



Course Report 2015

Subject	Urdu
Level	National 5

The statistics used in this report have been compiled before the completion of any Post Results Services.

This report provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers, lecturers and assessors in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It 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 and marking instructions for the examination.

Section 1: Comments on the Assessment

Component 1: Question Paper

Listening

- ◆ 20 marks in total
- ◆ 8 marks for the Monologue
- ◆ 12 marks for the Dialogue
- ◆ Average mark: 14.06

Reading and Writing

- ◆ Reading is worth 30 marks
- ◆ Writing is worth 20 marks
- ◆ Average mark for Reading 22.24
- ◆ Average mark for Writing is 13.99

Component 2: Performance

Component 2 is a Performance assessing Talking. It is internally devised and assessed by presenting centres, and externally verified by SQA.

Reactions to the examination from centres and practitioners were positive, and centres and practitioners are to be congratulated on the high standard of candidate performance.

Section 2: Comments on candidate performance

Component 1: Question paper

Reading

The average test score in Reading was 22.24 out of a maximum 30. Online feedback indicated that Reading was 'as expected' and 'was of an appropriate standard'.

Some candidates found the Reading paper challenging.

Listening

The average test score in Listening was 14.06 out of a maximum test score of 20. Many candidates attempted to give the appropriate level of detail.

There were couple of areas in listening paper which were demanding for candidates.

Writing

In Writing, candidates performed best in bullet points 1–4, the ‘predictable’ bullet points. Large number of candidates had difficulty with the bullet points 5 and 6, the more ‘unpredictable’ ones.

Centres are to be commended in preparing the candidates for the Writing assessment. Many responses were opened and closed appropriately. Some candidates were able to demonstrate accuracy and detail in addressing the two unpredictable bullet points.

Component 2: Performance — Talking

Most candidates had been presented at the right level in Talking and performed well. Generally speaking, candidates performed well in the talking performance. The majority of candidate performances scored ‘Satisfactory’ and above for the presentation and conversation sections. The natural element was also mainly awarded ‘Satisfactory’ and above.

Presentation section

In most cases, candidates performed more confidently in this section of the talking performance, with many well-structured and fluent performances. Generally, this section of the talking performance provided an opportunity for candidates to show control of the language.

Conversation section

In general, candidates performed well in the conversation section and were able to sustain an interaction based on the same or related topic in relation to the presentation context. Where interlocutors used a wide variety of questions in the conversation section, this often helped candidates to avoid recycling the same language and structures from their presentations into their conversations.

Section 3: Areas in which candidates performed well

Component 1: Question paper

Reading

Questions 1(a), 2(c), 3c (i), 3c (ii), and 3(e) were particularly well answered, with around 85% of candidates being able to achieve the marks for the questions.

Listening

Questions (1) (a), (1) (c), (2) (a), (2) (b), (2) (b) (ii), (2) (d) (i), were particularly well answered, with around 90% of candidates being able to achieve the marks for the questions.

It was noted by markers that some candidates had developed good skills to deal with exam questions:

- ◆ during the time given at the beginning of the exam to read through the questions, they had taken the time to underline key words in the questions
- ◆ during the listening process, they had also developed the skill of note-taking rather than attempting to write the full answer while listening

Writing

In bullet points one to four, there was evidence of a good range of vocabulary and structures, and some very complex language. Markers highlighted a good degree of accuracy and fluency in the first four bullet points.

Section 4: Areas which candidates found demanding

Component 1: Question paper

Reading

1 (d), 1 (e), 2 (a), 2 (e), 3 (a), 3 (b), 3 (d), 3 (f) were possibly demanding for some candidates.

Listening

1 (b), 1 (d), 1 (e), 2 (a) (i), 2 (c) (i), 2 (c) (ii), 2(d) (ii) were possibly demanding for some candidates.

Writing

There was evidence of good preparation for the predictable bullet points but some candidates were not able to match that standard in the two unpredictable bullet points. For a number of candidates, there was a marked difference in quality between the predictable and unpredictable bullet points.

