Course report 2022

Subject	Urdu
Level	National 5

This report provides information on candidates' performance. Teachers, lecturers and assessors may find it useful when preparing candidates for future assessment. The report is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding. It would be helpful to read this report in conjunction with the published assessment documents and marking instructions.

The statistics used in this report have been compiled before the completion of any appeals.

Grade boundary and statistical information

Statistical information: update on courses

Number of resulted entries in 2022	70

Statistical information: performance of candidates

Distribution of course awards including grade boundaries

A	Percentage	[c]	Cumulative percentage	[c]	Number of candidates	55	Minimum mark required	80
B	Percentage	[c]	Cumulative percentage	[c]	Number of candidates	10	Minimum mark required	67
C	Percentage	[c]	Cumulative percentage	[c]	Number of candidates	0	Minimum mark required	55
D	Percentage	[c]	Cumulative percentage	[c]	Number of candidates	0	Minimum mark required	42
No award	Percentage	[c]	Cumulative percentage	N/A	Number of candidates	[c]	Minimum mark required	N/A

All figures are rounded to the nearest five. Figures between one and four inclusive have been suppressed to protect against the risk of disclosure of personal information. All percentage figures for a course have been suppressed where values between one and four inclusive have been suppressed. Cells containing suppressed figures are marked up with the shorthand [c].

You can read the general commentary on grade boundaries in appendix 1 of this report.

In this report:

♦ 'most' means greater than 70%
♦ 'many' means 50% to 69%
♦ 'some' means 25% to 49%
♦ 'a few' means less than 25%

You can find more statistical reports on the statistics page of SQA's website.

Section 1: comments on the assessment

The question papers largely performed as expected. Feedback indicated they were positively received by centres and were fair and accessible for candidates. Most candidates understood what was required. However, given the disruption over the last two years, it was clear from candidate responses' that the lack of face to face learning and teaching, and the opportunity to regularly practise Urdu had impacted on their exam technique and the development of language skills. This was taken into account when setting the grade boundaries.

Question paper 1: Reading

The question paper consisted of three Urdu texts in the context of learning, employability and society.

Overall, the paper was of accessible and in line with national standards.

Question paper 1: Writing

This year candidates were asked to apply for a job in a cash and carry (food warehouse). Some candidates missed the last two unpredictable bullet points, which meant they were unable to access full marks.

Overall, the paper was accessible for all candidates and in line with national standards.

Question paper 2: Listening

Candidates listen to Urdu recordings and then answer questions in English. The context of the listening paper was culture.

Overall, the paper was judged to be slightly more demanding than expected. This was taken into account when setting the grade boundaries.

Assignment–writing

This requirement to complete the assignment–writing was removed for session 2021–22.

Performance–talking

The approach to the assessment, and the assessment judgement used by centres, was valid and accepted at National 5 level. All centres verified in round 2 used the SQA guidelines for the internally assessed component of course assessment: National 5 Modern Languages performance–talking assessment task.

The quality of the performances sampled was high. Candidates chose their topic well in many performances, allowing them to use a range of structures, vocabulary and tenses appropriate to the level.

Many presentations were well-organised with relevant content. Candidates were more accurate in this section, although some performances were too short.

Most centres provided proof of internal verifications, which was helpful to verify the performances.

Section 2: comments on candidate performance

Areas that candidates performed well in

Many candidates performed well in the National 5 question papers.

Question paper 1: Reading

Candidates answered questions 1(b)(ii) and (e), 2(d) and (e) and 3(e) well. Most candidates were able to relate to these questions and understand how to respond.

Candidates were able to relate to the questions and provide good answers related to their own life.

Question paper 1: Writing

Candidates who wrote a full detailed essay were able to access the full range of marks, whereas candidates who missed bullet points did not gain the available marks.

Question paper 2: Listening

Candidates listen to Urdu recordings and answer questions in English. The context of the listening paper was provided in advance, which provided some assistance to candidates.

Performance–talking

The overall standard of candidate performance sampled was high. Candidates gave very informative presentations on their chosen topics, and performed to a high standard in terms of content, accuracy and language resource.

Most of the performances selected for verification covered at least two contexts. Candidates were able to understand questions and respond accordingly.

Areas that candidates found demanding

Question paper 1: Reading

A few candidates did not write full answers and sometimes their writing was difficult to read. Questions 1(a), 2(b) and 3(c) were not answered as expected.

