



CHIEF MARKER'S REPORT

SUBJECT:	SESOTHO HOME LANGUAGE P2
-----------------	---------------------------------

1. ANALYSIS OF QUESTION BY QUESTION PERFORMANCE

QUESTION 1

- 1.1 The question was an essay type of question that sought to assess the candidates' knowledge of literary devices as applied to a poem. They were required to identify literary devices in the poem extract and to further state the function of such a device in the poem. It was a choice question from the prescribed list..
- 1.2 It is relevant in that it forms the main thrust of LO 2, LO 3 and LO 4, together with AS's. Performance in this question was by and large not good.
- 1.3
- Firstly, the candidates missed the essay structure and write in the form of points that were mostly not well executed, whilst further omitting to state the function of a particular device. Most of those who attempted the question failed to give examples of relevant lines from the poem.
 - Secondly, some candidates seemed to confuse "**phetapheto ya mantswe**" and "**phetapheto ya moelelo**". The same occurred with with "phetamola" which can be roughly translated as a refrain – which differs completely from the other two in that it refers to a repetitive use of a certain poetic line which may occur either at the beginning of each stanza or at the end of every stanza. Well, there were instances where some candidates seemed to have been intensively taught/trained in the application of literary devices in general.
 - Thirdly, devices that were the same but occurring in different lines were not grouped together in line with the **structuralist** view of literary critique.
 - Lastly, some candidates failed to score marks because instead of supplying the devices they gave themes, content and lessons/morals of the poem in their responses.

QUESTION 2

- 2.1 This was a contextual poem which among others aimed to assess the candidates' knowledge of the poem type, devices used and semantics. It was a choice question from the prescribed list.
- 2.2 This is in line with LO 2, LO3 and LO 4 and their AS's. Performance in this question was not bad in that most candidates scored more than 5 out of 10 marks.
- 2.3 Some candidates were able to identify "**lebotsi**", but instead of explaining the function thereof they supplied its definition – mainly that it is a rhetorrhic question.

QUESTION 3

- 3.1 This was also a choice question from the prescribed list; it aimed to assess "**mookotaba**" (theme), "**tlotlontswe**" (vocabulary) and "**makgabane a bothothokisi**" (poetic devices).
- 3.2 The question was relevant as it sought candidates to apply critiquing techniques which form part of LO 2, LO 3 and LO 4 and their AS's. A mediocre performance was registered, although it was largely passed.
- 3.3 "**Mookotaba**" in 3.3 was mostly confused with "**molaetsa**" – thus causing them not to get full marks.
- Candidates explained "**dinatshana**" outside the context of the poem – they could not detect that it was used metaphorically (it contextually referred to the feminine gender). The question was clear and direct, but it was mostly missed.
 - Some seemed not to comprehend that "**tlohelo**" was invariably used to refer to "**kgonyetso**" in the question paper – but that did not disadvantage any learner as such.

QUESTION 4

- 4.1 The last of choice poems in the prescribed list, it aimed to assess meaning of poetic lines, identifying devices used, explaining words.
- 4.2 This did not deviate from the requirements of the NCS in that the above have reference in LO 2, LO 3 and LO 4 and their AS's. This was a popular choice and performance was good in this poem. A few 10 out of 10 were noted.
- 4.3 Quite a few candidates failed to comprehend that "**dishweshwe**" and "**dipalesa**" actually referred to the feminine gender (like "**dinatshana**" in question 3).

QUESTION 5

- 5.1 A poem from the unseen list was set. It aimed to assess the candidates' knowledge of literary critique in essay form. They had a chance to choose its contextual counterpart in question 6.
- 5.2 It was a relevant question as it was NCS compliant – its contents do refer in LO 2 and its AS's. It was not a popular choice. Most of those who chose this question were able to score 6 out of 10 marks, with very few scoring 10 out of 10.
- 5.3 More candidates could have obtained 10 out of 10 had they not had a problem with writing in the essay form. The rubric that was used clearly indicated that both the **content** and the **structure** were important, as a candidate cannot argue without writing full, structured, coherent sentences.

