



GCSE

Polish

8688/WF Writing (Foundation)

Report on the examination

Version: 1.0
June 2025

Further copies of this report are available from aqa.org.uk

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres 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 centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

General Overview

There were just over 550 entries this year, a slight increase on the last year's number. The quality of work produced was mixed. The ability to use varied vocabulary, a range of tenses and knowledge of structures was on a satisfactory level. The poor spelling continues to be a challenge for many students, with a large number of answers written phonetically in their entirety. This was reflected in number of marks awarded for the quality of language across the paper.

Question 1

Students were required to write four sentences about what was **in** the photograph. Each sentence is marked separately and is worth a maximum of two marks. Because clarity of the message is the key element, the students who were most successful in this question were those who used simple language, usually with a verb like *widzę* or *jest*, followed by something they could see in the photo. This year around 80% of students managed to gain 1 or more marks for each sentence, which was a better result than last year. Many answers, however, were unintelligible or ambiguous, e.g. *tat szyma yayco* or *na foto ya vice łapca*. Some answers had no verb or included incorrectly conjugated verb, e.g. *tata maluję jajka*. This caused a delay which meant a loss of marks. As in previous years, there was a number of students who wrote just one word, for example *farba* or *koshik*, did not attempt the question or wrote just one or two sentences instead of four required.

Question 2

In this question students were required to write approximately 40 words about four different bullet points. All bullet points are compulsory and must be covered, but there is no need for equal coverage of the bullets. The maximum number of marks for Content and Quality of Language is 10 and 6 marks respectively. Many successful responses were concise and addressed all bullet points. It seems that all bullet points (*gdzie jest klub, z kim tam chodzisz, jakie sporty tam uprawiasz oraz jak można zapisać się do klubu*) were understood by most of the students. Many students developed their answers as required, but some students wrote very short sentences, for example *Klub jest na lewo* which caused some ambiguity. Some students did not write about four bullet points, thus missing on the mark for Content. Overall, just over 60% of all students scored seven or more marks for Content this year. The Quality of language was also mixed, with just over 50% students scoring four or more marks. Both figures were slightly lower than in previous series. Answers which scored marks in lower bands contained partial coverage of the bullet points and frequent lapses (*ja szcze zeby ty szedł ze mnom, zapitacz sie można internetczu a jak nie, zapitacz nauchichielowi, do klubu się zapisac na telephoni i aplikatyja*) or mixed up time markers and tenses, e.g. *w tym klubie grałem w piłkę jutro*. Answers which were very short and contained repetitive or lifted language, for example *Klub jest w szkole, gram w piłkę w szkole, można zapisać się w szkole*. have not been awarded many marks due to the fact that they lacked variety of vocabulary and structures.

Question 3

For this question, students could be awarded 5 marks for Conveying key messages and 5 marks for Application of grammatical knowledge of language and structures. Each series, the level of demand of the key messages is aimed at covering all available grades, ie. grades 1 to 5. As in previous years, the question differentiated well and it seemed that similarly to previous years' cohorts, many students found the translation challenging. Overall, there was a decrease in performance with just over 40% of all students scoring three or more marks for Conveying the message, while slightly over 30% managed to gain three or more marks for Application of grammatical knowledge and structures. A considerable number of students wrote their answers phonetically, for example *moyey szostry monsz yest barzo wadny, Ja krzyczy isch do juniversideta, ale yest drogi*, found conjugation and declension challenging, lacked knowledge of basic vocabulary and struggled with accuracy. Not attempting to translate a couple or more sentences was not that uncommon, either.

Once again, students are reminded to practise high frequency words and phrases and become familiar with the Vocabulary List for Foundation level.

The sentences in this question were divided into 12 key messages, and the main issues were as follows:

- *My sister's husband* was sometimes translated as *moja siostra's mąż*
- many students misspelled *mąż* as *monsz, monz, maż, moz*, to mentioned just a few
- *handsome* was often mistranslated as *ładny, wadny, śliczny, pierny*
- *always* was often omitted
- *take notes* was sometimes translated literally as *brać notatki*
- *we always have to* was very often translated as *trzeba* or *czeka* – both were accepted
- *geography* and *university* were often copied and used in English
- *last week* was often rendered as *w tamtym tygodniu* which was accepted
- *went by car* was often mistranslated as *poszła* or *poszła z samochodem*
- *main square* was very often omitted or erroneously rendered as *główny kwadrat*
- the last sentence was often translated as *ten rynek ma dużo kolorowy dom / kolorowe domy* which indicates lack of ability to use different grammatical structures

As in previous years some students attempted to translate sentences word for word with no regard for any grammar or structures in the target language. This affected the intended meaning and resulted in loss of marks.

Question 4

For this question, students were able to score maximum 10 marks for Content and 6 marks for Quality of Language. Students were required to choose either question 4.1 or question 4.2 (this year they focused on music and studies / school respectively) and write approximately 90 words in total about four different bullet points. All bullet points must be covered, but there is no need for equal coverage of the bullets.

This year both Question 4.1 was nearly twice as popular as Question 4.2. The bullet points in both questions were well understood and most of the students were able to respond

successfully to all of them. Many students conveyed a lot of information, including details and opinions, for example (Q4.1) *Ja ostatnio słuchałem muzyki kilka godzin temu. Muzyka jest ogromna częścią mojego życia i zawsze słucham muzyki jak jestem w domu albo w samochodzie. Mój ulubiony rodzaj to hip hop, bo ja uwielbiam jak artyści szybko śpiewają i jak łatwo jest się poruszać do tej muzyki. Nie bardzo lubię muzykę klasyczną, bo wogóle jej nie rozumiem. Muzyka zbliża młodych ludzi, bo jak dwa ludzie słuchają tej samej muzyki to oni raczej będą bardzo do siebie podobni i mogliby być dobrymi kolegami.* Some students seemed to have misunderstood bullet point 4 in Question 4.1 as they mentioned playing an instrument as a music event. In Question 4.2 some students shared their honest insight into why they were taking the exam and how they prepared for it; examples included listening to Polish music or podcasts, frequent calls to family in Poland or reading a book with one of the parents. There was a number of students who in bullet point three omitted the fact that there was a specific reference to homework being set online. Instead, they focused on homework in general. On the other hand, some students shared thoughtful and interesting opinions about advantages or disadvantages of learning a foreign language and using technology in education. The topic seemed to have been particularly timely with many students writing passionately about the need to put more focus on language learning as a skill for future.

Students who chose Question 4.2 performed slightly better, with over 40% scoring 7 or more marks for Content and nearly 40% being awarded 4 marks or more for Quality of language. As in other questions throughout the paper, this is slightly lower than last year. Students who attempted to use a variety of vocabulary and language, for example different adjectives, variety of structures and appropriate linking words, were able to score higher marks for quality of language. Similarly to last year, many answers contained frequent accuracy errors and were written phonetically making deciphering the message not only difficult, but sometimes not possible at all.

There were many students who counted their words and ceased writing upon reaching the recommended number of 90. In some cases, it meant missing one (or more) bullet points or not being able to add another (sometimes needed) opinion or explanation. It should be stressed once again that the whole student's answer is read and marked, even if it is far longer than required.

Concluding Remarks

The difficulty of the exam was comparable to previous years. It seems that the overall students' ability to write in the target language in a coherent and accurate manner continues to be a challenge for some of the students sitting the Foundation level. On the other hand, there was a small number of students who were able to communicate clearly and effectively and express their opinions well.

Students and centres should be reminded of the necessity to prepare before the exam. Both Specification and the Vocabulary List should be made available well in advance to everyone who has been entered for this exam.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

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