Some candidates did not write full answers for question 1(a) (why Adam decided to study in Islamabad) with some missing the fact that it was an exchange visit. For question 3(c) (school activities) some candidates again did not write full answers.

Question paper 1: Writing

Some candidates missed one or two bullet points. There was an increase in candidates' spelling and grammar mistakes this year and at times their Urdu handwriting was difficult to read.

Question paper 2: Listening

Question 2(c): candidates did not respond fully about what they saw when they visited a museum. The answer was 'plates and/or pots with pictures on them', but some candidates wrote 'picture of plates and/or pots'. The second answer was 'clothes of fashion in old times or during old times' and again candidates did not give the full answer.

Question 2(d): candidates did not know the correct vocabulary for floods (this Urdu word sounds similar to another Urdu word) or did not give full details.

Performance–talking

There were several grammar errors and some performances lacked depth and complex language appropriate to the level. Some candidates appeared to repeat themselves to gain time.

Most of the performances were within the required time limit, while some performances were too short.

Section 3: preparing candidates for future assessment

Teachers and lecturers should ensure candidates:

♦ know how to write full and complete answers to all questions rather than just a few words
♦ practise exam techniques throughout the course to help them respond effectively to the question papers

Question paper 1: Reading

Teachers and lecturers should ensure candidates:

♦ try to answer all questions
♦ frequently practise translating from Urdu to English in class so that they can access the full range of marks

Question paper 1: Writing

Teachers and lecturers should ensure candidates:

♦ practise Urdu writing in class: sometimes it was difficult to read their Urdu handwriting

Question paper 2: Listening

Teachers and lecturers should ensure candidates:

♦ make notes during the first listen of the recording and then start writing full answers after listening for the second time
♦ review all the answers after listening to the recording a third time and adjust answers if required

Performance–talking

Teachers and lecturers should ensure candidates:

♦ choose two different topics from two different themes: one for the presentation and a second topic for the follow-on discussion

Appendix 1: general commentary on grade boundaries

SQA's main aim when setting grade boundaries is to be fair to candidates across all subjects and levels and maintain comparable standards across the years, even as arrangements evolve and change.

For most National Courses, SQA aims to set examinations and other external assessments and create marking instructions that allow:

♦ a competent candidate to score a minimum of 50% of the available marks (the notional grade C boundary)
♦ a well-prepared, very competent candidate to score at least 70% of the available marks (the notional grade A boundary)

It is very challenging to get the standard on target every year, in every subject at every level. Therefore, SQA holds a grade boundary meeting for each course to bring together all the information available (statistical and qualitative) and to make final decisions on grade boundaries based on this information. Members of SQA's Executive Management Team normally chair these meetings.

Principal assessors utilise their subject expertise to evaluate the performance of the assessment and propose suitable grade boundaries based on the full range of evidence. SQA can adjust the grade boundaries as a result of the discussion at these meetings. This allows the pass rate to be unaffected in circumstances where there is evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been more, or less, difficult than usual.

♦ The grade boundaries can be adjusted downwards if there is evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been more difficult than usual.
♦ The grade boundaries can be adjusted upwards if there is evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been less difficult than usual.
♦ Where levels of difficulty are comparable to previous years, similar grade boundaries are maintained.

Grade boundaries from question papers in the same subject at the same level tend to be marginally different year on year. This is because the specific questions, and the mix of questions, are different and this has an impact on candidate performance.

This year, a package of support measures including assessment modifications and revision support, was introduced to support candidates as they returned to formal national exams and other forms of external assessment. This was designed to address the ongoing disruption to learning and teaching that young people have experienced as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, SQA adopted a more generous approach to grading for National 5, Higher and Advanced Higher courses than it would do in a normal exam year, to help ensure fairness for candidates while maintaining standards. This is in recognition of the fact that those preparing for and sitting exams have done so in very different circumstances from those who sat exams in 2019.

The key difference this year is that decisions about where the grade boundaries have been set have also been influenced, where necessary and where appropriate, by the unique circumstances in 2022. On a course-by-course basis, SQA has determined grade boundaries in a way that is fair to candidates, taking into account how the assessment (exams and coursework) has functioned and the impact of assessment modifications and revision support.

The grade boundaries used in 2022 relate to the specific experience of this year's cohort and should not be used by centres if these assessments are used in the future for exam preparation.

For full details of the approach please refer to the National Qualifications 2022 Awarding — Methodology Report.