



Pearson
Edexcel

Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2024

Pearson Edexcel GCE
In Greek (9GK0)

Paper 03: Listening, reading and writing in Greek

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 or 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.

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

Summer 2024

Publications Code 9GK0_03_2406_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

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

PE Report for 2406 9GK0 03

In this year's exam series, most candidates demonstrated strong language skills and produced competent responses, showing a solid understanding of the tasks and writing coherent essays for question 5c.

Question 1

This was a multiple-choice question where most candidates achieved full marks.

Question 2

This was a multiple-choice question in which most candidates performed well.

Question 3

Question 3 was straightforward, and most candidates provided accurate answers, though some items were more challenging. Candidates need to read the questions carefully, provide precise answers, and justify them when necessary. Some candidates unsuccessfully tried to rephrase the recording, deviating from the meaning and resulting in inaccurate answers, for example «δεν ξέρει ο ένας τον άλλον αλλά κάνουν παρέα». Others repeated part of the question, failing to provide two details in the two-mark question, as seen in Q03(a)(v) with answers such as «ένα κορίτσι τον ρώτησε να μπει σε ομάδα μουσικής».

In Q03(b)(i), a few candidates struggled to convey the journalist's ideas about the meaning of friendship. The answers were often unclear due to the lack of a subject, which hindered clarity, for example «μοιράζονται την καθημερινότητα» or due to the use of incorrect wording «οι πραγματικοί φίλοι μοιράζουν την καθημερινότητά μας».

Question 4

In Q04(b) and (c), some candidates answered from the perspective of European countries instead of Greece, which was accepted as correct. In Q04(d), some candidates failed to answer correctly because they were unfamiliar with the initials of NGOs, even though the same initials were included in questions (f) and (g).

Candidates should use their devices independently and listen carefully to the recording as they go through the questions. They can go back and listen again to ensure they provide the correct answers.

Question 5

In this question, candidates needed to extract four arguments from the spoken source and four from the written one. They should identify the opposing points of view expressed by the two sources and present four arguments, not facts or personal details.

Many candidates successfully provided four correct arguments for Q5(a), but some wrote facts about what the spoken source did in their life rather than the main argument about life. In Q5(b), more candidates successfully wrote four arguments, with very few opting for facts instead.

Regarding part (c), many candidates knew how to write the essay and successfully evaluated the arguments of the two sources while justifying their own opinions. However, some found this part challenging, either describing what the sources did or evaluating only one source. Many evaluated the sources only in the conclusion, failing to provide convincing judgments and thus not being awarded full marks.

To receive full marks, candidates should avoid merely describing and repeating what the two sources say. Instead, they should express judgments on the viewpoints of the two sources, showing clear evaluation. Additionally, candidates need to draw convincing conclusions on both sources and give their opinion focused on the discussed topic highlighted in Q05(a). They shouldn't write a summary unsupported by their own judgment on the two sources' viewpoints. In the introduction, they should state their opinion. They can evaluate the different sources in separate paragraphs or interweave arguments stated by the two sources throughout the essay, expressing judgments and drawing convincing conclusions.

Most candidates had the language skills to express their opinions and judgments, and any errors did not hinder the clarity of communication. They adhered to the word limit.

Summary

- Most candidates demonstrated strong language skills.
- Candidates should be careful not to create ambiguity due to spelling errors.
- Candidates should read the questions carefully and listen twice or three times to the recording to ensure they find the correct answer.
- Candidates should include subjects before verbs in sentences to clarify the meaning.
- For Q5(a) and (b), candidates need to provide arguments, not facts, to show what the spoken and written sources are thinking, not what they are experiencing.
- For Q5(c), candidates should avoid description and instead express judgments on the two sources, showing clear evaluation. Throughout the essay, they need to demonstrate their viewpoints and support them with well-structured arguments.