



Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback
Summer 2025

Pearson Edexcel International GCSE
In Greek (4GK1) Paper 01
Paper 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 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 candidates at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2025

Publications Code 4GK1_01_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

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.

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. They are also called to apply the conventions of grammar in order to produce and manipulate content pertinently and accurately.

Summary of performance

This year's cohort performed very well in questions 2, 3, 4, 7, 10 and 12 and their responses showed a remarkable improvement on last year's results. It was refreshing to see that the majority of the candidates were able to identify the correct detail and support their claims with appropriate, concise and clearly indicated quotations from the text (questions 2, 3, 7), summarized most points in the stimulus text with clarity and accuracy (question 10) and manipulated structures correctly in order to complete sentences in question 12.

Even though questions 8 and 9, two of the traditionally more demanding questions, and question 11, the grammar transformation exercise, still posed a moderate challenge to many candidates, there, too, was visible improvement, albeit at a smaller scale than in question 4. One area where we would like to see better compliance with the ongoing recommendations of this report, ever since the conception of this specification, is in the length of candidates' responses, which continues to be an unwelcome pattern that ultimately disadvantages candidates. Further training in more focused and concise responses is needed, for candidates to perform to the best of their abilities and produce content in a purposeful way, which avoids reproducing indiscriminately everything they were taught. There has already been a noticeable reduction in the number of candidates who requested extra paper and this, among others, accounts for this year's better results.

We look forward to more improvement in the years to come.

For indicative responses to the 2025 4GK01 examination in Greek, please see the 2025 Mark Scheme, which is found on the [Pearson website](#).

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 quite well in questions 2, 3, 4 and 7, whereas performance in questions 1, 5, 6, 8 and 9, ranged in quality. As regards questions that require short answers in Greek, candidates are 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. Therefore, some candidates' tendency to use tautology, using the actual words of the quote they include in order to answer the questions 2, 3b, 6 and 7b should be avoided.

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 1

This was worth 1 mark and asked candidates to identify the reason why many Greeks have trouble falling asleep. Most candidates did not perform as well as expected, because they replied with general information that did not pinpoint with precision the fact that sleep eludes people who spend time on Tik Tok before they go to bed.

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 passage. The quotation ought to be indicated with the appropriate punctuation marks. Many candidates performed very well by constructing responses in their own words and by providing appropriate substantiation from the source text that confirmed the validity of their response, which was the extent and seriousness of the issue. Reference to the need for setting a healthy limit to internet use was also accepted. In this question, as in others which require substantiation, candidates are advised to interpret the information in the text and look for an extract to support their claim. Paraphrasing an extract does not necessarily lead to a successful response. For example, the answer *Πρέπει να δραπετεύσουμε από τη φυλακή του διαδικτύου* supported by the extract «...επείγει να δραπετεύσουμε από αυτήν

τη φυλακή της παρατεταμένης χρήσης διαδικτυακών εφαρμογών...». is not acceptable and cannot earn 2 marks as it simply paraphrases the extract, instead of drawing a conclusion from it and recasting it in the candidate's own words.

Question 3

This question was worth 4 marks and most candidates performed very well, earning at least 3.

3 (a) required that candidates scan the text to locate the correct information and relay it in their own words. Most candidates performed successfully and provided the correct piece of information. Some candidates, though, failed in locating the answer and mentioned only the short duration of the videos on Tik Tok, without interpreting this information and adding that they are addictive. The fact that they are consecutive was not required for a correct response.

In 3 (b) candidates were asked to explain why “beauty videos” are harmful for children. The answers provided were generally correct. A common error pattern here was in relation to what was described above under question 2. Some responses were articulated in a way that was too close to the quotations that supported them, rather than in the candidates' own language. As explained earlier, these were not successful responses and only gained one mark for the substantiation, if this was correct. For example, those who responded that the videos are harmful because they cause «εμμονή με την εμφάνιση» or because of «επιπτώσεις στον ψυχισμό των κοριτσιών» did not earn full marks as they used the exact same words for both their claim and its substantiation.

