



General Certificate of Education

Panjabi 1681 *Specification*

PANJ1 Reading & Writing

Report on the Examination *2010 examination - June series*

Further copies of this Report are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

COPYRIGHT

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.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

General Comments

On the whole the paper made similar demands in comparison with the previous year's paper. This year's paper was well received by the majority of candidates. Overall the general quality of candidates' work was a little better than last year as candidates and teachers have a better understanding of the specification requirements and assessment tasks. Candidates at the upper end scored slightly better marks and comprehension texts seemed to be more interesting and accessible. In some cases, at the lower end of the ability range, the quality of language was poor and candidates copied parts of the text by matching a phrase or a part of the sentence with the vocabulary used in the questions. Some candidates could not write the complete answer as they had difficulties in understanding what the questions required of them. All questions were clear in demanding the required answers and there was no ambiguity.

The majority of candidates found the paper well within their reach and attempted every question. The answers provided by the majority of candidates were well structured and interesting and they managed to score better marks in comparison with the previous year.

Section 1

Comprehension questions

Question 1

This question was attempted by all candidates and the majority of them provided the correct answer. A few candidates at the lower end of the ability range could not provide the correct answer. The required answer was “ਪਰਵਾਸੀ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਵਿੱਚ ਪੈਸੇ ਭੇਜਦੇ ਹਨ ਤੇ ਤਰੱਕੀ ਹੁੰਦੀ ਹੈ ਜਾਂ ਜੇ ਪਰਵਾਸੀ ਪੈਸੇ ਨਾ ਭੇਜਣ ਤਾਂ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਦਾ ਵਿਕਾਸ ਰੁਕ ਜਾਵੇਗਾ।”

Question 2

The majority of candidates answered this question well and provided both key points required which were “ਦੁਆਬੇ ਦੇ ਅਤੇ ਕਿਸਾਨ ਤੇ ਕਾਰੀਗਰ ਲੋਕ”. Both points were required to get the mark. There were some candidates at the lower end of the ability range who answered only one part of this question and they were not awarded the mark.

Question 3

This question was answered well by the majority of candidates and almost all candidates who answered this correctly provided both points mentioned in the text “ਇਲਾਕਾ ਅਮੀਰ ਹੋ ਗਿਆ / ਪ੍ਰਤੀ ਪਰਿਵਾਰ ਆਮਦਨੀ ਸਾਰੇ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਨਾਲੋਂ ਵਧ ਗਈ।”

Question 4

This question appeared to be demanding as it required candidates to mention two points. Since they had to deduce the information from the text some candidates found it difficult to score full marks. The points they were supposed to write were (i) ਖਰਚ ਤੇ ਆਮਦਨੀ ਦਾ ਹਿਸਾਬ ਨਹੀਂ ਰਹਿੰਦਾ ਤੇ ਕਈ ਵਾਰੀ ਖਰਚ ਆਮਦਨੀ ਨਾਲੋਂ ਜ਼ਿਆਦਾ ਹੋ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ। (ii) ਕਿਸਾਨ ਨੂੰ ਪਤਾ ਹੀ ਨਹੀਂ ਹੁੰਦਾ ਕਿ ਪੈਸੇ ਬਚਣਗੇ ਜਾਂ ਨਹੀਂ। A small number of candidates missed out one of the points and wrote “ਬਾਹਰਲੇ ਪੈਸੇ ਨਾਲ ਕਿਸਾਨ ਘਾਟਾ ਝੱਲ ਸਕਦਾ ਹੈ”. This was marked wrong as it was part of the answer to Question 5.

