



Examiner's Report Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2025

Pearson Edexcel GCE
In Greek (9GK0)
Paper 1: Translation into English, reading
comprehension and writing

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 9GK0_01_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

Examiner's report, 9GK0/01 Summer 2025

9GK Assessment Overview

The Pearson Edexcel A level in Greek comprises three externally examined papers that assess reading, writing and listening skills. Summer 2023 marked the first full iteration of this qualification under post-pandemic conditions.

The three 9GK papers are as follows:

Paper 1: Translation into English, reading comprehension and writing (research question) in Greek

Paper 2: Translation into Greek and written response to works

Paper 3: Listening, reading and writing in Greek

All three papers draw their content from a list of themes, sub-themes and research areas which are identified below and serve as vehicles for the development of linguistic and cognitive skills, as well as cross-cultural awareness. Assessment is predominantly related to the ability to use the target language in an articulate manner, effectively, accurately and pertinently.

Themes 1, 2 and 4 focus on aspects of the society, artistic culture, and politics of Greece only. Theme 3 focuses on society and culture in Cyprus.

- Theme 1: Αλλαγές στην ελληνική κοινωνία (Changes in Greek society, past and present)
- Theme 2: Τέχνη και πνευματικός πολιτισμός στην Ελλάδα (Artistic culture in Greece, past and present)
- Theme 3: Όψεις της Κύπρου (Perspectives on Cyprus, past and present)
- Theme 4: Νέες εξελίξεις στο πολιτικό και οικονομικό πεδίο (Developments in politics and the economy, past and present)

In general, many candidates who entered for this examination demonstrated good reading, writing and listening comprehension skills and the ability to present relevant ideas in connection to their research findings and their evaluation of the questions posed to them. An unwelcome pattern of overly lengthy responses was observed in papers 1 and 2.

9GK0/01

Paper 1: Translation into English, reading comprehension and writing (research question) in Greek

This paper is worth 80 marks and candidates have 2 hours 30 minutes to complete it. It is divided into three sections and on the front page of the question paper there are recommendations as to the amount of time one should devote to each section.

Performance on this paper was marked by very good to excellent translation skills in section A, often excellent comprehension skills in Section B, in the MCQ questions in particular, and often very good evidence of research in Section C, with presence of critical analysis consistently evident in the more concise responses which adhered to the recommended wordage.

Recommended wordage for essays in section C is between 270-320 words. Many candidates, from returning centres in particular, wrote unnecessarily long answers for question 9. These answers made it clear that even though the candidates had considerable practice in exam technique, they were not trained adequately to respond to the question in a purposeful and confident manner, and instead gave in to the temptation to write everything they were taught for this “independent research” question. Many of these essays contained similarly worded information in an uncritical, list-like manner and all-inclusive responses that did not link well to the issue under focus. The citing of sources was abundant, but it did not link convincingly to the question asked. Even though some answers to question 7 had these characteristics also, the overly long essay with considerable digression was mostly evident in question 9, which draws from the topic of the refugee crisis post 2015. Illegible handwriting, rubric violations (not indicating the question choice, indicating one question choice and answering another and continuing on a page that is reserved for another question) and disregard for the conventions of spelling and clear presentation were also a common unfortunate occurrence. We request that centres kindly consider training their students to avoid such practices.

In conclusion, candidates who exceeded this word limit by far and continued on extra paper digressed from the topic and their performance contained irrelevance and loss of focus. As a result, excessively lengthy responses were assessed as all-inclusive with “occasional loss of focus on the research subject”. (AO4: band 9-12)

A) Section A: Translation into English (20 marks)

It is recommended that students spend 20 minutes on Section A, which requires the translation of a text from Greek into English. The translation into English question is marked using a points-based mark scheme (please see Sample Assessment Materials, page 23 and the MS for 2025). The translation is divided into 20 segments, and there is one mark available for the correct translation of each segment. The mark scheme gives indicative, acceptable answers for each part and variants are always accepted by the examiner if they convey the same intended meaning clearly.

This year content was drawn from Theme 3: Perspectives on Cyprus, past and present. A good number of candidates impressed with their indisputable translation skills and their ability to offer responses that showed complete understanding of the source text, its nuances and style.

Odd slips were mostly with regard to the translation of individual words, collocations and expressions. Misspelling was tolerated as long as it did not lead to ambiguity

Below you may find examples of words and sentences that seemed to pose a challenge to some candidates. Some of these hindered and slightly altered meaning, whereas others obscured it.

- 1) Σαράντα νέοι και νέες was sometimes translated as “forty boys and girls”, which does not accurately render the demographic.
- 2) θερινό σχολείο was often translated as “evening school”. Occasionally the word θερινό was omitted entirely.
- 3) πραγματοποιήθηκε posed a challenge to weaker candidates. It was often wrongly or inappropriately rendered as “originated”, “became a fact” or “became a reality”.

