



Pearson  
Edexcel

Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2022

Pearson Edexcel International GCSE  
in Greek (4GK1/01)

Unit 1:

Reading, Summary and Grammar

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2022

Publications Code 4GK1\_01\_2206\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd

## Introduction

The Pearson Edexcel International GCSE in Greek (First Language) consists of two externally-examined papers: Paper 1, 4GK1/1: Reading, Summary and Grammar, 60% of the qualification, and Paper 2, 4GK1/2: Writing, 40% of the qualification. There are ten topic areas tested across both papers and new test types have been introduced, in addition to extended writing responses, which test summary, comprehension and grammar skills. This was the first summer that this new specification was examined and awarded.

Paper 4GK1/01, Reading, Summary and Grammar is externally assessed over a period of 2 hours and 15 minutes. Total marks for this paper are 75. The content of this unit is informed by the following topic areas:

- A. Youth matters
- B. Education
- C. Media
- D. Culture
- E. Sport and leisure
- F. Travel and tourism
- G. Business, work and employment
- H. Environment
- I. Health
- J. Technology

4GK01 Paper 1 consists of three parts.

In **Part 1: Reading** candidates are required to convey their understanding of written Greek through a series of reading tasks and in response to two texts found in a special extracts-booklet. They have to answer four questions on each text and then compare the two texts, stylistically but also in terms of how they express their position in relation to a certain topic. Candidates must be able to demonstrate the following skills:

- Read and respond to material from a variety of sources
- Scan for specific information
- Interpret and infer explicit and implicit meaning, including writers' thoughts, feelings and ideas
- Understand and analyse how writers create effect
- Select and use relevant evidence from the text to support their answer

- Make comparisons between texts

In **Part 2: Summary**, candidates are required to demonstrate their ability to summarise a short text by writing four main points clearly and accurately.

**Part 3: Grammar** assesses the candidates' understanding of grammatical usage in a series of exercises. Candidates are expected to demonstrate their awareness of the rules of grammar and of the relationships between parts of speech in a text and apply the conventions of grammar in order to produce and manipulate content pertinently and accurately.

### **Summary of performance**

This was the second full iteration of the summer examination series in this qualification. In general, performance was very good in questions that required short answers in Greek with substantiation from the source text. There was noticeable improvement in responses to Section C, which was grammar-focused. Levels of accuracy in the application of language were high, as candidates were clearly familiar with the assessment requirements in this section and paid particular attention to spelling and grammar.

Areas of weakness were often evident in questions 4, 8 and 9, particularly in relation to the organisation and linking of ideas, substantiation of claims, spelling and the orderly presentation of writing,

A small number of candidates wrote overtly and unnecessarily long responses in Parts 1 and 2. These responses often contained digression, repetition and marred the performance of otherwise able candidates.

### **Comments on performance in individual sections.**

#### **Part One: Reading**

Candidates are advised to allocate approximately 1 hour and 15 minutes to Part One, which is worth a total of 49 marks. They must read two text extracts and answer all questions. The following objectives are assessed.

- Read and understand a range of texts, selecting and interpreting information, ideas and Opinions (AO1)
- Understand how the writer uses techniques to create effect (AO1)
- Compare and contrast information (AO1).

This year's candidates performed particularly well in questions 1-3 and 5-7, whereas performance in questions 4, 8 and 9, which required extensive responses ranged in quality.

## Question 1

This was worth 1 mark and was a rather straightforward recall question. The vast majority of candidates gained one mark. Those who did not, answered by copying long extracts from the text verbatim, without the necessary manipulation and rephrasing, as required by the rubric. An example of such a response that did not gain marks was ή σε κατοίκους απομακρυσμένων περιοχών. An example of a response that gained one mark is οι κάτοικοι απομακρυσμένων περιοχών.

## Question 2

This was worth 2 marks and required the processing of information in the candidate's own words, substantiated with a short quotation from the extract. The quotation ought to be indicated with the appropriate punctuation marks.

Many candidates performed well by constructing responses in their own words, which corresponded to the framing of the question in negative terms (i.e., what a certain group of teachers *did not do*). They answered by formulating syntactically correct responses, in accurate Greek: μερικοί καθηγητές και καθηγήτριες δεν αντέδρασαν με θετικό τρόπο στην τηλεκπαίδευση/ δεν προθυμοποιήθηκαν να προετοιμαστούν για να διδάξουν διαδικτυακά. They provided appropriate substantiation from the source text that confirmed the validity of their response: «Σχεδόν στο σύνολο...με κείμενα διαμαρτυρίας».

