


CONTENTS

FIRST LANGUAGE AFRIKAANS	2
Paper 0512/02 Reading and Directed Writing.....	2
Paper 0512/03 Continuous Writing	5



FIRST LANGUAGE AFRIKAANS

Paper 0512/02
Reading and Directed Writing

General comments

On the whole, performance was satisfactory, but, as in most sessions, the summary and comparison questions were answered the poorest. It was clear that some candidates at a number of Centres had not been exposed to or trained to answer these types of question.

Comments on specific questions

A number of candidates tended to write overlong and, at times, clumsy sentences. These candidates should always look at the marks awarded for each question and let that guide them as to how many words they need to write. For example, if the question is out of two marks then no more than, at most, three lines should be written.

Mistakes which occurred included the following:

- the idiom “tweede viool speel” was taken literally by some
- some confused the words *biograaf* and *biografie*
- some misspelled the plural of the word *biografie*
- some wrote the pronoun *u* with of a capital letter
- some used Anglicisms, such as “rede vir die boek” instead of *inspirasie vir die boek*
- a book’s name must be in inverted commas, i.e. “Die Goue Seun”, when handwritten.

Questions 1-3

Most of the candidates answered these questions correctly.

Question 4

In order to receive both marks, the question required a “Yes” or “No” answer and then a justification with which to back it up. The answer required candidates to show they understood that it was not a book to read at leisure, but needed concentration from the reader, yet many candidates lifted the sentence describing how Krige would have read the book.

Question 5

Most of the candidates answered this question correctly, although many lifted the whole sentence in which the answer appeared, showing they were unable to write a concise answer.

Question 6

First of all, candidates had to mention the relevant period in Krige’s life (“onrust” or 1969 – 1987), and then give a reason for their choice. Many candidates resorted to lifting from the text, resulting in answers that did not make much or any sense.

Question 7

Hardly any candidate wrote their answer in their own words. Most lifted the two paragraphs in which the answer was situated in the hope that they had guessed correctly.

Question 8

The skill to be able to summarise was tested in this question, a skill in which all candidates should be trained.

In particular, this question required a summary of the content of the book, which would entice the public to read the book.

Most candidates only gave a summary of the different periods of Krige's life, which still allowed them to gain almost 10 of the available 20 marks. The mark scheme awarded 50% of the marks to content and 50% to language, style and sense of audience.

Most candidates scored average to good marks for this question.

Question 9

This was the most poorly answered question in the whole paper. The question stated that candidates should mention the difference between the two articles regarding the content and the way the authors use language. Unfortunately, most candidates made comparisons which went beyond the confines of the required types of comparison, which seemed to indicate the question had not been read properly.

Question 10

Most candidates scored good marks, but there were a number of candidates who did not know they were required to write in dialogue form. Some candidates wrote a report on the interview, rather than the interview itself. Some candidates got confused as to whom they were conducting the interview with; they were conducting the interview with Krige and not Kannemeyer, even though some used Kannemeyer's name.

Inverted commas (aanhalingstekens) should not be used when writing a dialogue, as the dialogue is not embedded in another text.

A good interview would have to mention at least some of the following points:

- any problems encountered in writing the book
- why Kannemeyer chose Krige as his subject
- why Kannemeyer chose "Die Goue Seun" as the title for his book
- what he thinks of the critics' reaction to his book
- Kannemeyer's feelings and opinions regarding Krige's life and work
- the 'journalist' must give the impression that he/she has read the book.

General linguistic mistakes

Prepositions

'n biografie *op* Krige instead of the correct **oor**

Artikel *verskil met mekaar* instead of **van**

Op so 'n mate instead of **in**

Doen dit tot die beste *van* jou vermoë instead of **na**

Skuldig *maak van* instead of **aan**

Op tye instead of **by**

Spelling mistakes

ondek instead of **ontdek**

onvang instead of **ontvang**

moelike instead of **moeilike**

gooie/goi more instead of **goeie more**

manner/menneer/miner instead of **meneer**

Vooreg instead of **voorreg**

Lei/ly instead of **lui**

Gerys instead of **gereis**

Sommer instead of **somer**

Somer instead of **sommer**

Journalis instead of **joernalis**

Fraanse instead of **Franse**

Erkening instead of **erkenning**

Bruï uit instead of **brei uit**

Skruiw 'n brief instead of **skryf 'n brief**

Verskuie instead of **verskeie**

Kla geskryf instead of **klaar geskryf**

Confusion in the use of certain words

Kritici/kritikusse/kritiek, kritiseeringe; kritisisme

Resensie, resensent, resenseer

Literatuurkunde instead of *letterkunde* of *literatuur*

'n Boek *publiseer* not *vrystel/uitsaai/toeken*

spreek uit my duim instead of *suig uit my duim*

Prepositional phrases

vergelyk met not *teenoor*

betrokke geword instead of *betrokke geraak*

steur jou daarvoor instead of **daaraan**

Punctuation

Frequent omission of commas, where one was required

Others

Na dit instead of **daarna**

Van dit instead of **daarvan**

<p>Paper 0512/03 Continuous Writing</p>

General comments

The overall performance of candidates was satisfactory, and most essays were presented well.