- 4) πήραν μέρος was often wrongly translated as “took place”. Since this is a common collocation, it is good to be able to distinguish when it means “took place” and when it means “took part”.
- 5) οφέλη was often left out or mistranslated
- 6) Έκαναν εκδρομές was often literally translated as “did excursions”, which is ambiguous

These isolated areas of weakness aside, most candidates scored 14 marks and above and showed their ability to transfer meaning from Greek into English accurately and appropriately.

B) Section B: Reading (20 marks)

It is recommended that students spend 45 minutes on Section B, which consists of four comprehension questions based on a variety of text types and genres. The questions in this section are marked using a points-based mark scheme (Please see Sample Assessment Materials, pages 27–29 and the MS for 2025).

Section B draws on vocabulary and structures across all sub-themes within the four themes and this year’s content came from themes 1, 2 and 4.

Performance in questions 2 and 3, which were based on MCQ in Greek, was very good, and often excellent, with many candidates earning full marks. There was evidence of very good ability to identify the correct detail and understand the relationship between words in order to extract meaning.

Performance in questions 4 and 5, which were based on open responses in Greek, was also very good and there was noticeable improvement in the way candidates pinpointed the correct information without bringing in extra details. Many candidates expressed themselves unambiguously and fully, which does not mean in full sentences, but with the required amount of detail. For example, a correct and appropriate answer to the question *Γιατί η Φανή καθυστερεί να πάρει το πτυχίο της* (qu. 4a) was *Γιατί εργάζεται*. Answers such as *Η Φανή καθυστερεί να πάρει το πτυχίο της γιατί εργάζεται* are unnecessarily long and in many cases, when writing spills into the margins of the page, this impacts clarity.

As is often the case with short answers in the target language, syntactical anomalies and verbatim copying from the source text hindered clarity and, sometimes obscured meaning. This was particularly the case with question 5c, when to the question *Τι συνέβαινε συχνά τον τελευταίο καιρό στην Αθήνα* many candidates wrote “*να κλέβουν άγνωστοι διάφορα μπρούτζινα αντικείμενα από το κέντρο της πόλης και να τα πουλάνε*”. This sentence was deemed incorrect as it did not contribute any information in the candidate’s own words and was syntactically misaligned with the question. Another area that some candidates found challenging had to do with question 6e which asked what the narrator found strange about the events of the day before. Even though one could speak of a coincidence, that the narrator dreamt about a writer and the next day this writer’s bust was stolen, what *she* found strange, according to the text, was that *this incident happened in the centre of Athens* (1 mark) and yet *no one saw the thieves* (1 mark).

C) Section C: Writing (research question) (40 marks)

It is recommended that students spend 1 hour 25 minutes on Section C, which draws on a **student's independent research** of their chosen research subject, which is linked to one of the 4 themes. Students must read one unseen text in Greek and then answer a question, incorporating information and ideas from both the unseen text and their research findings and citing their sources. The extent of citing varied but the majority of candidates who entered this paper were able to provide varying degrees of acceptable citations. For example, “In the 2019 book by Nikos Sideris with the title *Η Ιστορία του Ρεμπέτικου Τραγουδιού*, (Question 7); “In the documentary “*Refugee Highway*” by Chronis Pechlivanidis (Question 9).

This question is marked using three levels-based mark grids:

- 20 marks: Knowledge and understanding of society and culture (via research) (AO4)
- 10 marks: Understand and respond to written language in writing (AO2)
- 10 marks: Accuracy and range of language (AO3)

In their response, students should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of society and culture through their ideas, arguments and conclusions, supported by information, references and examples from their research. Students must also refer to information in the text that supports their ideas, arguments and conclusions (thereby showing understanding of the text).

There are more marks available for AO4 (20 marks) than AO2 (10 marks), so students are expected to place more emphasis on knowledge and understanding of society and culture (AO4) than on the text (understand and respond in writing to written language -AO2)

Many candidates showed extensive knowledge and understanding of society and culture by providing relevant ideas, information, references and examples related to the research aspects of questions 7 and 9 and occasionally of question 8. Answers to question 6 were not many but they showed impressive improvement from the performance of previous years.

One noticeable pattern of inappropriate response in relation to **Assessment Objective 2** (AO2), which targets understanding and responding to written language in writing, was evident in Section C, in question 9, in particular. This has been pointed out repeatedly year after year but, regrettably, there has been no improvement in the performance of those who choose question 9 and tend to write at excessive length.

