

# 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

In order to do well in this examination, the candidates should:

- focus on the requirements of the questions, including paragraph references
- communicate answers as precisely as possible
- convey answers to comprehension questions in their own words.

## General comments

In **Question 1** candidates were required to find synonyms within a specified portion of the text to match the word provided in the question. In **Question 2** candidates were required to rewrite a particular sentence to show their ability to manipulate syntax and punctuation accurately.

The texts used in the comprehension questions (**Questions 3 and 4**) allowed for good comparative and contrastive questions. The textual content appeared to be within the interest field of the candidates who performed quite well in both questions. Some candidates made good use of the high-value questions to boost their scores. A few of the weaker candidates struggled with the vocabulary used in the questions and did not pick up on the linguistic nuances indicating a negative point of view in the first text.

Candidates who followed the instructions and planned for **Question 5 (a)** generally did very well. **Question 5 (b)** was generally well done and most candidates were able to refer fruitfully to their own opinions concerning the situation in their areas.

There were still a few candidates who resorted to copying large parts of the texts in their answers to **Questions 3, 4 and 5(a)**. Candidates should be reminded that they may only quote directly from the texts when it is specifically required in a question and that the quoted text should be presented in quotation marks.

Candidates generally achieve better marks when they attempt to answer questions in their own words. In doing so, they take the opportunity to show their ability in the target language and increase their chances of their answers attracting credit.

Examiners suggest that extra attention be given to careful reading of the questions and adopting a more formal register in answering. A number of candidates tended to rely on colloquial language and spelling, which had a negative effect on marks awarded for language.

## Comments on specific questions

### Question 1

This exercise was generally done well.

- (a) This question was well answered by most candidates.
- (b) Most candidates answered this correctly, although a few used 'gevorderste'.
- (c) A very well answered question.
- (d) Many seemed to find the answer easily.

- (e) A challenging question which most candidates nevertheless answered correctly.

### Question 2

A few weaker candidates struggled to produce some of the more complex sentence structures required in this section.

Centres are reminded that candidates need to keep the sense of the original sentence while making the required syntactical changes.

- (a) Many candidates understood that the word '*dis*' contained the verb *is* and knew its future tense version.
- (b) A number of candidates successfully changed the past tense *lydende* form into the appropriate *bedrywende* form indicated by the hidden subject (*hulle*).
- (c) This question was generally well attempted but candidates needed to use punctuation more accurately between clauses.
- (d) This question required conversion from *lydende* to *bedrywende* form by providing the subject more explicitly in '*robotte*'. Many candidates coped well with this question.
- (e) Many candidates understood what was required in this question with only very few retaining the punctuation from direct speech.

### Question 3

Candidates are advised to read the questions carefully, especially with regards to paragraph references. Answers should come from the texts and not from general knowledge.

- (a) This question was well answered as most candidates understood the words '*verlief raak*'.
- (b) Most candidates grasped the change in attitude but some were not able to recognise the fear implied by the attitude (*houding*).
- (c) A number of candidates did not grasp that the paragraph referred to emphasised the loss of job opportunities (*werksgeleenthede*).
- (d) A few candidates either did not take into account or did not understand the word '*skrikwekkende*' (paragraph 1). As a result they perceived only the positivity of a good life (paragraph 5).
- (e) Some candidates linked hippies to violence rather than to a turning away from regular norms, therefore not understanding their relevance in the text.

### Question 4

The text for this question appeared to suit the knowledge and interests of the candidates quite well.

- (a) The question was fairly well answered by those who understood the idiom used.
- (b) Many candidates understood '*gevolge van*' to refer to job losses but a few resorted to general knowledge for the reason.
- (c) A few candidates did not appear to have read the question well enough after the word '*en*' to take on board what supportive details were required.
- (d) Where candidates heeded the paragraph reference the question was well answered.
- (e) Candidates often overlooked the first part of the question but the supporting details were generally well presented where candidates stayed within the relevant paragraph.

### Question 5

- (a) The candidates coped well in their responses to this question. It is good to see that more candidates are attempting to adhere to the word limit through effective planning. The candidates are also increasingly aware that a more formal style of writing is required.

Candidates earn one mark per similarity and two marks for well-explained differences.

There were various possible answers but the Examiners were mainly concerned with candidates showing an awareness of the opinions or attitudes expressed in the texts relevant to the world of technological development, especially in relation to work opportunities.

A small number of candidates misconstrued the task. They listed incidental differences between the two texts, such as their structures, dates of publication and sources, instead of focusing on their content in relation to the question.

- (b) Candidates who understood the context in which the word *skoolverlaters* was used generally handled this question very well and expressed interesting opinions. A handful of candidates took *skoolverlaters* to mean school dropouts, although this usually did not inhibit their score too greatly.

While an answer to this question can bear a less formal style than answers to **Question 5(a)**, candidates must be wary of colloquialisms and informal spelling and syntax.

