



Pearson

Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2017

Pearson Edexcel GCSE

In Russian (5RU03)

Paper 3: Reading and Understanding in
Russian.

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 2017

Publications Code 5RU03_01_1706_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

GCSE Russian
Unit 3: Reading
Examiners Report

GCSE Russian 2017.
Unit 3 Reading and Understanding.
Examiner's report.

The paper was accessible to the vast majority of candidates, who usually performed well, showing that they had been well trained.

The standard of handwriting was much improved this year and there were very few candidates who lost marks due to illegibility. However some candidates (perhaps heritage learners) did lose marks due to poor spelling or poor, sometimes incomprehensible English in general.

Questions 1,2,3,4 were well answered by the majority of candidates.

Question 5. This was well answered by most candidates, which was pleasing.

- (i) several candidates guessed at *woods*
- (ii) *sledges* was a popular guess here. It was surprising that *skis* was not known.
- (iii) almost all candidates knew *skated*
- (iv) some candidates put both *fur coats* and *fur hats*. This does not help as no marks are awarded in such situations.
- (v) almost all candidates knew *cooking a meal*.

Question 6 and 7 caused very few problems for most candidates.

Question 8 was aimed at the most able and was extremely well done by many candidates.

Question 9

(a) Most candidates had no problems with this question. Some did not appear to know *международный*. This was not tested, but it was encouraging to see how many did include it in their answers. Several answered *people over 100* or *Nina's birthday*, so gained no marks. A small number even guessed *Anniversary of the Revolution!*

(b) On the whole this was well done. The vast majority understood that a letter and present were to be received by *people over 100*. A few said *Nina* or *100th birthday present*.

(c) Again this proved accessible to most candidates. *Сон* was not known by many, but it was not necessary to gain full marks. 2 marks were gained by mentioning any two from *good/healthy/proper sleep; no bad habits; no smoking*. Many guessed at a *healthy son* or *keeping in or out of the sun*; or a *healthy diet* or *lifestyle* which was not precise enough at this level. Some candidates (possibly heritage candidates) wrote *healthy dreams*, which again was not enough. The majority of candidates did know *smoking*, so almost all gained at least one mark here. Surprisingly not all knew *привычки*. The spelling of habits was interesting – *hobbies, hobbits* amongst others.

(d) Most gained at least one mark here. *Ферма* was frequently not recognised and many guessed at *firm, company, office*. There were some problems with *ветеринар*. Some did not understand it at all and guessed at *veteran* or surprisingly *weather forecaster* (presumably from *ветер*). Many lost marks through poor spelling of veterinarian or veterinary, although vet or even animal doctor were perfectly acceptable.

(e) This question provided very few problems, with only a minority not understanding that *Nina* had lost her sight.

(f) This was the most testing part of Q9. To gain full marks, candidates had to be accurate and say **too** many old people, **too** few (not enough) hospitals/old people's homes. Many lost marks because they only said *a lot* or *many*. Others just said there would *not be enough homes* without mentioning *for the elderly*. At this level candidates should be precise in their answers.

(g) To gain the mark candidates had to mention either *economic* or *social* difficulties. The vast majority did this well, usually mentioning *economic* difficulties, although it was pleasing to see some who mentioned *social* difficulties. It was good to see how many knew *economic*, although they could gain the mark by mentioning *financial* or *money* difficulties. A few missed the point entirely and gave pessimistic answers such as *we will all die soon* and *Nina will go blind and get worse*.

As usual this proved to be the most testing question for all candidates. Candidates at this level are expected to understand some unfamiliar language and extract meaning from more complex language and extended texts. They should be able to identify main points and extract details from such a text. It was pleasing to note how many candidates did just that and answered the

questions well. A small minority found this question difficult, but it is aimed at the most able and it was encouraging to see to see that very few left blanks.

