



GCSE
Polish

8688/WF Paper 1 Writing Foundation Tier

Report on the Examination

8688
June 2024

Version: 1.1

Further copies of this Report are available from aqa.org.uk

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

General Overview

There were over 500 entries this year, with the quality of performance varied. The ability to use a range of vocabulary, tenses and knowledge of structures was on a satisfactory level. Some students were able to express opinions, but many answers did not contain any. The poor spelling continues to be a challenge for many students, with some answers written phonetically in their entirety thus affecting the ability to communicate. This is reflected in the number of marks for the quality of language across the paper.

Question 1

Students are required to write four sentences about what is **in** the photograph. Each sentence is marked separately and is worth a maximum of two marks. Clarity of the message is the key element, the students who were most successful in this question were those who used simple language, usually with a verb like *widzę* or *jest*, followed by something they could see in the photo. This year around 62% of students managed to gain 1 or more marks for each sentence. As in previous years many answers were unintelligible or ambiguous, eg *Eden fan doctrak i pan* or *na foto špitalu yest z tywu*. Some answers had no verb or included an incorrectly conjugated verb. This caused a delay or entirely broke the communication, which meant less or a total loss of marks. Additionally, there was a number of students who wrote one word, for example *medicina* or *stetoskop*, some students left the question unanswered and some others wrote just one or two sentences.

Question 2

In this question there are 10 marks for Content and 6 marks for Quality of Language. Students are required to write approximately 40 words in total about four different bullet points. All bullet points are compulsory and must be covered, but there is no need for equal coverage of the bullets.

Many successful responses were concise and addressed all bullet points. It seems that all bullet points (*gdzie jest kemping, z kim tam jesteś, jaka jest pogoda oraz co trzeba zabrać na wakacje pod namiotem*) were understood by most of the students, but many students would benefit from developing their answers further. Some students wrote very short sentences, for example *Kemping jest na górze* which caused some ambiguity. Some students did not write about four bullet points, thus missing on the mark for Content. However, overall there was an increase in the number of students who scored eight or more marks for Content this year. The Quality of language was mixed, although comparable to last year's cohort of students scoring four or more marks.

Those who scored marks in lower bands wrote using inaccurate language (*kempuje z tatom, czeba zabrać worek do leżenia, durzo čukry, latarka, bo mogwa vigeć po čemku*) or mixed up time markers and tenses, for example *ja jest z trzy osoby, pogoda jutro padała*. Some students wrote answers to all bullet points in just a couple of sentences, including repetition and lifted language, for example *Kemping jest w górach, jest moja koleżanka, jest ciepło. Na wakacje pod namiotem trzeba zabrać ubrania*. These students, despite writing mostly accurately, lost marks due to the fact that their answers lacked variety of vocabulary and structures.

Question 3

For this question, there are 5 marks for Conveying key messages and 5 marks for Application of grammatical knowledge of language and structures. Given that the level of demand of the messages is aimed at covering Grades 1 to 5, the question continues to differentiate well. Similarly to last year, many

students found the translation challenging. However, there was a slight increase in quality of performance and over 50% of all students scored three or more marks for Conveying the message, while slightly over 40% managed to gain three or more marks for Application of grammatical knowledge and structures. As for the latter, it should be noted that many students wrote their translations phonetically, for example *ya lubje gelich szmeiszne filmy s mojim kolego* or found declension or conjugated words challenging. A number of students did not attempt to translate any or some of the sentences.

Once again, students are reminded to practise high frequency words and phrases. They should make sure they are familiar with the Vocabulary List for Foundation level.

The sentences in this question were divided into 12 key messages, and the main issues were as follows:

- *sharing videos* was often omitted or mistranslated as *dzielić videos*
- many students mistranslated *serves* as *daje*
- *delicious* was often omitted
- *vegetarian* was often misspelt as *wegetarne* or erroneously translated as *vegańskie*
- *dishes* was sometimes translated as *talerze*
- *Wednesday* was very often rendered as *wtorek, czwartek* – students continued to be challenged by this simple and basic vocabulary
- *clothes* were often rendered as *czuchy*, interestingly some students used a particular piece of clothing like *kurtki* or *spodnie* instead, and others not knowing *swoje* or *własne ubrania* phrase described it as *nosić to, co my chcemy*
- *every day* was sometimes translated as *każdy dzień*
- *breakfast* was often translated as *obiad, kolacja* or *jedzenie*
- *sick* was sometimes rendered as *uczulony*
- *school's football team* was often omitted or translated as *grupa futbolu*
- as in previous years some students attempted to translate sentences word for word with no regard for any grammar or structures in the target language which affected the intended meaning and resulted in losing marks

Question 4

For this question, there are 10 marks for Content and 6 marks for Quality of Language. Students are required to choose either question 4.1 or question 4.2 (this year they focused on friends/online friendships and environment/recycling respectively) and write approximately 90 words. All bullet points must be covered, but there is no need for equal coverage of the bullets.

Interestingly, this year both Question 4.1 and 4.2 were equally popular. The bullet points were well understood and most of the students were able to respond successfully to all of them. Many students conveyed a lot of information, including details and opinions, for example (Q4.2) *Sadziliśmy drzewa koło mojego domu w parku w Gdańsku. Kupiłam sto sadzonek i wszystko posadziliśmy w jeden dzień. Nie kosztowało nas to dużo, tylko dwieście dwadzieścia złotych, ale myślę że warto dla środowiska. Moja rodzina bardzo dba o planetę, dlatego wysłali mnie na to sadzenie. Oszczędzamy też wodę oraz światło. Moja siostra też nie wyrzuca starych zeszytów, używa te puste kartki na końcu w następnych latach. Ludziom jest trudno recyklować, bo nie wszyscy mają kosze, a niektórym się nie chce, tak myślę. Mam tego dosyć. Według mnie, jak się nic nie zmieni, nasza planeta będzie bardzo brudna i zniszczona przez nas.*

It is worth noting, that in question 4.2 some students combined information required for bullet point 1 and 2, for example *moja rodzina dba o planetę, bo sadziliśmy drzewa w parku*. Students who did not add any further details, were not able to score marks in higher bands.

Question 4.1 attracted many interesting answers. Bullet point 3 about opinions regarding meeting people online was particularly timely and topical, with many students describing passionately advantages or disadvantages of such friendships.

Students who chose Question 4.2 performed slightly better, with over 50% scoring 7 or more marks for Content and nearly 50% being awarded 4 marks or more for Quality of language. Students who attempted to use a variety of vocabulary and language, for example different adjectives, variety of structures and appropriate linking words, were able to score higher marks for quality of language. Similarly to last year, many answers contained frequent accuracy errors and were written phonetically making deciphering the message not only difficult, but sometimes not possible at all.

There were many students who counted their words and ceased writing upon reaching the recommended number of 90. In many cases it meant missing one (or more) bullet points or not being able to add another (sometimes needed) opinion or explanation. It has been in the past and it should be stressed once again that the whole student's answer is read and marked. And this includes everything over the recommended number of 90.

Concluding Remarks

The difficulty of the exam was comparable to previous years. Despite a larger cohort, it seems that the overall students' ability to write in the target language in a coherent and accurate manner continues to be a challenge for some of the students sitting the Foundation level. On the other hand there was a slight increase in percentage of students who were able to communicate clearly and effectively and express their opinions well.

Students and centres should be reminded of the need to prepare before the exam. Both Specification and the Vocabulary List should be available to everyone who is entered for this exam.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results Statistics](#) page of the AQA Website.