

FIRST LANGUAGE AFRIKAANS

Paper 0512/02
Reading and Directed Writing

General comments

In general, candidates performed better than in 2006. After the syllabus was revised in that year, it seems that teachers and candidates alike are now more familiar with the format of the paper and know what to expect. Unfortunately, a small group of candidates does not read the questions carefully and therefore lost out on marks unnecessarily.

In general, handwriting was legible. However, there were many candidates who did not put full stops at the end of a sentence. Candidates are reminded that this is a basic requirement which they need to address, especially when writing an exam.

It was also clear that some candidates did not read their work after finishing the paper. This could have prevented many unnecessary mistakes from occurring.

Candidates are strongly advised to leave at least one line open between their answers. This will make the answer script appear more organised and neat.

Although a small group of candidates still tend to use sms-language, its usage has diminished. Future candidates should be reminded that sms-language should not be used in an exam.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Questions 1 (a – c)

Candidates did not do quite as well as expected in these questions. This indicated that some lacked a sufficient vocabulary.

Question 1 (d)

The answer was any two of the following: *borge*, *gratis brandstof* en *koskenkers*. Not all candidates were able to write the answer in the short format required. Many candidates lifted nearly the whole paragraph in which the answers were contained in the hope that this would cover the task. Candidates are reminded that their answer should be to-the-point, as they risk losing marks if their answer does not specifically address the task.

Question 1 (e)

Most candidates answered the question correctly. However, some again did not use their own words but resorted to lifting whole sentences from the text.

Question 1 (f)

Most candidates were able to identify that Mother Teresa did *barmhartigheidswerk*, but some did not add the other bit of required information to show that people such as her do so without expecting any monetary reward.

Question 1 (g)

Most candidates answered this question correctly.

Question 2 – Letter

Although the instructions were clear, a fairly large proportion of the candidates did not understand what was required of letter they were supposed to write. Many wrote a letter to the press, instead.

The letter needed to convey:

- (a) the intention to start a particular project;
- (b) that some sponsors had been acquired
- (c) that advice was needed on how to start such a project.

Therefore, a letter should have consisted of at least three main paragraphs.

Although most candidates addressed all these issues in one way or another, many did not do so in an organised and structured way, which showed that many candidates did not plan their letter before they started to write.

The salutation (*aanhef*) was done incorrectly in some cases. A few candidates appeared unsure of how to address Bianca du Plessis. Most common mistakes were: *Mev du Plessis* or just *Bianca du Plessis*. As this was a semi-formal letter, it was acceptable to write *Beste Bianca*, even *Liewe Bianca*.

Some candidates were a bit vague on the sponsorship they had already acquired and did not mention what exactly they had already received. In a few cases, candidates had received vast sums of money from companies without knowing what they wanted to do, which seemed implausible. Candidates are reminded to write a realistic piece for this directed writing task. Some candidates, for instance, forgot to write their full name at the end or forgot to draw their letter to a proper conclusion.

Common mistakes in **Section 1** included:

honger lui, lei, kry instead of *ly*
wil 'n projeckt opstig/stig instead of *loods*
het alreeds klaar borge gekry
vrywillige mense gekry instead of *vrywilligers*
hoop tot harte instead of *hoop van harte*
goeie dade oprig
toekennings geeien, versorg, besorg instead of *ontvang*
 confusion between *toekennings* and *belewenisse*
onderhoud saam met my te hou/uitvoer instead of *te voer*
Bianca is a ware held instead of *heldin*
Jou artikel raakgelees
Vissie instead of *visie*
Om arms te help instead of *armes*
 Misapprehension of the word *barmhartigheid*

Section 2**Question 3**

The question stated: **Noem kortliks die verskille...**, but some candidates missed this crucial command word. In addition to stating differences, they supplied supporting quotations or explained at length what the differences were when they were supposed to mention them briefly in no more than 100 words. Some were only able to mention two differences before they ran out of the number of words allowed for this task. A very small group of candidates made the mistake of also mentioning similarities. Candidates are therefore again strongly reminded that they must read and analyse the question properly, before starting to write their answer.

Question 4 – Interview

A few candidates did not use the correct format. Quotation marks are not used if the entire text consists of dialogue. (They should only be used to embed dialogue in another type of text, such as a narrative.)

It became apparent that some candidates had not understood the texts on which the interview was to be based or had not read it thoroughly enough. Candidates are reminded that they need to show that they have understood both task and texts by using the information provided instead of making up facts.

There was a tendency among some candidates to spend too many words on their introduction, which meant they never quite got around to writing about the issues they were required to address.

Common mistakes in this Section included:

- Omgee vir anders* instead of *ander*
- U het toekenning besorg* instead of *ontvang*
- Plekke gestug* instead of *opgerig*
- Onderhoud doen* instead of *voer*
- Sponsors* instead of *borge*
- Sterf van Vigs* instead of *aan*
- Verstoot van die gemeenskap* instead of *deur*
- Moet mekaar lief het* instead of *hê*
- Watse* instead of *watter*
- Daai* instead of *daardie*
- Probleem wat kan opkom* instead of *ontstaan*
- Behoeftigdes* instead of *behoeftiges*
- Confusion between the use of *help* and *hulp*
- Confusion between the use of *eintlik* en *eindelik*
- Confusion between the use *wardeer* and *wardeu*
- Confusion between the use of *kleure* and *klere*
- Oorskiedkos* instead of *oorskietkos*
- Aantestel* instead of *aan te stel*

FIRST LANGUAGE AFRIKAANS

Paper 0512/03
Continuous Writing

General comments

The general performance of the candidates was good. Most candidates chose a topic they could relate to and the essays were presented in a satisfactory way.

