



Course report 2024

National 5 Urdu

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. You should read the report with the published assessment documents and marking instructions.

We compiled the statistics in this report before we completed the 2024 appeals process.

Grade boundary and statistical information

Statistical information: update on courses

Number of resulted entries in 2023: 96

Number of resulted entries in 2024: 98

Statistical information: performance of candidates

Distribution of course awards including minimum mark to achieve each grade

A	Number of candidates	61	Percentage	62.2	Cumulative percentage	62.2	Minimum mark required	84
B	Number of candidates	17	Percentage	17.3	Cumulative percentage	79.6	Minimum mark required	72
C	Number of candidates	11	Percentage	11.2	Cumulative percentage	90.8	Minimum mark required	60
D	Number of candidates	6	Percentage	6.1	Cumulative percentage	96.9	Minimum mark required	48
No award	Number of candidates	3	Percentage	3.1	Cumulative percentage	100	Minimum mark required	N/A

We have not applied rounding to these statistics.

You can read the general commentary on grade boundaries in the appendix.

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 statistical reports on the [statistics and information](#) page of our website.

Section 1: comments on the assessment

Question paper 1: Reading

The reading paper was appropriate for A–C level candidates. Candidates could relate questions to their life and provide good responses. The paper was accessible for all candidates and the level was appropriate to National 5.

Question paper 1: Writing

Candidates read a job advertisement and write a job application in Urdu. Candidates had to apply for a job in a hotel in Pakistan.

A-type candidates always fully answer all four bullet points, whereas C-type candidates generally don't complete the last two bullet points.

The paper was accessible for all candidates and the level was appropriate to National 5.

Question paper 2: Listening

The listening paper was based on the context of employability. The paper was accessible for all candidates and the level was appropriate to National 5.

Assignment–writing

The assignment–writing was reinstated this session. Most candidates performed very well. They had prepared well and presented a range of topics. Most candidates chose assignment topics from the contexts of society and culture.

Performance–talking

Overall, the performances were very good. Many candidates selected topics that allowed them to use a range of structures, vocabulary and tenses, appropriate to the level.

Most candidates chose a second topic from a different context. Some candidates disadvantaged themselves by choosing too many topics.

Section 2: comments on candidate performance

Question paper 1: Reading

Most candidates performed well in this paper, and could relate to questions 1(a), 2(b), 3(c), (d) and (e) and understood how to respond. Some candidates did not write complete answers for questions 1(g), 2(d) and 3(d) and had difficulty with some words, for example trade, difficult, environment, friendly, open field and/or market.

Question paper 1: Writing

Most candidates performed well in this paper, and fully completed all four bullet points. Some candidates missed the last two bullet points, which are unpredictable, so were unable to gain full marks. Some candidates made spelling and grammar mistakes and, in some instances, Urdu handwriting was difficult to read.

Question paper 2: Listening

Most candidates performed well in the listening paper, and performed particularly well in questions 1(a), (c), 2(b) and (d). Some candidates found questions 1(e), 2(e), and (f) challenging and wrote incorrect or incomplete responses.

Assignment–writing

Most centres used their own stimuli for the assignment–writing task. Candidates chose to write about a topic of personal interest and performed very well by using a variety of topics.

Performance–talking

Most candidates performed very well and were able to understand and respond well to questions. In some performances, candidates took the initiative to ask questions, which showed they had good understanding of the spoken language.

Most candidates presented their topics very well. In the follow-on conversation, they chose two or more topics from different contexts. Some candidates chose three, four, or in some cases five topics, which does not allow for an in-depth conversation, as required at this level.

Section 3: preparing candidates for future assessment

Question paper 1: Reading

Teachers and lecturers should ensure candidates:

- ◆ practise writing full and complete answers to all questions
- ◆ practise exam technique throughout the course to help them respond effectively to the questions
- ◆ try to answer all questions
- ◆ practise translating from Urdu to English in class more often to help them access the full range of marks

Question paper 1: Writing

Teachers and lecturers should ensure candidates:

- ◆ practise Urdu writing in class, as it was sometimes difficult to read their Urdu writing
- ◆ practise answering all four bullet points

Question paper 2: Listening

Teachers and lecturers should ensure candidates:

- ◆ practise making notes during the first listening of the recording and then write 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

Assignment–writing

Teachers and lecturers should ensure candidates:

- ◆ are aware that the task is on the context of society, learning or culture
- ◆ know that the assignment–writing must not be the same as their job application for the writing exam
- ◆ keep to their chosen title or choose a title that reflects their work
- ◆ read the marking instructions to ensure their assignments demonstrate the correct amount of detail required. Particularly the language resource section, which asks for a range of opinions, ideas and reasons
- ◆ show the range of their ability and knowledge in the language and avoid repetition of structures, verbs and verb forms
- ◆ do not produce a discursive piece of writing at this level

Teachers and lecturers should:

- ◆ be careful not to overly rely on providing extensive scaffolding for candidates as it removes the element of personalisation and choice. Open topics, such as holidays tended to do well
- ◆ be cautious of overcorrecting candidates' work, and use SQA's writing improvement code, or their own code, when returning the draft to candidates

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 conversation
- ◆ choose topics that could allow for a conversation using detailed language
- ◆ are aware that the conversation must move on to cover a topic from a different context that they chose for the presentation
- ◆ are prepared to respond to questions in the modern language on the second context

Appendix: 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.

Every year, we evaluate the performance of our assessments in a fair way, while ensuring standards are maintained so that our qualifications remain credible. To do this, we measure evidence of candidates' knowledge and skills against the national standard.

During the pandemic, we modified National Qualifications course assessments, for example we removed elements of coursework. We kept these modifications in place until the 2022–23 session. The education community agreed that retaining the modifications for longer than this could have a detrimental impact on learning and progression to the next stage of education, employment or training. After discussions with candidates, teachers, lecturers, parents, carers and others, we returned to full course assessment for the 2023–24 session.

SQA's approach to awarding was announced in [March 2024](#) and explained that any impact on candidates completing coursework for the first time, as part of their SQA assessments, would be considered in our grading decisions and incorporated into our well-established

grading processes. This provides fairness and safeguards for candidates and helps to provide assurances across the wider education community as we return to established awarding.

Our approach to awarding is broadly aligned to other nations of the UK that have returned to normal grading arrangements.

For full details of the approach, please refer to the [National Qualifications 2024 Awarding — Methodology Report](#).