Unfortunately, many candidates did not read the question carefully and provided as their own interpretation the exact same or similar phrases to the ones they cited as substantiation. For example, the response 'αντέδρασαν με κείμενα διαμαρτυρίας' does not explain accurately or clearly what a small number of teachers did NOT do. Moreover, this phrase is reminiscent of the quotation that was also used to offer the substantiation to the candidate's response, 'προτίμησαν να αντιδράσουν με κείμενα διαμαρτυρίας'. One cannot earn two marks for effectively offering the same content without an attempt to interpret the content in their own individual way (με δικά σας λόγια). The same erroneous pattern of responses was also observed in question 3, 6 and 7 and students are reminded to study the mark scheme for questions 2, 3, 6 and 7, in order to gain a better grasp of how these questions should be answered.

Candidates are also reminded that adherence to the requirements of the rubric (με δικά σας λόγια) helps them to demonstrate that they understood the source text and are able to convey their understanding in accurate, clear language that is their own.

An additional caveat relates to the length of the answers. It was counterproductive on the part of certain candidates to answer with whole paragraphs of repetitive narrative, writing in additional sheets and often with no indication that their answers continue in additional sheets, stopping mid-sentence in the space provided. Supporting quotations should also be exact and succinct, maybe a phrase and certainly not whole paragraphs that leave it to the examiner to tease out the correct evidence. Such all-inclusive answers that lacked precision and clarity did not gain full marks.

### Question 3

This question was worth 4 marks. 3 (a) required that candidates scan the text to locate the correct information and relay it in their own words, identifying precisely who is negatively impacted by remote learning. Most candidates performed successfully and provided the correct details.

Common patterns of errors in 3 (a) were in connection to responses that were based on direct quotations, rather than the candidates' own words, and were therefore deemed unsuccessful in gaining marks. For example, the phrase *δεν είναι δεδομένο ότι όλοι διαθέτουν τον απαραίτητο εξοπλισμό* did not gain any marks.

In 3(b) candidates were asked to provide the appropriate explanation as to why remote learning helped save time and back it up with the correct quotation. Many candidates identified the reason correctly, i.e., the fact that everyone studies/works from home and do not have to spend time having to go back and forth every day.

A pattern of confusion emerged again in relation to the difference between providing information in the candidates' own words (*επειδή όλοι κάνουν μαθήματα εξ' αποστάσεως δεν χρειάζεται να πηγαίνουν στο σχολείο*) and offering supporting evidence by quoting from the text (*«η κατάργηση ...τα άγχη της μετακίνησης»*). Those who gained only one mark in 3 (b), provided a quotation that in their mind served two purposes: the candidate's own opinion and the supporting example from the text.

### Questions 4 and 7.

Questions 4 and 7 invite candidates to identify and explain how the writers of the texts use discourse, persuasion modes and various techniques (linguistic or structural) to create effect. This question usually starts with 'Explain how the writer presents... ' and requires that the candidates use evidence from the text to support their answer. Modes of persuasion may include establishing ethos, pathos and the authority and credibility of the speaker. Various linguistic and textual techniques include the use of a certain narrative tone and verb person, repetition, rhetorical questions, cohesive devices such as transitional phrases, linking words and subordinate clauses, paragraphing, use of connectives, alliteration, extended metaphor, personification, simile, oxymoron etc. A good response in questions 4 and 7 (and by extension question 9) does not list uncritically and with unnecessary wordage that extends beyond the allocated space *all* the techniques that the candidate was taught. Instead, it selects only those techniques and modes of persuasion that are relevant for the particular text and are evident in the selected quotations that serve as proof of the claim. An answer that identifies a technique but fails to explain how this creates effect, and what type of effect, is incomplete. The most common pattern of unsatisfactory performance related to precisely this: a list-like, overtly long piece that identified the use of certain tenses and moods without explaining why or how such use provokes and gives rise to a strong engagement on the part of the reader. An observation such as *'η συγγραφέας χρησιμοποιεί Αόριστο για να δείξει ότι η πράξη έγινε και Ενεστώτα για να δείξει ότι η τηλεεκπαίδευση ακόμα συνεχίζεται'* constitutes a rather basic claim that does not contribute very much to a clear explanation about how the writer of the first passage creates effect. Tenses are also used

functionally, to convey a time line and sometimes a time line is simply that, it is not a technique. In addition, many times the evidence selected was chosen haphazardly and betrayed insecure knowledge of Grammar. For example, in the phrase ‘Ο Γιάννης χρησιμοποιεί τον Ενεστώτα για να δώσει διαχρονικότητα, π.χ. «να κατευθύνουμε», «να επιδείξουμε» κ.τ.λ.’, the candidate wrongly equated the subjunctive mood used in the second passage with a tense.