Section 5: Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

Component 1: Question paper

Reading

It was difficult to read some candidates' handwriting. Centres should encourage students to write clearly and leave space between answers.

- ◆ Candidates should continue to be encouraged to provide detailed responses in line with the National 5 method of marking.
- ◆ Where possible, candidates should receive opportunity to read authentic Urdu texts.
- ◆ Candidates must revise all common grammatical structures and vocabulary.

Listening

Candidates should try to concentrate on first couple of questions for first hearing, then try to answer middle ones after the second hearing, and the last questions after the third hearing.

Some students did not link their answer to the question.

Markers noted evidence of highlighting key words (especially question words) during the silent time on the CD, and also evidence of note-taking during the first playing of the Urdu recording.

In 'tick box' answers, although most candidates did tick the correct boxes, it would be worthwhile to remind candidates that they will not gain the mark if more than one box is ticked. This also applies to Reading.

Writing paper

Candidates should cover all bullet points; some candidates lost marks because they missed one or two bullet points.

- ◆ Candidates should also be reminded that they must include relevant information in their responses. They should imagine that this is a genuine job application.
- ◆ Centres should spend time preparing candidates for the unpredictable bullet points. Candidates should learn how they may adapt a bank of templates/sentence structures to address the unpredictable bullet points.
- ◆ Candidates should be reminded that they must include a variety of grammatical structures and vocabulary in order to demonstrate their skills and range. Candidates should avoid repeating grammatical structures if possible.
- ◆ Candidates should be encouraged to write in sentences at all times and avoid listing/using bullet points.

Component 2: Performance — Talking

- ◆ To prepare candidates, centres should continue to refer closely to the National 5 *Modern Languages Performance: Talking General Assessment Information* document and the National 5 Modern Languages Performance: Talking Assessment Task. Both these documents should be considered in conjunction with the Productive Grammar Grid for National 5 Modern Languages.
- ◆ Centres are advised to make use of the Understanding Standards' materials available from the SQA site via their SQA Co-ordinators.
- ◆ Centres should continue to guide candidates in relation to the types of structures, phrases, vocabulary and grammar that might be used during the talking performance, and should advise candidates on detailed language. Some candidates performed with greater success, and accessed higher pegged marks, with contexts that lend themselves

more easily to using a greater variety of structures and tenses. Centres should consider this in advance of the assessment event, advising candidates accordingly.

- ◆ Some centres encouraged candidates to personalise their presentation and/or use a range of contexts or topics for the presentations (from the same centre). It is good practice to encourage this. In a few cases, the context of the conversation section elicited responses from candidates that included the same (or very similar) vocabulary and structures that had been used in the presentation.
- ◆ While centres can use a variety of methods to record candidates' performances, centres are kindly requested to verify the quality of the audio recording before submitting to SQA for external verification.
- ◆ External verification activities highlighted that in some cases where candidates' presentations were extended in length, this impacted on the candidates' ability to sustain the conversation section using detailed language. Centres are encouraged to advise candidates on the length of their proposed presentation. Conversely, some performances were shorter than the recommended duration, and this meant that in some cases candidates were unable to access the higher pegged marks.
- ◆ Finally, the interlocutor plays an important role in managing the assessment event to ensure that candidates get the most out of their talking performance. Interlocutors are encouraged to use a wide variety of open-ended questions that will allow the candidate to expand on answers. Interlocutors should also be mindful to remain flexible and to tailor the length of conversation section. For example, interlocutors can support candidates by gauging how the candidate interacts on the day of the assessment event, and can shorten or lengthen the intended duration of the conversation section as appropriate.

Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2014	42
------------------------------------	----

Number of resulted entries in 2015	49
------------------------------------	----

Statistical information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of Course awards	%	Cum. %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum Mark - 100				
A	75.5%	75.5%	37	70
B	6.1%	81.6%	3	60
C	8.2%	89.8%	4	50
D	2.0%	91.8%	1	45
No award	8.2%	-	4	-

The Course assessment functioned as intended, therefore no adjustment to grade boundaries was required.