Questions 4 and 8

Questions 4 and 8 invite candidates to identify and explain how the writers of the texts use discourse, means of persuasion 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. The candidates may refer to the common means of persuasion, which may include appeals to reason, emotion and

the authority and credibility of the speaker, etc. They may also refer to stylistic devices, such as irony, repetition, narrative tone and verb person, alliteration, extended metaphor, personification, simile, oxymoron etc. A good response in questions 4 and 8 and by extension question 9, will identify four or five different such tools for persuading the reader about the importance of what they claim. These may include both the means of persuasion, and the stylistic devices mentioned earlier. These four or five points, depending on their level of depth and range, will help candidates earn marks from the top tiers of the assessment criteria that are titled “The writer’s craft mark grid”.

A complete answer that is awarded a high mark should follow the pattern of Point / Evidence / Explanation and link. An answer that includes, let’s say, a means of persuasion (e.g. appeal to reason) and the relevant quote, but does not mention the technique (e.g. statistical data) and does not explain how this impacts the reader (e.g. data make the speaker’s claim appear more grounded in facts) is not considered a complete response.

Moreover, an answer where the candidate provides a long list of different means of persuasion and/or technique is also not considered appropriate for marks from the top band, as this repetition may be at the cost of omitting other more visible and substantial rhetorical devices. In addition, an answer where the candidate provides a list of all possible means of persuasion and techniques that can be found in the text, often resorting to writing extra pages extending beyond the allocated space, is also not considered a subtle and thoughtful response. The requirement is that candidates write a concise, complete and coherent answer within the allocated space, thus revealing that they can perform well and effectively within the recommended framework and can be discerning about what to include and what to exclude. Excess wordage results in indiscriminate information that may often seem rambling on and inconsequential.

In sum, the most common pattern of unsatisfactory performance related to precisely this excessive wordage and lack of complete points and especially in questions 8 and 9: list-like, overtly long pieces that identified the use of several techniques or means of persuasion without explaining why or how such use provokes and gives rise to a strong engagement on the part of the reader.

Other instances of confusion related to verb persons or the incorrect identification of tenses and parts of speech (for example an Aorist was often referred to as a Present tense, a first-person singular as a first-person plural, a pronoun as an adjective etc).

In addition, it was often quite disheartening to see so many candidates write without concern or with indifference to the conventions of good spelling, clear writing and effective organisation of ideas. Even though linguistic structures in themselves are not directly tested in these questions, 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 many wrote a clear and detailed explanation of how the writers created effect and controlled discourse through linguistic and structural techniques, mostly in passage 1 and less so in passage 2.

Question 5

This question was worth 1 mark. Surprisingly, many candidates found this question challenging. The most common error pattern had to do with inability to identify a phenomenon, i.e. *Νέα κορίτσια ενδιαφέρονται για προϊόντα ομορφιάς/αντιγήρανσης* and offer, instead, responses that simply talked about Mrs Lianos' experience with her daughter (which is not a 'phenomenon'), failing to extrapolate from this a common social practice amongst young women.

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. Most candidates found this task moderately challenging. To the question *Τι κάνει την κυρία Λιανού να πιστεύει πως οι γονείς δεν είναι σε θέση να ελέγξουν τη συμπεριφορά των παιδιών;* they often cited not the fact that these practices happen outside the home, at school, but the fact that parents were divided about how to deal with these issues. Therefore, their responses were often off topic.

Question 7

This question was worth 4 marks and performance was generally very good, with most candidates earning at least 3 marks.

7 (a) required that candidates scan the text to locate the two things Danae won't be able to do in the next couple of years. Most candidates performed successfully and provided the correct details. The few who did not, failed to use either the correct tense (future tense) or the correct subject (Danae, not her mum). In 7 (b) the majority of candidates succeeded in answering correctly and using the correct quote.

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 τους». 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. It was good to see that this year's performance showed an improvement on last year's, but there is still room for building on the existing strengths and considering the feedback conveyed further up, in relation to questions 4 and 8.