QUESTION 6

- 6.1 This was a contextual counterpart of question 5. It aimed to assess the same knowledge as in question 5 – albeit in contextual form. It was a choice question from the unseen list.
- 6.2 Part of LO 2 and its AS's. Appropriate for Grade 12. A more popular choice than its counterpart in question 5. Performance in this question even surpassed performance in prescribed poems.
- 6.3 Most of those who failed to score the total were those who seemed to have a problem with **paraphrasing** poetic lines **13** and **14** in the poem "**Ke Ila le wena**", as well as those who missed the "**sejura**" in line 1. Since these questions were 2 and 1 marks respectively, the average performance was 7 out of 10 marks.

QUESTION 7

- 7.1 This was the first question Section B, which aimed to assess the skill of critiquing literature with particular stress on conflict – the motorial moment, development leading to the climax in KPD Maphalla's prescribed novel, **Botsang Lebitle**. The essay organising skill was also assessed.
- 7.2 This forms part of LO 2, LO 3 and LO 4, together with the AS's found therein. This was not a popular choice; those who chose this question registered a mediocre to bad performance.
- 7.3 As in those poems where candidates were required to write essays on, the problem of the lacking of essay writing and organising skill also surfaced, thus causing even those who had facts pertaining to the question not to score good marks. Whilst the knowledge of conflict in general was good, organising arguments according to the given subheadings posed a problem for some candidates. Only about **6,5** percent of those who chose this question scored high marks.



QUESTION 8

- 8.1 This question was a contextual counterpart to question 7 – same novel. It aimed to assess the literature critiquing skill in a contextual form.
- 8.2 This was a relevant question for NCS – LO 2 (fully) and LO 3(partly) were engaged. This was a more popular choice than its essay counterpart; even candidate performance attested to the question’s popularity. Excellent performance ranged between 23 to 25 marks, the latter being the total mark.
- 8.3 However, some missed a few subquestions, such as **8.7**, which required candidates to state the time (era) of the events in the novel. Normally this refers to the time in relation to the milieu, not in relation to chronometer (watch) time or a particular point in time during the day. Most of those who missed this subquestion referred to all the other instances of time than the era of the events in the novel. All in all,

QUESTION 9

- 9.1 This was an essay choice question with similar aims with question 7 – conflict being the main thrust, set from Seema’s **Diepollo**, a novel.
- 9.2 Refer to question 7. The least popular choice that was badly performed by those candidates who wrote it.
- 9.3 See question 7.

QUESTION 10

- 10.1 Seema’s novel, **Diepollo**, was set as a contextual choice and counterpart of question 9. The question aimed to assess the literature critiquing skills in contextual form.
- 10.2 LO 2 – 4 together with all the AS’s were assessed in line with NCS. It was also not chosen by many, but most of those who chose it performed well.
- 10.3 As in Question 8, those candidates failing to score high marks were put off by about two subquestions, namely **10.7** which required information not available in the extract, thus proving that they may not have done the whole book, and **10.10** –which required them to state the beginning of **conflict** in the novel.

QUESTION 11

- 11.1 This question was an essay type set on **Mme**, a prescribed novel by NP Maake. Its main thrust was to assess the skill of conflict: beginning, development and climax.
- 11.2 It covered LO2, LO 3 and LO 4 in languages and was therefore relevant. This was the most popular choice – seemingly it is done by most schools. Performance was very excellent.
- 11.3 Whilst performance was excellent, the essay writing tenets – introduction, body and conclusion, still needed attention, thus scaling down the marks of those who lack these skills. More comments similar to these refer in question 7.