Students should consider refraining from the practice of recasting the stimulus in their own words, in rather long-winded descriptions, devoting more than half of the recommended words to an unrequired and irrelevant task. This is the expert recommendation of the examining team, which is based on the spec demands and has been reiterated in previous reports. Yet, the pattern continues. This year the practice was exacerbated, particularly in the essays of a considerable number of candidates who thought it appropriate to write in extra paper, producing four times as much as suggested. This summing up of what the source text says is irrelevant, it is not required, and it deducts marks from the response, as it a digression and repetition. Instead, what is expected is linking one's opinion or evidence presented in relation to the question asked to what is claimed in the source text and proceed to explain whether they agree with that position or not.

For example, in question 8, and to satisfy the requirements of AO2, one could write in the following manner: *As the source text claims, “Περισσότερα από 80 είναι τα ρεμπέτικα τραγούδια της δεκαετίας του 1930 που έχουν ως θέμα γυναίκες που ζουν μέσα στη ρεμπέτικη κοινότητα”. My research corroborates this claim and also shows that women were also the performers who made these songs famous. Songs like “Αλανιάρια Μερακλού» and “Είμαι μια τσαχπίνια” sang by Roza Eshkenazy and «Όλο θέλεις κι όλο θέλεις» sang by Lela Oikonomidou deal with themes that affected women in the 30s, most importantly the women who moved in the rebetiko circles and defied the social conventions of the period regarding gender roles. These songs were about independent women who were not bowed by the social demands about marriage, housework and modesty that the period placed on them... etc.*

Providing a summary as part of the AO2 requirement (Understand and Respond to Written Language) shows that candidates from some centres are not familiar with the demands of this paper. Please consider training the candidates to remain focused on responding to the given prompt and demonstrate the ways in which their thesis may be supported or argue against the ideas or the information in the stimulus text.

Question 6

More candidates than in previous years chose this question, and performance showed a vast improvement to last year's. In the 2025 series we saw fewer personalised narratives based on anecdotal experience or simply ideas not backed by research, and we saw more evaluative statements grounded in bibliographical data drawn from educational websites such as [The Institute for Educational Policy](#), [AlfaVita](#) or [Esos](#). Many essays were able to make evaluative comparisons with previous academic curricula and pinpoint with confidence and relevance the benefits of the new instructional approaches and digital tools, while also offering caveats about overreliance in technology and the complete abandonment of traditional methods of teaching and learning. Some exceptionally able candidates were able to link the introduction of new measures to a documented lack of resources and unsatisfactory labour conditions for the teaching staff and suggested a more wholistic approach to the improvement of education in Greece.

Question 7

Question 7 was the second most popular question and yielded some comprehensive, well-articulated and properly researched and cited responses. The essays on question 7 showed that many candidates who chose this topic were well prepared and had appropriate training in using relevant information from their research to link to the question about the role of women in the history of rebetiko music. Relevant responses identified a social climate of patriarchal values, that was not conducive to women performing in the public or to the subject matter of women who were living the lifestyle of the rebetes, and singled out elements of the life and work of Roza, Marika Ninou, Rita Ambatzi etc, to argue that women contributed to the success and longevity of rebetiko. References to bibliography were clear and impressive in their range: from Petropoulos' study to Spyriadou's monograph *“Η Κοινωνική θέση των Γυναικών στα Ρεμπέτικα Τραγούδια του Μεσοπολέμου”*.

There were instances where candidates felt compelled to give lengthy accounts of the various phases of rebetiko, including details about the careers of, for example, Markos Vamvakaris and Vassilis Tsitsanis, which was outside the scope of the question, when they failed to link that to an argument about a male-dominated cultural practice and product which was not always friendly to women. Such extraneous details are deemed irrelevant when they remain descriptive and do not offer no obvious thesis in relation to the presence and the contribution of women. Short introductions that identify the context and perhaps some historical transitions can help frame the argument, but these surveys of the topic that take up a lot of space and only tangentially remember to address the question in a sentence or two are not useful. Depending on the extent of this practice of writing all one knows about the topic, as opposed to all one knows about the specific topic question, the essays are awarded marks out of the 5-8 band for AO4 (“some reliance on description rather than analysis”) or out of the 9-12 band (“occasionally relies on description rather than analysis”).

Question 8

A very small number of students chose this question. Performance in this question varied from very good to satisfactory. Students performed well with regard to Assessment Objective 4 (AO4), that targets knowledge and understanding of the research subject and Assessment Objective 3 (AO3), that targets Accuracy and Range of language. As is often the case, engagement with the source text took the form of a synopsis rather than a conversation with the ideas it contains.

The majority of the candidates focused on the various diplomatic efforts under the auspices of the UN to a solution of the “Cyprus issue”

and the various cultural and educational initiatives for reconciliation, for example bi-communal film and music festivals etc. Interestingly, very few focused on the issue of the impact of the partition on the cultural heritage of the island.