Other instances of confusion related to verb persons, tenses or the identification of parts of speech. Accuracy and clarity are important aspects of good performance at this level of demand. Words were identified as φορτωμένες instead of φορτισμένες, standard collocations such as ρητορική ερώτηση were conveyed as ρητορική πρόταση, and quite often there was a misidentification of verb person that was not followed by an explanation of why a certain person constitutes a linguistic technique that serves persuasion. For example, the statement ‘ο Γιάννης χρησιμοποιεί α’ ενικό πρόσωπο’, which does not mean very much in and of itself, was often substantiated with evidence from the text that included a different verb person, e.g. ‘θα χάσουμε’, ‘είχαμε’.

In addition, it was often quite disheartening to see so many candidates write without concern or with indifference to the conventions of good spelling and effective organisation of ideas. Even though linguistic structures in themselves are not directly tested in this question, they contribute to an impression of a clear and convincing explanation and as such they affect the assessment of the response.

In conclusion, a good number of candidates had secure knowledge in Greek as a first language and wrote a clear and detailed explanation of how the writers created effect and controlled discourse through linguistic and structural techniques in passages 1 and 2. They provided appropriate and appropriately cited evidence that fully supported the points being made. These candidates supported the identification of a linguistic technique with explanation of its effect and provided appropriate substantiation. An example of such performance is the phrase, ‘η συγγραφέας επικαλείται το ήθος της και επιτίθεται στο ήθος του αντιπάλου χρησιμοποιώντας μια αντίθεση ανάμεσα στο «εμείς» και «αυτοί». Χρησιμοποιεί το πρώτο πληθυντικό πρόσωπο για να εντάξει τον εαυτό της στο σύνολο που αντέδρασε θετικά και να προσδώσει μια αίσθηση συλλογικής ευθύνης στις πράξεις της. Για παράδειγμα «υπηρετούμε πιστά’, «κληθήκαμε» κ.τ.λ.’

In conclusion, questions 4 and 8 carry 10 marks each and are marked according to specific criteria. A good response must be written in accurate Greek, with words properly spelled and accented and offer a perceptive and analytical explanation of how the writer uses linguistic and structural techniques to create effect. These claims must be consistently accompanied by evidence from the text that fully supports the point being made. The indicative responses in the MS offer examples of performance that could gain marks from the top band of the response mark grid.

### Question 5

This question was worth 1 mark and was a rather straightforward recall question. The vast majority of candidates gained one mark. Those who did not, answered by copying from the text verbatim, without the necessary manipulation and rephrasing, as required by the rubric.

### Question 6

This was worth 2 marks and required the processing of information in the candidate's own words, substantiated with a short quotation from the extract. The quotation ought to be indicated with the appropriate punctuation marks.

Many candidates performed well and provided opinion with appropriate substantiation. Patterns of errors related to answers which, instead of indicating clearly and precisely why Giannis is concerned about access to his teachers, offered superficial responses that failed to provide the level of detail that is necessary for this level of demand. For example, a response such as 'ανησυχεί γιατί η πρόσβαση χειροτέρευσε' is an obvious, and incorrect, response because it more or less reiterates the essence of the question (τον απασχολεί το ζήτημα της πρόσβασης). One correct response with the correct level of detail could be 'δεν έχει την δυνατότητα να κάνει ερωτήσεις στους καθηγητές του εμπιστευτικά, χωρίς να τον ακούει όλη η τάξη, για παράδειγμα « Δεν μπορώ να πλησιάσω την έδρα...ακροατήριο» '.

An additional caveat relates to the length of the answers. Candidates are advised that it is counter-productive to answer in an all-inclusive way that contains irrelevant details alongside some relevant ones. Such answers did not gain full marks as it was not clear whether the candidate had understood the question correctly. In general, candidates are advised NOT to use additional paper for their answers and to offer only the relevant information succinctly.

### Question 7

This question was worth 4 marks. 7 (a) required that candidates scan the text to locate the correct information as to the expectation regarding government support. Most candidates performed successfully and provided the correct details in 7(a).

In 7(b) candidates were asked to explain why a student's character may lead to falling behind during remote learning. Many candidates were able to answer succinctly and clearly: Δεν προοδεύει αυτός που δεν έχει αυτοπειθαρχία.