QUESTION 12

- 12.1 This was a contextual counterpart of question 11, aiming at assessing literature critiquing skills in a contextual form.
- 12.2 This was a relevant question in terms of the NCS requirements. This was also a popular choice to those who were averse to the essay type. Performance was very good in this question.
- 12.3 There were quite a few cases of 25 out of 25 marks, with near perfect cases of 23 and 24 marks. However, there were minor problems in responses such as where candidates confused characters in the novel and dramatis personae in the drama genre.

QUESTION 13

- 13.1 This was an essay type of question which sought to assess the literary critiquing skills including **milieu** and **conflict**. Seyalemoya, a collection of 6 one-act plays by R Moeketsi, was the main source of the assessment instrument. This was also the first question on the drama genre.
- 13.2 This was relevant in that it covered LO 1 – LO 4. This was not a popular choice – perhaps it is not done (chosen) by most schools (centres). Performance was mediocre to bad.
- 13.3 Whilst some candidates were able to give factual evidence with regard to this question, a key problem was that of confusing characters and story lines. This disturbed an otherwise mediocre attainment. For instance, the character, Tholang, in **Sekgobo sa Tshifanalehata** was invariably confused with Kgasiane from **Ha se boya ba ntja**.

QUESTION 14

- 14.1 This was the contextual counterpart of question 13 – same book, same editor/author. The literary critiquing skills in general were assessed.
- 14.2 This was a relevant question that was NCS-compliant. Performance matched that of other contextual questions in other contextuials, although even here problems of confusing characters was evident.
- 14.3 Performance here was much better than in its essay counterpart.

QUESTION 15

- 15.1 Haeso Mafotholeng by CJ Teleki, was the source of assessment in question 15. An essay-type of question was set to assess milieu and conflict; it was identical to the other drama book in question 13.
- 15.2 This was a relevant question covering LO 2 – LO 4. Since this is a continuous story, and not a collection of stories, performance was commendable. It was a much more popular choice than its one-act plays counterpart.
- 15.3 Deficient essay writing skills spoiled an otherwise excellent output. See comments in question 7 with regard to the type of problems noticed.

QUESTION 16

- 16.1 Same book, same author as in question 15, the only difference being that assessment here was contextual – assessing critiquing skills in general.
- 16.2 An appropriate question in line with the NCS programme. Performance here exceeded that of its question 14 counterpart, attesting to the fact that the book enjoys more acceptance than the other drama book.
- 16.3 Comments on further attainment problems compare fairly well with those in question 8 and 12 above.

2. ANY ADVICE THAT YOU COULD GIVE TO EDUCATORS TO HELP LEARNERS TO REACH THE EXPECTED LEVELS

- 7.1 For structural critiquing, educators would do well to first identify devices they would like to teach, after which they group poems with such devices together without teaching the themes of the individual poems – the content of the poems can be done as a second round of dealing with them. This can go a long way towards teaching learners to differentiate between the themes and content from the literary devices.
- 7.2 The “drill method” can still be functional as a means of drawing a line of difference with regard to literary devices that seem to be similar though not.
- 7.3 Learners need training in writing appropriate essays in literature (and indeed all essays), embodying the basic tenets thereof – introduction, body and conclusion.
- 7.4 Both the denotative and connotative meanings of words, phrases, lines and stanzas should be taught alongside of one another – to clearly differentiate between the two levels of meaning.

3. ANY OTHER COMMENTS

- It would benefit educators – and in turn the learners – if they could arrange cluster seminars early in the year to address content gaps leading to a common understanding of literature, using the prescribed works as resources. In such seminars, the more proficient educators, under the baton of subject advisors, could assist others in dealing with aspects such as “*tlhekelo, sesosa sa kgohlano, kgodiso ya kgohlano, sehlohlolo, mothipoloho*” and others as they apply to the prescribed works.
- The markers agreed that this was a balanced paper which tried to embody all the cognitive levels of assessment – including a fair spread of learning outcomes of reading and writing.
- The examiners used accessible language throughout, even attaching synonyms in some cases.