

Oral component

In 2002 the performance of students ranged from good to outstanding. Thorough research was conducted by some students.

All tasks were handled well by most students. Overall, accuracy of pronunciation and level and appropriateness of vocabulary were high. Good communicative strategies were adopted by students including body-language, eye contact and expressive presentation.

Only a few students arrived with interesting visual displays which formed the basis of their presentation.

Section 1 – Conversation

In this section the overall performance of the students was very good. They were very successful in dealing with the content of a conversation on various topics. This indicated a serious approach towards Polish language, literature and history. Most students were keen to initiate topics and to complete their presentation without support from the assessors, and appeared confident. However, some students did not give full answers and this restricted their ability to deal with the content of the conversation.

Section 2 – Discussion

This year there was not a great variety of interesting and imaginative topics (only two topics: A Wajda – filmmaker and director, the Polish city Kraków). Students spoke mainly about the monuments, history and beauty of the city. Students' reports, although very short, were generally of a good standard. However, they lacked visual support material. Reports were introduced successfully and were well developed. The level of language used in this task was very high. Most students were well prepared for the discussion of their chosen topics. Students who chose the topic on Kraków were better prepared than those focusing on A Wajda.

Written component

Section 1 – Listening and responding

Part A

Students heard three short texts and one longer text and then had to answer questions on the texts in English. It was evident that general comprehension was good, but students must read and follow the instructions more carefully and convey the information more precisely.

Question 1

This question was answered quite well by 50% of the students. Those students who followed the instructions properly and gave convincing reasons scored well. Very general explanations that did not address the question adequately did not score well.

Question 2

Most students gave correct responses. Those who identified specific information and conveyed it precisely scored highly, as opposed to students who, for example, gave the reason for the cancellation of the flight as 'bad atmosphere'.

Question 3

More than half the students scored the maximum marks for this question. However, many were confused and found it hard to define and differentiate the safety features of the product from the other features and so listed them together; this resulted in lower marks.

Question 4

More than 70% of the responses scored highly. These students identified the positive and negative points of holiday accommodation, categorised them, and used phrases or sentences to convey this information. General and single-word answers generally did not convey the information adequately.

Part B

Students listened to one short and one longer text and responded to them in Polish. For many students the topic of migration appeared to be difficult, including its content and vocabulary; subsequently their ability to convey information clearly and accurately was significantly affected.

Question 5

More than 80% of the students demonstrated high-level comprehension skills and the ability to identify and convey the message in an appropriate form. A few students experienced difficulties in recognising the required details and using the correct text type.

Question 6

Students who understood this text performed quite satisfactorily. Those who compared the past and the most recent migration clearly indicated their understanding and subsequently obtained very high marks (10% of students). About 25% of the students found it hard to clearly understand the outline of the history of migration and were able to give only

general and short responses. A few responses indicated that students understood the text in general but found it hard to express this information in Polish.

In general, the standard of Polish in relation to the criterion 'convey the information accurately and appropriately' was low.

Section 2 – Reading and responding

Part A

Students were required to read two texts and respond to them in English. A high level of general comprehension of the texts was not always accompanied by sufficient skills in analysis and attention to details. Many students did not pay enough attention to the correct way of conveying information.

Question 7

More than 50% of the students proved their high capability of understanding the text and extracting relevant information. The most successful students read the questions properly and analysed the content and language of the text. Many responses, especially to (d) and (f), lacked detail.

Question 8

This question had a slightly higher number of very good marks compared with Question 7. Students who in parts (a), (b), and (c) demonstrated good skills in summarising, evaluating, and conveying information in their own words scored better than those who relied more on translation. Students who compared and contrasted both texts and presented their own opinion obtained very good marks. A number of students neglected one of the texts or summarised them instead of developing their own opinion on the subject.

Part B

Students had to read one text and respond to it in Polish. Many students did not analyse the text completely and therefore did not address all the cues in the letter. Some students found it hard to use a wide range of vocabulary and expressions on this topic.

Question 9

There were many good responses which scored well against the criterion of 'understand general aspects of a text'. Students who identified and responded to specific aspects scored very well. Most students handled the text type (informal letter) well, but frequently used lower case when writing personal pronouns (you, yours, etc.). Although there were many good responses to this question a number of students had difficulties with accuracy and variety of vocabulary related to the subject, for example:

krem przed słońce, ochroniacz oa słońca, kremy na opalana, latwo uszkodować skórę, nie zostaniesz upalony, promieniowanie ultrafioletowe są, kupalnik (strój kąpielowy).

A significant number of students experienced difficulties in using correct verb forms, especially in conditional structure.

Section 3 – Writing in Polish

(completed by interstate students)

Students had a choice of three questions. The most popular was Question 12, selected by 68% of the students then Question 11 (25%) and Question 10 (7%). Generally, students scored well against the criterion of 'relevance'; however, the 'depth of treatment' criterion could have been more successfully addressed. Although there were many good responses, linguistically it proved to be the most challenging section for many students. As in previous sections of the examination there were many grammatical and spelling mistakes. A number of students had difficulties with the spelling of double letters and soft consonants, for example:

musiś dbacz, mówiłasz, kciała, przyjeżdżaczcie, doczekacz, napiś, którzy, nie mogą dociekać się ciebie, chas (time), nic nie znachy.

Question 10

This question was answered well by most students who selected it. Those who read the question carefully and justified their choice scored well. The text type (profile) and addressing the audience (Polish Yearbook readers) were handled well.

Question 11

Most students answered this question satisfactorily. Those who fully addressed the criterion 'depth of treatment' and explored a variety of cultural activities scored well. Generally, students coped well with the text type (a magazine article); however, a few neglected to adhere to its proper structure.

Question 12

Many students who chose this topic achieved very high marks and about 70% performed well. The best responses went beyond basic daily routine activities and demonstrated the ability to reflect upon imaginary experiences leading to interesting conclusions. Answers were usually expressed effectively through correct and rich language.

A number of students scored poorly as they limited their responses to the basic activities of daily living, such as hygiene, food preparation, and completing homework. In some cases students' work showed limited control of vocabulary and sentence structures. Examples of the most common errors were:

nałączyła światło, nad kuchence nagrzać wodę, bez elektryku, oparzyłam herbatę.

Generally, students adhered to the conventions of the diary entry, and in only a few cases was the English heading *Drogi pamiętniku* used.