Patterns of unsuccessful answers were very similar to the patterns observed in 2 and 3 (b). Candidates did not answer by interpreting the information in the text and pinpointing a character trait but by rephrasing what the candidate does during class and offering the exact same content as substantiation. For example, 'παιδιά που βλέπουν βίντεο, «Ξέρω παιδιά που βλέπουν βίντεο»'



## Question 9

In question 9 candidates are required to compare the two texts in the extracts-booklet in Part One. The question may start with an invitation to compare linguistic and textual techniques, for example, ‘Να συγκρίνετε τους τρόπους με τους οποίους τα δύο κείμενα χειρίζονται το θέμα των επιπτώσεων της τηλεκπαίδευσης». The question also invites candidates to use evidence from the two texts to support their answer, ‘Να εντοπίσετε στα κείμενα λέξεις ή φράσεις που τεκμηριώνουν την απάντησή σας’. A candidate cannot gain marks for making claims unless these are accompanied by ‘evidence relevant to the points made’. The indicative responses in the MS illustrate the characteristics of a good response that could gain marks from the top bands of the response mark grid.

One type of response to this question could be structured by writing about the characteristics of the first passage— for example, the first writer’s impressions and stylistic techniques and devices— in the first half and then use a connective device to transition to the second passage and write about the second writer’s discourse features while also cross-referencing with points made earlier. This response may prove underdeveloped, if the information, even though relevant, is conveyed without a clearly stated comparison, leaving it to the reader to draw conclusions.

A more sophisticated answer would compare the two texts point by point throughout, either in terms of the commonalities between the two writers or in terms of the differences. A good response provides a balanced account of the similarities and differences between the two texts, supported by apt analysis and appropriate evidence.

Performance in this question was generally satisfactory in terms of relevance of points and the comparative aspect. For example, ‘και οι δύο αφηγητές χρησιμοποιούν επίκληση στο συναίσθημα αλλά με διαφορετικούς τρόπους’. Some responses considered a range of comparisons between the texts, more often than not in relation to what was said, rather than how it was said and what it meant. A pattern of incomplete answers treated comparisons as follows: ‘Στο πρώτο κείμενο η αφηγήτρια μιλάει θετικά για την τηλεκπαίδευση ενώ στο δεύτερο κείμενο ο Γιάννης μιλάει αρνητικά’. This statement, as true as it may be, does not consider the comparison in an informed way and does not attribute to it an explanation of how the writers create effect while they discuss the benefits or the negative impact of remote learning. In addition to the necessary critical framing, a comparison ought to pinpoint not what is said but how things are said to persuade or engage the audience. In this case, a more successful answer would have framed the reference to the two writers’ ideological difference with an example such as this one, in addition to many others: ‘Οι δύο συγγραφείς αναφέρονται στις επιπτώσεις της τηλεκπαίδευσης από διαφορετικές οπτικές γωνίες που έχουν να κάνουν με τη θέση τους μέσα σ’ αυτήν. Η συγγραφέας του πρώτου κειμένου επικαλείται τη λογική («μας έσπρωξε επιτέλους») και την αυθεντία της ως εκπαιδευτικού («για πάνω από μια εικοσαετία») για να μας πείσει πως η είσοδος της τεχνολογίας είναι και επιθυμητή από τους ειδικούς και καίρια λόγω της εποχής. Ενώ ο Γιάννης στο β’ κείμενο επικαλείται το συναίσθημα, χρησιμοποιώντας συναισθηματικά φορτισμένο λόγο σε εξομολογητικό α’ πρόσωπο ενικού («δεν μπορώ να πλησιάσω...») «δουλεύω ασταμάτητα...») για να μας πείσει για τις αρνητικές επιπτώσεις της τηλεκπαίδευσης στους μαθητές’.

In this question, just as in questions 4 and 8 earlier, a balanced and clear account necessitates good knowledge and application of language and writing with appropriate cohesive devices, good linking between ideas and unambiguous language.

## **Part Two: Summary**

### **Question 10**

The source text in this question is between 340-360 words and requires a summary of 100-150 words. The text may be taken from any source – journalistic prose or fiction – but it will contain clearly identifiable main points. It is expected that candidates will write four main points and be marked on their understanding of the text and on their ability to **write clearly**. Candidates are advised to allocate approximately 30 minutes to Part Two.

There is a total of 6 marks for this section and candidates are required to use their own language to summarise.