A cause for some concern was the fact that some candidates adapted the given topic into a topic of their own. Candidates should be aware that they must stick to the topic as given on the question paper.

Candidates should also note that the essay should be between 350 and 500 words and that they will not be credited for material that exceeds the word limit. Planning is therefore of paramount importance.

Some candidates still experience basic problems with the structuring of their essay. Discursive essays, for instance, should have a short introduction, a main body consisting of several paragraphs in which the topic is discussed in detail and a short concluding paragraph.

Recommendations

1. English words should not be used in an Afrikaans essay. Instead, a sophisticated level of Afrikaans is expected at First Language level. Examples of English words or expressions used in the 2007 paper include: blockbuster, snazzie [sic], fame, bodywork, committed, perform, start, speakers, smart, killer, *die cherry op die koek*, *toe die pawpaw die fan tref*, drugs and druks [sic].
2. Candidates increasingly use sms-language and spelling. A few examples: *vidi* instead of *vir die*, *wati* instead of *wat die*, *da* instead of *daar* and *kla* instead of *klaar*. Candidates should be made aware they should only use standard language and spelling.
3. More attention should be paid to structuring an essay properly.
4. Candidates should be able to write essays of various types, i.e. descriptive, narrative and argumentative. It is therefore essential that candidates read widely in order to acquire the necessary general knowledge and writing skills that will allow them to write essays that are engaging and relevant.

Language matters

A solid grasp of grammatical rules and stylistic skills will result in candidates making fewer mistakes. Attention should be paid to the following:

- the length of sentences
- the structure of complex sentences
- avoiding incomplete sentences
- using appropriate and sophisticated vocabulary
- avoiding slang
- avoiding clichés (*aan die einde van die dag*, *basies*, *die wêreld daar buite*)

The following general linguistic mistakes should not occur at First Language level:

- not using the *die dubbele ontkenning*
- *mees belangrikste, mees interessantste, meer gevaarliker*
- *daai* instead of *daardie*
- sentences repeatedly starting with conjunctions: *En ... Maar ... Want*
- incorrect use of relative pronouns as in: *Dit is die wedstryd wat ek van praat* instead of *waarvan*. Also in this regard, *watse* should not be used in an essay.
- confusion between the use of *dis* and *dus*
- *meeste* instead of *die meeste*
- *klomp* instead of *'n klomp*
- *mens* instead of *'n mens*
- *daar is vir die motorfiets gebetaal, toe ek geverjaar het*. Remember: when the verb already starts with *be-*, *ge-*, *her-*, *ver-* or *ont-* it does not receive the prefix *ge-*. In other words: *Pa het vir die motorfiets betaal, Toe ek verjaar het, Ek kon hom glad nie onthou nie*.

Comments on individual questions

1 *Almal praat oor...*

This topic was fairly popular and most candidates wrote interesting essays. Some candidates, however, rewrote the topic and therefore did not stick to the task.

2 *Filmster – 'n droomberoep.*

This topic was popular and candidates wrote average to excellent essays.

3 *Die wenmotief haal pret uit sport. Bespreek.*

This topic was very popular and where this field of study appeared to have been discussed in depth at Centres, excellent essays were presented. A number of candidates, however, did not identify this as a discursive topic and wrote a narrative from personal experience which merely had a tenuous relationship with the topic.

4 *Onheilspellend pak die wolke saam ... Vertel jou eie verhaal rondom hierdie stelling.*

This topic was not so popular, but those candidates who did choose it mostly did well.

5 *So kan ons misdaad hokslaam.*

This topic was not very popular. There was a tendency among some candidates only to provide information on crime, without offering any solutions, which was, after all, the essence of the topic.

6 *Laat waai en... koebaai meraai. Motorfiets – 'n nuttigheid, luuksheid of die doodsendel?*

This was a popular topic. While most candidates did well by giving the pros and cons of certain issues, it was also important to move towards, and ultimately arrive at, a conclusive and convincing point of view. A very few candidates were unable to provide any or very few convincing arguments in support of their opinion.

7 *Dinge wat my kwel...*

This was not a very popular topic. It was clear that some candidates did not know the meaning of the word *kwel*, a word in common use.

8 *Rook is 'n slegte gewoonte. Bespreek.*

This was by far the most popular topic. Most candidates were able to give convincing arguments for and/or against. One or two candidates changed the topic to: *Rook is nie 'n slegte gewoonte. Bespreek.* Candidates are reminded that they are not allowed to change the title. Instead, the candidates should have taken an opposing point of view to the existing topic, which would have been perfectly valid under the meaning of the command word *bespreek*.

9 *Gebruik die volgende as slotwoorde van 'n vertelling: Dit noem ek nou 'n gelukkige einde. Voorsien jou opstel van 'n titel.*

This topic was not very popular. Some candidates were able to tell the most wonderful stories and marks varied from average to excellent.