



Examiners' Report Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2025

Pearson Edexcel GCSE

1GK0 Paper 3F

Foundation tier: Reading 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 2025

Publications Code 1GK0_3F_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

Principal Examiner's Report

Summer 2025

Specification 1GK

Paper 3F: Reading and Understanding in Greek

Introduction

Candidates in this paper were assessed on their understanding of written Greek across a range of different genres and by responding to question types comprising multiple-choice, short-answer, open response questions and one translation into English. This paper draws on vocabulary and structures across all themes and topics of the specification. The total marks awarded for 3F is 50.

There are three sections to this paper, A, B and C.

Section A has six questions and all instructions to students, comprehension questions and required responses are in English. The mark total for Section A is 28.

Section B has 3 questions and all instructions to students, comprehension questions and required responses are in Greek. The mark total for section B is 15.

Section C has one question, a short translation from Greek into English. The mark total for section C is 7.

Paper Summary

It was clear from this year's performance that the 89 candidates who entered for 3F had been well prepared to tackle the demands of this paper. Many entrants at this level achieved good and sometimes full marks in MC questions with English prompts, especially the ones which required the recall of familiar vocabulary. Answers which required short answers in English or a word in Greek taken from a word cloud or a list of options produced mixed results ranging from moderately successful to

very good. The translation question proved accessible in varying degrees to all ranges of ability, and many candidates were able to transfer meaning with impressive accuracy and fluency.

The small number of candidates who were less successful in questions which required answers in English or Greek (chosen from a list) encountered challenges when cognitive skills such as processing or inferring meaning were at play or when their English was not competent enough to provide unambiguous answers. Impressively, the literary texts proved accessible to most candidates.

Question 1

This question required that candidates provide the correct name in relation to statements about favourite pastimes. The rubric invited candidates to write these names in **English**, which they had to choose from a list provided. The question was worth 6 marks.

Most candidates found this question accessible as it contained very familiar vocabulary items. There were no evident patterns of errors, although some candidates found 1(d) challenging as they failed to link the idea of culture with “θέατρο/γκαλερί τέχνης”. Bad spelling or changing the word from English into Greek (even though it was supposed to have been copied **verbatim from a word pool**) was a regular feature of many weak responses. Filling in the gaps with names in Greek constituted a rubric violation. This practice should be avoided.

Question 2

This question was about a job opportunity and required that candidates choose the correct English word from a word cloud, in order to complete sentences. The question was worth 5 marks.

There was generally very good performance with evidence of occasional weakness in 3 (d), – where candidates failed to link the word *ευγενικοί* in the stimulus text with the option *polite*, in the word cloud.

Weak spelling spelling and illegible writing (even though the word was supposed to have been copied) was a regular feature of weaker responses which were sometimes impossible to decipher.

Question 3

This question related to the topic of ‘favourite place’ and required that candidates provide short answers in English. This question was worth 5 marks and most candidates achieved at least 3. There were some challenges in conveying the word *νηπιαγωγείο* in English, which was sometimes inappropriately rendered as “day care” or “primary school”. In (iii) there was misunderstanding when some candidates described the reason that Elli left Milies in August as “the tourists are too loud”. This evaluative statement was not correct, as what the text suggested was that the advent of tourists made the village less of a place that offered peace and quiet, as opposed to a suggestion that the tourists who came misbehaved.

Question 4

This was based on an adapted literary text and tested comprehension through multiple choice questions. This question was worth 5 marks and was computer marked. There was evidence of high level of achievement in the majority of responses. The less accessible sub question was 4(ii), where some candidates failed to link *μεγάλη αυλή* with “a big playground”.

Question 5

This question related to the topic of water shortages in the Greek islands. It elicited short answers in English, and it was worth 3 marks. Performance in this question ranged from moderately successful to good and the majority of candidates secured at least one mark out of the available three. The question that posed a challenge was 5 (c) and evidence pointed to poor English or to inability to select the correct

detail out of a host of others. For example, many cited as an example of how water shortages affect tourists in the summer the existence of “signs that stop them from using water” or resorted to a tautology and answered that the tourists are affected because of “water shortages”. The correct answer was that “water cuts off mid-shower”. Some awkward articulations such as “the water stops/is cut mid-shower” were accepted, as they showed that the candidate understood the question and the text.

