



GCSE **Polish**

8688/WH Paper 1 Writing Higher 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 more than 8600 entries this year and this is a new record of the number of students sitting this qualification. The difficulty of the paper as a whole was comparable to previous years.

The quality of work produced was generally on a good level. As expected, the paper differentiated well and students were able to score marks over a variety of questions. The quality of work seen in the overlap questions was of a higher standard than at the Foundation tier. However, it must be taken into account the difference in the number of entries, therefore drawing comparisons is less conclusive.

The variety of vocabulary, ability to use a range of tenses and more complex language was, as in previous years, at varied levels. Many students were able to share a lot of information, express and justify their opinions well. At the same time, it is worth mentioning that many answers would benefit from further justification and illustration, especially in question number 2. It seemed that students spent more time on writing detailed and interesting responses to question 1, and as a result were rushing when writing second essay, sometimes not even reaching the required length.

A number of answers written phonetically seemed to decrease, which was encouraging and pleasing.

Question 1

In question 1 students can be awarded a maximum of 10 marks for Content and 6 marks for Quality of Language. They have to choose between 1.1 and 1.2 and are required to write approximately 90 words in total. All bullet points must be covered, but there is no need for equal coverage of the bullet points. Everything that students write is read and marked, even if it is well over the recommended length.

The majority of students chose Question 1.1 (it was more than 2 times more popular than 1.2) which covered the topic of friendship. Most of the students were able to respond successfully to all of the bullet points. Nearly 75% of all students who chose this option scored eight or more marks compared to around 60% for those who chose 1.2.

Students who failed to score high marks, either omitted or misunderstood one of the bullet points or did not manage to use time frames or tenses required. Some students failed to describe their last meeting with friends, which was required in bullet 1 in question 1.1 and just stated when that meeting took place, for example *Ostatni raz widziałam Hanię wczoraj*. While it is perfectly correct in its form, it does not provide the answer to the bullet point. Similarly in bullet point 2 in question 1.1 some students chose to mention just one quality of a good friend as in *Przyjaciel powinien być szczery*. Those who did not add any further details, did not score marks in higher bands. Answers to bullet point 3 were particularly interesting and well developed. The topic of virtual friendships is particularly familiar to students and many showed their strong opinions about being careful and realistic about people they meet online.

Some students who chose Question 1.2 combined bullet points 1 and 2. For example *Wczoraj sadziłam drzewa w parku przy szkole. Moja rodzina też pomagała, moja mama uwielbia przyrodę i sama zaproponowała, abym wzięła udział w tej akcji. Moja koleżanka nie mogła iść, ale wiem, że dba o nasze cenne środowisko w inne sposoby, na przykład jeździ do szkoły skuterem*.

Many answers in this question were detailed and contained original and interesting thoughts on the prescribed topics. Students attempted to use a variety of language, eg different adjectives, particularly around expressing opinions; used a variety of structures with references to various time frames and

appropriate linking words. On the other hand, the quality of language could be higher as students lost marks for major grammar errors and frequent inaccuracies which caused delays or breaks in communication. It should be reminded that colloquialisms or vulgar expressions should not be used in the examination paper.

Question 2

For this question, there are 15 marks for Content, 12 marks for Range of Language and 5 marks for Accuracy. Students have to choose between 2.1 and 2.2 and are required to write approximately 150 words in total about two different bullet points. In order to access highest bands of marks, both bullet points must be covered, but there is no need for equal coverage of the bullet points.

Similarly to last year, the quality of answers this year was mixed. Option 2.1 focused on a topic related to a dream job and working part time, whereas option 2.2 provided an opportunity to write about applications available on mobile phones, and advantages and dangers of using mobile phones. Option 2.2 was nearly twice as popular as option 2.1. Many students were able to provide detailed responses, conveying lots of information and included justified opinions. Over 55% of those who chose 2.2 scored 12 or more marks for Content, while for question 2.1 that figure was around 45%. This is a slight improvement on last year.

Many students were able to write fluently in response to both bullet points. They wrote passionately about jobs they would like to have in the future, and how working part time could be both useful and limiting. Many recognized the value of working part time while studying, learning particular skills or raising a young family. As for the second option, it was fascinating to read students' thoughts about mobile phones. Many shared their worries about the amount of time they spend on their devices, and how they are going to or have already begun using it sparingly and in certain situations.

As in previous years, some students failed to indicate that they were stating their own opinions, but this was less evident than in previous years. Teachers and students should be reminded once again that opinions may be expressed simply, e.g. *Lubię ..., ... podoba mi się*. Any positive or negative adjective is only classed as an opinion or a justification if it is preceded by something like *Myślę, że ..., Uważam, że ..., Wydaje mi się, że ...*. Students who failed to indicate that, scored less marks.

Similarly to Question 1, it seemed that some students were under the impression that they should not be writing more than the recommended number of words thus leaving out the last bullet point or stopping in the middle of a sentence, so it is worth reiterating once again that the whole answer is read and marked.

Question 3

The translation was done very well. Around 65% of all students scored five or more marks for Conveying the key messages, and nearly 50% were awarded five or more marks for the Application of grammatical knowledge. If one of the key messages contained a minor error or errors, it was still credited for Application of grammatical knowledge. However, an accumulation of such errors had an overall effect on accuracy. There was usually a direct correlation between the two marks. There were not many issues with this question, but those most frequent are listed below.

Yesterday I finished my exams.	This was generally conveyed correctly.
In the evening my sister and I	<i>Evening</i> was often translated as <i>popołudnie</i> .
went to a vegetarian restaurant.	Again, this was done well, although <i>vegetarian</i> was sometimes not translated, but copied in its English version. Also, some students used a colloquialism <i>knajpa</i> as translation of <i>restaurant</i> and this was not accepted. <i>Wegańska</i> was not accepted either.
Tomorrow afternoon I am going to	This was generally done well, but some students rendered <i>afternoon</i> as <i>evening</i> .
a concert on the beach with friends.	This was generally conveyed correctly.
Our seats are not the best,	This was generally well done.
but I heard that	<i>As above</i> .
there will be a big screen.	<i>Screen</i> translated as <i>telewizor</i> , <i>plakat</i> or <i>tablica</i> were not accepted
From next Tuesday	<i>Tuesday</i> posed quite a challenge. It would be reasonable to think that days of the week belong to very basic knowledge in any foreign language, so this difficulty is puzzling. Some students rendered it as <i>poniedziałek</i> or <i>czwartek</i> .
I will be helping at the	This was generally well done. <i>Pracował/-a</i> was not accepted.
homeless shelter,	Many students translated it correctly, but there were some variations which were not awarded, for example <i>dom/hotel dla bezdomnych</i> .
mainly with cooking	This was done generally well, although some students struggled with <i>mainly</i> . <i>Najbardziej i najgłówniej</i> – these were most frequent erroneous renditions.
and cleaning.	Although a straightforward and relatively easy word, <i>cleaning</i> seemed to pose quite a challenge for some students, who rather creatively translated it as <i>czyszczenie</i> , <i>klinowanie</i> , <i>zmywanie</i> , <i>mopowanie</i> .

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

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