

Examiners' Report/ Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2015

Pearson Edexcel GCSE
in Greek (5GK01/01)
Paper 1: Listening and Understanding
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 2015

Publications Code UG042191*

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2015

GCSE Greek
Unit 1 Listening and Understanding in Greek
Examiner Report

General comments on performance

In general, candidates' performance on this paper was of a high standard. Most of the questions proved accessible to a considerable number of candidates. There was evidence of satisfactory vocabulary awareness and an ability to identify the information targeted by the questions. However, there were some responses which lacked precision and left out essential details. Also, due to poor English some candidates failed to score full marks. Overall, evidence of misunderstanding and inaccuracies related mainly to questions requiring inference skills.

Occasionally, there was a large amount of unsolicited information provided in question 9. The correct details were often part of those lengthy responses but only after other irrelevant and often contradictory details were conveyed. These responses were not considered correct. When two details are required, candidates are advised against providing three or four and leave it to the examiner to select the correct ones. In such cases, only the first two items listed are read and marked.

Weaker candidates found parts of questions 2, 5, 8 and 9 challenging and failed to score full marks.

Candidates are reminded to make use of the space provided for each response and not to write in the margins of the page or use supplementary pages.

Question 1 (Tourist information)

This question proved straightforward to all the candidates.

Question 2 (A sale)

This question was answered very well, although 2b proved challenging for many candidates, who failed to score 2 marks, as they left out essential information (many candidates wrote "phones" instead of "mobile phones"). Equally challenging was question 2d where a number of candidates failed to identify the word "εμπορικό κέντρο" ("shopping centre"), although it is in the minimum core vocabulary. There was an increasing amount of candidates who answered the question in Greek instead of English and as a result they lost marks.

Question 3 (Plans for the weekend)

This question was handled very well by the majority of candidates and the topic proved accessible to most of them. Errors were made in question 3(ii) where a number of candidates failed to identify the word "ιστιοπλοΐα" ("sailing").

Question 4 (My school)

This question was handled very well by the majority of candidates, but proved challenging for weaker candidates especially question 4(i), possibly due to the fact that they did not make the connection between the adjectives “υπομονετικοί, φιλικοί, αυστηροί” (“patient, friendly, strict”) and “teachers” on the question paper.

Question 5 (A job advertisement)

As in past examinations the topic about job advertisements proved challenging for a number of candidates but on the whole it was answered well. Errors were rather frequent in question 5(i), 5(ii) and 5(iv).

Question 6 (Hotel facilities)

Excellent performance in this question. The topic proved very accessible and the majority of candidates managed to score full marks.

Question 7 (A lost item)

This question was handled very well by the majority of candidates and the topic proved accessible to most of them. Errors were rather frequent in question 7(iii) where a number of candidates failed to identify the word “σκούρο μπλε” (“dark blue”) and in question 7(v) the word “επιβάτης” (“passenger”).

Question 8 (A festival)

This question required good language awareness and inference skills and was handled well by able candidates. Question 8(i) and 8(iv) proved the most challenging subsections of the question and differentiated well between high and average ability candidates. Vocabulary that seemed to pose difficulties included “πανελλαδική συνάντηση”, “διοργανώνονται”, “πεζοπορίες”.

Question 9 (Where I live)

Performance in this question was varied, as expected with questions targeted at higher tiers of ability. Many candidates were able to extract some relevant information and successfully identify the details that contributed to a full answer in some of the questions. Marks were lost where candidates’ answers showed insufficient attention to the recorded text or detail of the question to be awarded marks at this level. Also, the vocabulary proved challenging to a considerable amount of candidates, resulting in misunderstanding of the recorded text or incomplete responses which were not worthy of a mark. Some responses were not inclusive enough and left out essential details, especially with regard to 9(a), where

almost half of the candidates failed to mention that Martha used to live in a large city and instead they stated that she used to live in Northern Greece without any further detail. Other examples include:

9(b) provoked a good number of successful answers, indicating that two thirds of the candidates correctly identified the reason Martha's family moved. Frequent erroneous answers included "because of her father's job".

9(c) proved challenging to almost half of the candidates who did not listen carefully to the recorded text and did not read the question properly. As a result they stated that her father's job was for three years, whereas the question was "why Martha's parents decide to stay there for more than three years".

9(d) proved very challenging to most, except to A* candidates. Very few stated that Martha had mixed feelings about her parents' decision and provided the precise evidence in order to score 3 marks. Marks were lost when candidates mentioned that Martha liked the decision and offered two of her positive comments about the place they lived.

In 9(e) a third of the candidates did not score full marks mostly due to the fact that they failed to mention that Martha was specifically going to work at her aunt's hairdressing salon. Erroneous answers included "She is going to work with her aunt".

9(f) proved challenging to almost a half of the candidates who mentioned that Martha's parents agreed with her decision and carried on adding that they thought of that too, which is not the reason why they agreed. As a result they scored only one out of the two marks, as they offered two pieces of information for the first part of the question.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