A pattern of good practice, that has been noticed this year also, concerns the framework that many candidates adopt to structure their response, comparing the two texts point by point throughout, either in terms of the commonalities between the two writers or in terms of the differences, presenting four to five complete points, as has been suggested earlier.

Most candidates earned at least 9 out of the 15 points available, making statements that showed their understanding of the two passages and what the question requires, which is not what the texts say but how they say it. Therefore, lengthy introductions that state what is obvious (e.g. in the first text a journalist talks about...and in the second text a mother talks about...) and enumerate the various arguments in detail are not necessary and show that the candidate does not understand the question very well.

A pattern of incomplete answers treated comparisons as follows: “Αν και τα δύο κείμενα μιλούν για το ίδιο θέμα, το πρώτο παρουσιάζει το θέμα με πιο σοβαρό ύφος ενώ το δεύτερο με πιο προσωπικό”. Such statements, as true as they may be, do not consider the comparison in an informed way and do not attribute to it an explanation of how the writers create effect while they discuss the impact of the internet and the beauty industry on people and young women. In addition, a comparison must be grounded in the facts of each passage. A sweeping statement such as, *In the first text the journalist evokes the authority of experts...whereas in the second text, the mother appeals to emotion...* is not entirely correct, as it gives the impression that the journalist does not use appeal to emotion; which is untrue. Recast, this statement could earn more marks if it was articulated differently, e.g. *In the first text the journalist evokes the authority of experts...whereas in the second text, we don't see an appeal to expert opinion but rather more examples of evocation of reason and emotion, as the passage has more of a personal tone...* Then the candidate could proceed to explain that in the first text, also, we have appeals to reason and to emotion.

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 very good and many candidates identified at least 3 points clearly and unambiguously and earned at least one mark for language accuracy. The point that was mostly ignored was the fact that open-air food markets constitute a long-time tradition in Greece. Please refer to the 2025 MS for the indicative content expected in this question.

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
- Keyword type listing of main points without conveying the relevant information.

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. 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 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 are required to read sentences that have been extracted from the texts in the extracts-booklet and transform and recast the sentence using the word(s) in brackets. Even though many candidates found this task moderately challenging, there was evidence of improved performance in relation to last year.

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.

Some question-specific challenges were as follows:

- In the phrase *Διαφέρει από τα άλλα μέσα λόγω του τρόπου παρουσίασης του περιεχομένου του*, some candidates wrote *Το περιεχόμενό του διαφέρει από τα άλλα μέσα*, which is not correct, as it does not convey the sense that it differs because of the way that it is presented.
- In the phrase *Δίκαια θα αναρωτιέστε από πού τα έμαθε. (δίκιο)*, some candidates wrote *με δίκιο αναρωτιέστε* which is not a correct expression or collocation (*unless it was Με το δίκιο σας θα αναρωτιέστε...*)
- Surprisingly, the phrase *Οι παραγωγοί σε ξέρουν με το όνομά σου. (πώς)* was often rendered as *Πώς σε λένε;*

More general 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

- Changes in the prompt

Please refer to the 2025 MS for indicative content.

Question 12

In question 12 students were asked to read a 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 was very good and most candidates earned at least 7 marks out of 10. Unfortunately, a small number of candidates did not possess the required knowledge to perform at a high level of competence or showed a disregard for the position of the stress which caused them loss of marks (even when the grammatical structure in question had been otherwise correctly manipulated).

Patterns of unsatisfactory responses related to the following:

- Inflectional spelling that was inaccurate and showed poor knowledge of grammar (e.g. δικαιολογείτε)
- Changes in the voice in which the verb was given (e.g. θα υποστηρίζονται)
- Omitting the position of the stress (e.g. τεχνικες)

Conclusive remarks

In general, performance in this examination series was very good, with some examples of excellent 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 to show interpretation of the information
- answer questions 1, 3a, 5 and 7a, 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 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 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.