Question 6

This question was an adapted literary text and focused on an elderly man’s daily routine and his relationship with his dog. The question was worth 4 marks and the majority of the candidates secured at least two. Question 1 was mostly answered correctly by candidates. They were able to identify the man’s daily routines, which were “he went to a café” and “he read”. Few candidates misunderstood the focus of the question and instead described in painstaking detail the café, instead of what the man did.

Insecure language skills in English were largely responsible for areas of challenge that related to 6(ii). In response to what the dog was like many wrote “quite” or “like a sheep”, which did not render meaning clearly.

Question 7

This is the first question from Section B and was based on a new school initiative about animals. It was worth 5 marks. The majority of the candidates scored at least two marks

Candidates were asked to complete a sentence by choosing from a list of Greek words in a word cloud. This question proved challenging for weaker students, who could not fill in the gaps in the sentences that summed up the ideas in the stimulus text. For example, many could not complete the sentence *Το πρόγραμμα οργανώθηκε φέτος* with *για πρώτη φορά*, based on the sentence from the text that said: *Το πρόγραμμα με θέμα «Οι φίλοι μας, τα ζώα» ξεκίνησε φέτος τον Σεπτέμβριο*. There was a noticeable pattern of misspelling, to the point of unrecognisability,

even though the word was supposed to have been copied from the given pool.

As is often the case with topics that are drawn from concepts, rather than the personal experience of a 16-year-old, challenges related to syntax and vocabulary were responsible for some incorrect answers. When candidates are not familiar with a certain word, they ought to try to use their knowledge of syntax to complete a sentence. For example, in question 6(c) the subject is missing. Therefore, the answer would have to be a noun in the nominative, for example μαθητές.

Question 8

This question was about Efi's experience of a school excursion. This was a multiple-choice comprehension exercise that was in Greek. It was worth 5 marks. With the exception of 8(v) which was based on inference, many candidates performed very well in this question.

In 8(v) many were not able to associate the phrase in the text *κυρίες που μας συνόδεψαν* with the correct option, which was option (c) *Στην εκδρομή συμμετείχαν καθηγήτριες*.

Question 9

This question was on the topic of volunteerism. It required that candidates match a statement with the correct name, and it was worth 5 marks.

Performance was generally good, with most candidates achieving 3 marks or higher. There was an occasional pattern of misspelling the names from the given pool or transliterating them into English. This violated the rubric, it often impacted the clarity of the response and caused loss of marks. Names **should be copied as they are given**.

Question 10

This question related to the topic of free time and how a school girl spends Saturday. It involved the translation of a short passage from Greek into English and total marks awarded for this exercise were 7. Most candidates performed very well, achieving 5 marks and above, which indicated that the meaning of the passage was mostly communicated.

There were some patterns of mostly lexical challenges impacting the flow of the translation. Examples include:

- Rendering *περάσαμε* as ‘we have a good time’ instead of the correct ‘we had a good time’
- Occasional failure to recognise words such as *σκάκι* and *συναυλία*
- Rendering *συχνά* as ‘always’ or omitting it altogether

Candidates are reminded that in these short translations, transitions in time frames or the aspect of time are often signaled with adverbs of time or frequency, including days of the week. Since it is the requirement of this task to include different time frames, candidates should be trained in recognising and translating time-specific vocabulary.

Conclusion

Based on their performance in this paper, candidates are asked to consider the following:

- read all questions carefully, paying particular attention to the language that they must respond in, which is mostly English **not** Greek, unless a word needs to be copied from a pool
- remember that there is only ONE correct response in the multiple-choice questions. Often, the closest distractors, i.e., the incorrect options, may contain some words from the text (or cognate words), precisely in order to “distract” and differentiate between levels of achievement

- ensure that their translation reads naturally in English. It is sometimes preferable to convey meaning by not adhering to word-for-word literal translation. There will probably be unknown words in the translation. Candidates should not omit words, and they should try to make educated guesses.
- remember the importance of clear presentation and legible writing
- write in the space provided and try not to continue in additional paper. Lengthy answers give rise to ambiguity and inaccuracies
- check their answers if they have time at the end.

Thank you for choosing to study this specification.