Performance in this question was good and many candidates identified at least 3 points clearly and unambiguously. Please refer to the MS for the indicative content required, in order to achieve marks from the higher bands of the assessment criteria.

A pattern of unsatisfactory performance related to the following:

- Failure to summarise information without copying whole chunks of text
- Unsatisfactory use of linking and organisation skills, which rendered the identification of discrete main points obscure and ambiguous
- All-inclusive answers that conveyed too much information that may have been true but not relevant for the purposes of this question
- Summaries that were so long that could no longer be considered summaries.

## **Part Three: Grammar**

This section includes two 10-mark questions, each assessing different grammar skills. In exercises 11 and 12 students are required to demonstrate their understanding of grammatical usage in a series of exercises. In particular, they are required to:

- show their awareness of the rules of grammar in order to demonstrate their understanding of textual features and the relationships between parts of speech in a text
- demonstrate understanding of content
- apply the conventions of grammar in order to produce and manipulate content pertinently and accurately

Candidates are advised to allocate approximately 30 minutes to Part Three and are required to answer all questions.

## Question 11

In question 11 students read sentences that have been isolated from the texts in the extracts-booklet. Students are asked to transform and recast the sentence using the word(s) in brackets. Please refer to the MS for indicative content.

Each sentence in question 11 has a prompt (in brackets) which must be used as cited. Students cannot change/adapt the prompt. Transformation exercises are a common feature in language testing as they invite learners to consciously manipulate language patterns, demonstrating their awareness of structures. Transformation exercises can focus on manipulating structures and/or producing new vocabulary that alters the syntax of the sentence. What is important is that the prompt must be used as is.

Performance in this question was generally good with many candidates scoring more than half of the marks available, particularly in questions 10(β), 10(γ), 10(ε) 10(στ). Patterns of unsatisfactory responses related to the following:

- Absence of the position of the stress and wrong spelling that indicated weak grasp of the rules of grammatical inflections (ανταποκριθήκαμαι, περιμέναμαι, ενδιαφέρονται)
- Changes in the prompt (είναι θετικό πως θα δούμε την εικόνα)

## Question 12

In question 12 students were asked to read a whole text of 80-100 words and then put the words in the brackets in the appropriate form. The words contained a mixture of verbs and nouns. In the text, the missing words were replaced by (α) – (ι) and were listed underneath with an example that set the tone and time frame of the piece.

Performance in this section ranged from average to satisfactory. Unfortunately, many candidates did not possess the level required to perform at a high level of competence.

Patterns of unsatisfactory responses related to the following:

- Inflectional spelling that was inaccurate and showed poor knowledge of grammar. For example: δράσης, ενημερώνοντε, υλοποιήται
- Changes in the voice in which the verb was given. For example: παραδίδουν
- Adding a preposition instead of forming the genitive. For example: Στα κυλικεία
- Omitting the position of the stress

### Conclusive remarks

In general, performance in this examination series was satisfactory, with some excellent examples of performance that satisfied the demands of this level fully.

Teachers and candidates who embark on teaching and studying this qualification might benefit from the guidance below:

- ensure that there are plenty of opportunities for the candidates to practise reading and responding to unseen passages under timed conditions
- be aware of the different assessment objectives to ensure that the content of the practice answers relates to the assessment criteria and the mark schemes
- during practice, highlight the supporting evidence and relevant lines for answers to questions 2, 3b, 6 and 7b in the Extracts-Booklet and offer opinion in their own words in order to show interpretation of the information
- answer questions 1, 3a, 5 and 7 a, as far as possible, in the candidates' own words
- write succinctly and without continuing on extra paper in questions, 1-3, 5-7 and 10, in particular, and as far as possible
- consider the effects of linguistic and cohesive devices within the context of the given extract in questions 4 and 8, rather than offering generic explanations of the type, 'the present tense is employed to express current action'
- identify points of commonality or difference in Question 9 and substantiate these with evidence from the two texts. Where possible, start with the point, rather than with the text. Points should be balanced across both texts and supported with relevant quotations or textual references
- substantiation from the source text ought to be indicated with punctuation marks when appropriate
- aim for structured, accurate, cohesive and well-developed pieces of writing in question 4, 8, 9 and 10
- allow time to proof-read responses in order to achieve the highest possible degree of accuracy and clarity
- read all instructions carefully
- attempt every question
- indicate the position of the stress, where needed; this is not optional

Thank you for choosing to teach and study this qualification.

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London, WC2R 0RL, United Kingdom