Occasionally, narrative that drew from the candidates’ extensive knowledge of the subject was at the expense of analysis or a more consistently purposeful response to the question, resulting in loss of focus. Most candidates referred successfully to the sources they used for their research, which included the official, government issued history textbooks and various articles from the press and websites.

Question 9

Question 9 was the most popular question in this series, but, as in the last two years and because many of the candidates who choose this question come from returning centres there has been very little noticeable improvement of ongoing challenges that relate to the volume of irrelevant information presented and the absence of critical engagement with the question. What started off as impressive performance on a topic of critical importance has become a practice of showcasing everything one was taught, with little consideration for analysis and relevance. In this respect, we believe that very able candidates who could otherwise gain marks from the top tiers of the

assessment criteria, do not manage to reach their potential because of their approach and their particular exam technique.

Many of the essays on this question were rehearsed and unnecessarily lengthy, descriptive and all-inclusive, containing often list-like accounts of everything that the candidate knew about the migrant crisis. This type of response required painstaking reading on the part of the examiners, in order to extract pertinence from an excessive volume of information. A positive aspect of these essays is that they cited references successfully, although, often, citations had very little to do with the question asked.

In addition, almost every essay started with identical one page recasting of the source text (one could not call them summaries as they were often longer than the source text). This was completely unnecessary and for this reason very few responses earned more than 6 marks for AO2.

In many of these essays, the candidates, earned full marks because of their native speaker language competence, but were marked out of the 9-12 band for AO4, because focus on the issue of integration was lost amidst uncritically presented information about NGO initiatives, border incidents and narratives about success stories that contained stories of integration but did not articulate a thesis about this issue. Had a better economy with words been displayed regarding the information the candidates possessed and had better judgment been exercised as to what to include, therefore making a response more relevant, candidates would have earned higher marks.

Ultimately it is in the candidates' interest to be trained to consider a different, more concise and analytical approach to this question.

Conclusion

In the 2025 series we saw a high level of performance in Sections A and B, with candidates displaying excellent translation and comprehension skills. Most candidates scored full marks in the AO2 category of Section C.

In general, candidates who study for this QP are advised to consider the following:

- Read each question carefully before answering
- Check answers if there is time at the end
- Keep in mind the importance of clear Greek and careful presentation in order to avoid ambiguous or illegible answers
- Write your response in the space allocated for each question. Do NOT indicate with an asterisk that the response continues on another page. This creates an administrative nightmare. If needed, seek extra paper.

- **In Section A**

Please consider the following:

- Do not offer a series of alternatives in the translation. The examiner will only take into consideration the first word on offer.
- Practice the translation of collocations: In Greek you may “do” an excursion, *κάνω εκδρομή*, in English you “go on an excursion” (among others).
- Do not leave individual words untranslated, if you can. Try to offer a periphrasis if the exact word escapes you.
- Literal translations do not always work, as the rules that govern the production of meaning are different in the two languages (in Greek ‘the case system’, in English ‘word order’). For example, *να μάθουν οι νέοι* *cannot* be rendered in English with the subject after the verb (*to learn the young*) but with the subject before the verb (*for the young to learn*.)

- **In section B**

- There is no requirement to respond in full sentences to open-response questions. Candidates are advised against incorporating the question in their answers. For example, the following pattern should be avoided:

Αυτό που παραξένεψε την αφηγήτρια σε σχέση με αυτό που συνέβη χτες ήταν το ότι...

And instead, the candidate should begin with the phrase that responds succinctly:

Το ότι κανένας δεν είδε τους κλέφτες...

- It is permitted for candidates to use words from the reading extract in their answer, but they must not copy whole sections, as this invariably leads to inaccurate and unclear, or all-inclusive responses.
- There are no marks for quality of language in this section, so spelling and grammar mistakes will be tolerated, as long as they do not introduce ambiguity or hamper clarity.
- For a one-mark answer, the first response is taken as the answer, even if this response is incorrect and the correct information follows later. Where two marks are available, the same rule applies, i.e., the first two responses are taken as the given answer, even if they are incorrect and the correct information follows later.
- Answers must be in Greek – correct answers in the wrong language will not be awarded marks.

- **In Section C**

In order to improve performance, it is important to consider that research-based questions in section C are designed around certain principles that require:

- a) good knowledge of the topic
- b) analysis of the statement posed, in relation to the research conducted
- c) citations or references to sources. Responses that refer to just one single research source cannot be awarded marks above the 13–18 mark range
- d) engagement with the written stimulus in a critical not summative manner.

Where wordage is recommended, candidates should consider adhering to the guidelines. Good responses are not accounts of everything one knows or everything that is true; rather they are rewarded for succinct, purposeful and fully developed arguments and consistent and precise focus on the statement/question.

Thank you for choosing to study this specification.

