



Course report 2025

National 5 Italian

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.

For information about the performance–talking, which is internally assessed, please refer to the 2024–25 Qualification Verification Summary Report on the [subject page](#) of our website.

We compiled the statistics in this report before we completed the 2025 appeals process.

Grade boundary and statistical information

Statistical information: update on courses

Number of resulted entries in 2024: 334

Number of resulted entries in 2025: 294

Statistical information: performance of candidates

Distribution of course awards including minimum mark to achieve each grade

Course award	Number of candidates	Percentage	Cumulative percentage	Minimum mark required
A	152	51.7	51.7	84
B	44	15.0	66.7	72
C	33	11.2	77.9	60
D	27	9.2	87.1	48
No award	38	12.9	100	Not applicable

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 or equal to 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 comprised of three texts of equal weight. There were three supported questions. The question paper covered the contexts of culture, society and employability. The contexts were engaging and relevant to candidates.

Question paper 1: Writing

The writing paper, which is always on the context of employability, required candidates to reply to a job advert for the role of a shop assistant in a supermarket. In the email, candidates were required to include the information specified in the four predictable and two unpredictable bullet points. The unpredictable bullet points were relevant to the context and allowed candidates to demonstrate their skills and knowledge in the modern language.

Question paper 2: Listening

The listening question paper was comprised of two parts: a monologue and a dialogue, and both parts included a supported question. The paper was on the context of employability. The paper was accessible to all candidates and performed as expected.

Assignment–writing

The assignment–writing performed as expected, with candidates selecting a range of topics from the three contexts of society, learning and culture.

Section 2: comments on candidate performance

Areas that candidates performed well in

Question paper 1: Reading

Text 1 (culture)

- question (b)(ii): most candidates gained the mark

Text 2 (society)

- question (a): many candidates gained the mark
- question (b)(i): most candidates gained the mark

Text 3 (employability)

- question (d): most candidates gained the mark

Question paper 1: Writing

Most candidates performed well in this paper, and some achieved full marks. Many candidates addressed the four predictable bullet points in a balanced manner and used detailed vocabulary and grammatical structures appropriate to the level. Most candidates were prepared for the two unpredictable bullet points and addressed these with varying degrees of detail and accuracy.

Question paper 2: Listening

Item 1 (monologue)

- question (b): most candidates gained the mark
- question (e): most candidates gained the mark

Item 2 (dialogue)

- question (e): most candidates gained the mark

Assignment–writing

Many candidates completed the assignment–writing with a high degree of accuracy and detailed language appropriate to the level. Most candidates submitted very good pieces of writing, and many achieved 16 marks from the 20 marks available.

Candidates covered a range of topics from each of the three contexts of society, learning and culture. Many candidates chose to write about their school or holidays.

Areas that candidates found demanding

Question paper 1: Reading

This year, there were a greater number of no responses. This suggests some candidates had difficulties with time management. There were some examples of poor expression in English and illegible handwriting.

Text 1 (culture)

- question (c)(iii): some candidates had difficulty with *non si trovano bene insieme* and did not gain the mark. There were a high number of no responses
- question (d)(i): some candidates had difficulty with identifying the verb *controllare* and did not gain the mark. There were a high number of no responses

Text 2 (society)

- question (c): some candidates had difficulty with the phrase *i rapporti umani sono essenziali per imparare bene* and did not gain the mark
- question (d)(ii): some candidates had difficulty understanding *ripassare una lezione quando vogliono* and did not include the detail ‘when they want’, and did not gain the mark
- question (d)(iii): some candidates did not include the detail required and did not gain the mark
- question (d)(iv): some candidates did not understand *con altri istituti all'estero* and did not gain the mark

Text 3 (employability)

- question (a): some candidates did not identify both numbers and did not gain the mark
- question (c): a few candidates mistranslated *corsi* as ‘races’ or ‘running’ and missed out on one of the marks

Question paper 1: Writing

Some candidates did not address the unpredictable bullet points with enough accuracy and detail and in a full and balanced manner, which prevented them from gaining the upper marks of 16 and 20. A few candidates did not complete the four predictable bullet points, which meant the email was not detailed enough to gain the upper marks of 16 and 20.

There were more no responses in this paper than in previous years. Illegible handwriting was an issue for some candidates.

Question paper 2: Listening

Listening is an area that most candidates find challenging.

Item 1 (monologue)

- question (f): some candidates were unable to identify *dodici* and did not gain the mark. Similarly, if attempting the second point *mangiare gratis quando vuoi* they did not give enough detail

Item 2 (dialogue)

- question (b) some candidates did not give enough detail to achieve both marks
- question (d): some candidates had difficulty understanding *sviluppare fiducia in me stessa* and they missed out on one of the marks

Assignment-writing

Some candidates wrote about the context of school and tended to write lists of subjects and items of clothing, and this led to language that was not detailed enough for the level.

Section 3: preparing candidates for future assessment

Question paper 1: Reading

Teacher and lecturers should ensure candidates:

- attempt all questions and leave time to check over their answers to ensure they make sense in English
- complete multiple choice questions correctly, and do not leave them blank or tick all boxes
- have a list of high frequency words and phrases in preparation for this paper
- include superlatives and adverbs to access the full range of marks available
- have legible handwriting and if not, make alternative arrangements

Question paper 1: Writing

Teacher and lecturers should ensure candidates:

- attempt all six bullet points
- when using learned material for the first four bullet points, check their spelling and ensure that basic information is accurate, for example name, age
- complete the four predictable bullet points in a full and balanced way and write a separate paragraph for each bullet point
- leave enough time to check over their work
- have legible handwriting and if not, make alternative arrangements

Question paper 2: Listening

Teacher and lecturers should ensure candidates:

- practise note-taking in the modern language or phonetic equivalents to improve their listening skills
- understand cognates in unfamiliar contexts and expressions, as these are frequently used in the listening paper
- answer in detail, and include qualifiers, which is often an area where they miss out on marks
- read all questions carefully and underline the key words so they can identify the correct information

Assignment-writing

Teachers and lecturers should ensure candidates:

- avoid writing in pencil or a gel pen
- are supported in choosing a topic that allows them to produce detailed language with a range of structures, opinions and reasons
- are discouraged from writing lists, for example school subjects, places in the town
- have a choice in the topic for their assignment. If they use a predetermined structure to complete the task it results in repetitive pieces and does not prepare them for the writing skills required at Higher level

Appendix: general commentary on grade boundaries

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

For most National Courses, we aim 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, we hold 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 our 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. We 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.

For full details of the approach, please refer to the [Awarding and Grading for National Courses Policy](#).