# 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, 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 besonder goeie verspreiding ten opsigte van die opdragte wat deur die kandidate gekies is. Nogtans het waarskynlik meer kandidate die opdrag oor *Generasiegaping (Opdrag 1)* beantwoord; gevolg deur *Tegnologiese vernuwing (Opdrag 4)*, *Bewaring (Opdrag 5)* en steeds met 'n beduiende verteenwoordiging: *Onderwys en opvoeding (Opdrag 3)* en *Gesondheid en welsyn (Opdrag 2)*. In die algemeen is al die opdragte goed hanteer, maar daar was vanjaar meer kandidate 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 4** (*Tegnologiese vernuwing*) wat kandidate laat struikel het aangesien hulle bloot oor die nuwe tegnologie geskryf het sonder inagneming van die slimfoon as 'beste vriend' wat sentraal staan in die opdrag. Aansluitend hiertoe is **Opdrag 2** (*Gesondheid en welsyn*) waar kandidate oor 'n gesonde leefstyl geskryf het sonder om die kwessie van 'verantwoordelikheid (neem) vir eie fisieke en gesondheid' aan te spreek. Gevolglik het dié opstelle die indruk gewek van 'n vooraf bereide skryfstuk en min punte gekry ten opsigte van inhoud.

In 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 slotparagraawe te bespeur. Iets wat wel problematies is, is die beduidende aantal opstelle wat nié vooraf beplan en skematies uiteengesit is nie. Die gevolg was 'n ongestruktureerde opstel waarin dieselfde gedagtes en beskouings dikwels herhaal is.

## Kommentaar op spesifieke vrae

### Opdrag 1

'Die enigste rede vir swak verhoudings tussen tieners en hul ouers is die generasiegaping.' Stem jy saam?

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 Aantal kandidate het egter sonder die nodige beplanning en gepaardgaande besinning begin skryf. Die gevolg hiervan was 'n ongestruktureerde opstel waar bepaalde stelling nie net op lukrake wyse gemaak is nie, maar ook telkens herhaal is. Veralgemeinings het vry algemeen voorgekom sonder om die kernaspek van die stelsin – dat die generasiegaping die enigste rede is vir die swak verhouding tussen tieners en hul ouers – aan te spreek. Uiteraard sou kandidate ook kon wys op gebrekkige kommunikasie, leefstylkeuses en -omstandighede as moontlike oorsake van 'n swak verhouding tussen ouers en hul tienerkinders. 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 lukrake gedagtegang.

## Opdrag 2

'Die tieners van vandag word groot met die idee dat daar 'n pil vir elke probleem is, sonder dat hulle self verantwoordelikheid vir hulle eie fisiese en geestelike gesondheid hoef te neem.' Dink jy hierdie mening is geregverdig?

Nie baie kandidate het ten gunste van hierdie onderwerp gekies nie; nogtans het hierdie opdrag goeie opstelle tot gevolg gehad. Kandidate wat beter presteer het in die beantwoording van hierdie opdrag het buiten die voor die hand liggende kommentaar ten opsigte van 'n gesonde leefstyl ook gedui op die belang van eie verantwoordelikheid, soos deur die opdrag vereis. In enkele gevalle is laasgenoemde helaas nie voldoende aangespreek nie.

## Opdrag 3

'Die interaksie met jou onderwysers en klasmaats dra baie min by tot jou skoolopvoeding. Skole sal in die toekoms eenvoudig oorbodig raak. Tuis- en selfonderrig met behulp van die internet sal oorneem.' Deel jy dié mening?

Soos reeds genoem was hierdie opdrag die naasgunsteling onder die kandidate. Ironies genoeg was daar met die opstel van die opdrag nog geen sprake van Covid-19 en die gepaardgaande inperkingsregulasies wat vir die grootste deel van 2020 in bykans alle lande gegeld het nie. Dié toedrag van sake het aanleiding gegee daartoe dat die kandidate wel deurdagte en genuanseerde skryfstukke kon lewer in die beantwoording van dié opdrag; met inagneming van beide die voor- en nadele verbonde aan tuis- en selfonderrig. Kandidate was uiteraard in staat om vanuit eie ervaring te skryf en het daarom in die breë goeie punte behaal.

## Opdrag 4

'Om eerlik te wees, is my slimfoon my beste vriend. Dit doen amper alles vir my en met elke tegnologiese ontwikkeling kan ek net nog beter funksioneer.' In watter mate stem jy saam?

Kandidate het die vraagstelling heel goed hanteer en daar is meestal besin oor sowel die positiewe as negatiewe aspekte van tegnologiese ontwikkeling. Ongelukkig was daar wel kandidate wat ná 'n aanvanklike sterk standpuntinname hul argument nie verder oortuigend kon ontwikkel nie. Gevolglik het dit 'n negatiewe impak op die inhoudpunt gehad aangesien die skryfstuk meer oor tegnologiese ontwikkeling in die breë as die slimfoon as 'beste vriend' gehandel het.

## Opdrag 5

'Die bewaring van ons kultuur, soos ons musiek, kuns en tradisies, is belangriker as die bewaring van bedreigde diere en plante. Ons moet eerder geld daaraan bestee as aan natuurbewaringsprojekte.' Verduidelik hoekom of hoekom nie.

Hierdie opdrag wat deur 'n beduidende aantal kandidate beantwoord was, het van die beste opstelle gelewer. Ongelukkig was daar nogtans gevalle waar die kandidaat ná 'n aanvanklike sterk standpuntinname nie in staat was om die argument verder sinvol te ontwikkel nie. Herhalings en lukrake segging het vry algemeen voorgekom.