Question 5

The majority of candidates managed to score full marks on this question. They were required to write the following two points “(i) “ਬਾਹਰਲੇ ਪੈਸੇ ਨਾਲ ਕਿਸਾਨ ਘਾਟਾ ਝੱਲ ਸਕਦਾ ਹੈ । (ii) ਵਿਦੇਸ਼ੀ ਪੈਸੇ ਦੀ ਮਦਦ ਨਾਲ ਹੀ ਮਹਿੰਗੀ ਜ਼ਮੀਨ ਖਰੀਦ ਰਿਹਾ ਹੈ ।”

Question 6

This question was the most demanding as there were good distractors in the text. A significant number of candidates did not score full marks. The question required candidates to write the following two points (i) “ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਵਿੱਚ ਹਰ ਰੋਜ਼ ਕਰੋੜਾਂ ਰੁਪਏ ਵਿਦੇਸ਼ਾਂ ਤੋਂ ਜਾ ਰਹੇ ਹਨ ਜਿਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨਾਲ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਖੁਸ਼ਹਾਲ ਹੋ ਰਿਹਾ ਹੈ ਅਤੇ (ii) ਵਿਦੇਸ਼ੀ ਪੈਸੇ ਨਾਲ ਲੋਕ ਭਲਾਈ ਦੇ ਬਹੁਤ ਕਾਰਜ ਹੋ ਰਹੇ ਹਨ । However many candidates mentioned “ ਜੇ ਵਿਦੇਸ਼ੀ ਪੈਸਾ ਨਾ ਆਵੇ ਤਾਂ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਵੀ ਬੰਗਾਲ ਵਾਂਗ ਭੁੱਖਮਰੀ ਦਾ ਸ਼ਿਕਾਰ ਹੋ ਜਾਵੇ ।” Since this fact indicates the impact of the support provided by Panjabi people living abroad it was accepted and awarded a mark. Candidates at the upper end of the ability range answered this question well and scored full marks while lower ability candidates did not score full marks.

Question 7

There were mixed responses to this question. As it required three points, the majority of candidates answered this question well but some candidates did not give all three points. Some candidates appeared to be confused and they wrote “ਸਰਕਾਰ ਜ਼ਮੀਨਾਂ ਤੇ ਕਬਜ਼ੇ ਕਰ ਰਹੀ ਹੈ”। As this was not the fact portrayed in the text, they were not awarded a mark. The required points were “(i) ਸਰਕਾਰ ਦਾ ਵਤੀਰਾ ਮਾੜਾ ਹੈ ਤੇ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਦੀਆਂ ਲੋੜਾਂ ਵੱਲ ਧਿਆਨ ਨਹੀਂ ਦੇ ਰਹੀ , (ii) ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਦੀਆਂ ਜ਼ਮੀਨਾਂ ਤੇ ਕਬਜ਼ੇ ਹੋ ਰਹੇ ਹਨ (iii) ਪੰਜਾਬ ਦੀ ਪੁਲਿਸ ਅਤੇ ਅਫਸਰ ਪਰਵਾਸੀ ਪੰਜਾਬੀਆਂ ਨਾਲ ਚੰਗਾ ਸਲੂਕ ਨਹੀਂ ਕਰਦੇ ।”

Question 8

This question was answered well by the majority of candidates but some candidates only answered the first part of the question and did not score full marks.

Question 9

This question was attempted very well by almost all candidates.

Question 10

This question was answered well and the majority of candidates managed to score very good marks.

Question 11

This question was challenging and the majority of candidates did not score full marks. The most common errors were made in part (b) ਇਲਾਵਾ/ਮਹੁਤਾਜ (d) ਅਣਗਿਣਤ/ਬੇਹਿਸਾਬ and (e) ਪੈਸਾ/ਪੂੰਜੀ as words were not provided as answers. Some candidates wrote ਰੁਪਿਆ as an answer to part (e); as it is frequently used to refer to the word ‘ਪੈਸਾ’ it was accepted and awarded a mark.