Most of the candidates had no problem with interpreting the various topics and they showed knowledge, insight and creativity in writing their essays.

Candidates should, however, pay attention to the following important aspects when writing the essay:

- the title should be indicated
- the topic should not be changed
- essays should be written in paragraphs
- handwriting should be neat and not in consecutive capital letters.

The following aspects also need attention:

- correct usage of language and the avoidance of slang
- variety in the length of sentences
- sentence structure
- incomplete sentences
- suitable style.

Nevertheless, the following basic linguistic and stylistic mistakes were found:

- omission of double negation
- pleonasm, such as "Die mees belangrikste aspek van bewaring"
- use of the colloquial *daai* instead of *daardie*
- sentences starting with conjunctions, such as *en* and *want*
- incorrect use of relative pronouns, e.g. "Die probleme wat die mensdom mee sukkel"
- confusion between the use of the following words: *dis/dus*; *gesin/familie*; *s'n/sin*; *meeste* instead of *die meeste*, *mens* instead of *'n mens*.

Centres should pay attention to the different styles of writing, i.e. the narrative, descriptive, imaginative and the expository essay, because it will enable the candidate to write better essays and, therefore, gain better marks.

Comments on specific questions**Question 1**

'n Sorgvrye naweek ontaard in 'n nagmerrie.

This topic was very popular. Most candidates handled it well. Marks varied from poor to very good.

Question 2

My wense vir die toekoms

This was by far the most popular topic. The majority of candidates handled it well. Only a few candidates did not know the difference between *drome* en *mense*. Marks varied from average to excellent.

Question 3

Die skeppingsopdrag is duidelik aan die mens uitgespel: Bewoon, bewerk en bewaar die aarde. Wat is dit belangrik dat ons dié opdrag moet gehoorsaam?

This was not a very popular topic. From the small number that chose this topic, some candidates lacked the necessary discursive skills to tackle the subject.

Question 4

Die wêreld is so behep met geld, mag, status, roem... Wat beskou jy egter as ware en blywende rykdom?

This was not a very popular topic. The few candidates who chose it, handled it very well. Marks varied from good to excellent.

Question 5

Is moderne tegnologie die mens se vriend of vyand?

This was a very popular topic. Most candidates handled it well and marks varied from average to very good.

Question 6

Só kan ek die lewe vir my naaste in 'n stukkie hemel verander.

This was not a very popular topic. The few candidates that chose it fairly handled it well.

Question 7

“Ons verklaar onder eed dat ons in lojale mededinging aan die Spele sal deelneem en dat dit ons voorneme is om mee te ding in die egte gees van sportmanskap tot eer van ons land en tot glorie van sport.” Dit is die Olimpiese eed wat deelnemers selfs vandag nog aflê – maar geld dié woorde werklik nog in 2004?

This was not a very popular topic. From the small number that chose this topic, some candidates lacked the necessary discursive skills to tackle the subject.

Question 8

Kersfees – en die mens van die nuwe millennium.

Not a very popular topic, but candidates handled it very well.

Question 9

Ek staan by 'n kruispad ...

This was a popular topic, but most of the candidates who chose it could not write a convincing essay. Marks varied from poor to good.

In conclusion the following examples of good, creative use of Afrikaans show evidence of the diligent work done in the language classes:

- “Geld is 'n veeleisende en gulsige god.”
- “Sukcesvolle mense is dié wat 'n fondasie lê met die klippe waarmee hul gegooi word.”
- “In 'n oorlog is daar nie wenners nie, net dié wat daarteen gekant was – en hulle het 'n verskil gemaak.”
- “Dalk is 'n kruispad nie die verdeler van 'n regte en verkeerde roete nie, maar bloot 'n keuse tussen twee ewe goeie paaie.”
- “Jy kan elke oomblik lééf, of jy kan jou lewe vir die wind gee.”
- “Die naelstring wat my agtien jaar aan die huis en twaalf jaar aan die skool gebind het, moet nou geknip word.”