?

'n Beduidende aantal kandidate het ten gunste van hierdie onderwerp gekies, en besonder interessante werk gelewer; veral indien die kandidaat eers deeglik oor die opdrag besin het. Kandidate wat beter presteer het in die beantwoording van hierdie opdrag het buiten die voor die hand liggende sosiale media ook oor ander media besin en nie net op die vorming van menings gefokus nie, maar ook op hoe die media ons gedrag beïnvloed. 'n Verdere voordeel is dat daar tans wêreldwyd heelwat voorbeelde ter illustrasie van die media se invloed op menings én gedrag is wat by die skryfstuk betrek kon word.

Opdrag 3

'Gelyke geleenthede vir almal is 'n illusie. Dit is nie moontlik om aan almal dieselfde geleenthede te bied nie.' Stem jy saam?

Hierdie opdrag was gewis een waarin die kandidate die swakste presteer het; in hoofsaak omrede hulle nie altyd heeltemal gesnap het wat met 'gelyke geleenthede' bedoel word nie. Dikwels het die opstel eerder op gelyke regte betrekking gehad as geleenthede. Ná 'n aanvanklike sterk standpuntinname was die kandidaat dikwels nie in staat om die argument verder sinvol te ontwikkel nie en gevolglik het herhalings en lukrake segging vry algemeen voorgekom.

Opdrag 4

'Wat jy in jou vrye tyd doen, wys wie jy is.' Is dit waar? Bespreek hierdie stelling.

Tot 'n groot mate is dieselfde kommentaar ten opsigte van **Opdrag 3** hier van toepassing, aangesien daar merendeels op lukrake wyse oor vrytydsbesteding geskryf is sonder om dit in verband te bring met identiteitsvorming en/of -uitdrukking. 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. Baie interessante werk is gelewer deur kandidate wat nie met die stelling saamgestem het nie aangesien die band tussen identiteit en vryetydsbesteding dan duideliker beredeneer kon word.

Opdrag 5

'Wetenskaplike en mediese vooruitgang het tot gevolg dat die mens al hoe ouer word. Dit gaan groot druk plaas op ons almal.' Is hierdie mening geregverdig?

Van die beste punte wat behaal is, is deur kandidate behaal wat ten gunste van hierdie onderwerp gekies het. Hulle kon oor die algemeen 'n sinvolle, goed gestruktureerde betoog oor die opdrag skryf. Nogtans het sommige kandidate net oor tegnologiese vooruitgang geskryf sonder om aandag te gee aan die druk wat 'n al hoe ouer wordende samelewing plaas op mediese dienste, voedselsekerheid, werkskepping, die ekonomie, ensovoorts.