Question 12

This question was attempted very well by almost all candidates and they provided a range of differentiated answers. If a candidate provided an antonym and spelled it correctly, it was awarded one mark; if this antonym was used in a sentence which made sense then the full two marks were awarded for each part of the question. This created differentiation in treating candidates fairly according to their answers. There were candidates at the upper end of the ability range who scored full marks while some candidates at the lower end did not score good marks. One of the most common mistakes made was in writing an antonym of the Panjabi word ‘ਆਮਦਨੀ’।

Marks for knowledge of grammar were awarded according to the quality of work produced by candidates answering all questions in Section 1. Question 12 was extremely useful in this determination as it required candidates to write sentences in their own words. Other questions also gave candidates a real opportunity to write answers in their own words.

Section 2

All candidates could relate to the Panjabi text very well as it was on an appropriate topic. The passage for translation into English was set on the topic of students doing part-time work. Almost all candidates understood the language, context and the content of the extract and the majority of them did well in translating it into English.

A number of candidates translated the first sentence very well. A significant number of candidates used ‘difficulty’ instead of ‘problem’; if the use of word ‘difficulty’ communicated the message it was accepted. The majority of candidates missed the word ‘extra’ in the last sentence of the first paragraph. Many candidates missed out the word ‘usually/often,’ and a significant number of candidates did not understand the Panjabi equivalent of ‘list’ and did not translate it. The sentence with a ‘list of shops and offices’ was translated incorrectly and many candidates failed to gain marks. On the whole, however, this section was attempted well by almost all candidates and they scored reasonably good marks.

The following is a list of words with which candidates had difficulty:

ਸਮੱਸਿਆ	problem
ਵਾਧੂ	extra
ਸੂਚੀ	list
ਵਰਤਾਓ	behaviour
ਕਦਰ ਕਰਨੀ	value

Section 3

This task made similar demands in comparison with last year’s paper and was attempted well by almost all candidates. Candidates were asked to write a letter to their friend advising him/her how to deal with his/her brother suffering from drug addiction. Candidates were given a stimulus to read and five sub-headings to give them the structure to write a letter by elaborating on them.

This task appeared to be interesting and candidates had a good knowledge of this topic. The majority of candidates provided thorough answers and elaborated very well on the points given. Their answers were interesting and supported with real examples and logical opinions. Very able candidates and candidates with average ability were able to produce good language and they scored reasonably good marks for their knowledge of grammar.

A few candidates had difficulties in addressing the points given and writing a letter and a few wrote an article which was not required by this question. However, the content of their article was appropriate in the context of the challenge set in this question. These candidates were awarded marks as they provided acceptable response to the points given. They justified their answers with their opinions on the points raised in the question. Most candidates were able to deal with the task very well even if they wrote an article rather than a letter.

A few less able candidates did not produce much writing for this question. They had such a limited knowledge of Panjabi they could not spell simple words. They copied some sentences from the stimulus given in the paper to start the task in Section 3 but their sentences were not structured appropriately. The common mistakes they made were agreement of verb with singular, plural, masculine or feminine subjects and sentence endings.

Concluding remarks

On the whole the paper appeared to be fair, well balanced and comparable with last year's paper. Although most candidates demonstrated good knowledge of key vocabulary, there was evidence of poor spelling and syntax error especially in complex sentences. Teachers are advised to train candidates to read and understand the questions, the demands made by the questions and the marks allocated to them as some candidates only answered parts of some questions in Section 1. Teachers need to teach the grammatical structures of the Panjabi language to prepare them for the demands of an AS examination.

Candidates should be guided, particularly in Section 3, to write their response to the situations portrayed in the stimulus. They should be advised to read the rubric carefully to establish what they are being asked to write, whether it is a letter or an article, and then address the topic in the appropriate format. In order to score good marks, they should elaborate in their own words on the points given. Where candidates are giving their opinion they should justify it with logical reasons and examples. It was noted that some candidates wrote very long letters in Section 3. Candidates are advised to write approximately 200 words; those who wrote more usually disadvantaged themselves as their structure broke down and their logic became confused.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

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