Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2023

Pearson Edexcel GCE
In Greek (9GK0)
Paper 2: Translation into Greek and written
response to works

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

Assessment Overview
Paper 2: Translation into Greek and written response to works

This is a 2-hour 40-minute paper and the total marks is 110. It consists of three sections. Candidates are required to answer question 1 in Section A and two questions from Sections B and C- this means **either** two questions from Section B **or** one question from Section B and **one** question from Section C. Candidates **are not allowed** to choose two questions from the module on cinema, only one. The recommended wordage for essays in sections B and C is between 270-320 words. Candidates who exceeded this word limit by far and continued on extra paper digressed from the topic and their performance contained irrelevance and lack of focus.

Assessment in this paper is predominantly related to the ability to use the target language in an articulate manner, effectively, accurately and pertinently. The majority of candidates were successful in achieving good marks in the category of AO3 (Accuracy of Language and Range of Grammatical Structures) and demonstrated acceptable or satisfactory skills in the category of Critical and Analytical Response (AO4). The existence of assessment criteria that rely heavily not only on relevance but also on critical analysis and use of apt, topic-specific terminology meant that candidates with good literacy skills were able to score from the top bands of these two categories.

An unfortunate pattern of overly long answers, illegible handwriting, all-inclusive response and narrative at the expense of analysis was also evident.

In general, many candidates who entered for this examination demonstrated good translation skills and the ability to present relevant ideas in connection to their research findings and their evaluation of the questions posed to them.

Section A: Question 1 (20 marks)

It is recommended that students spend 30 minutes on Section A, which requires the translation of a text from English into Greek. The translation is marked using a points-based mark scheme (please see Sample Assessment Materials and the MS for 2023). 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 will be accepted by the examiner if they convey the same intended meaning clearly.

The theme for this year's question 1 came from a sub-topic of Theme 3: Perspectives on Cyprus/rural versus urban environment. It was a real pleasure to see that the majority of candidates offered responses that showed very good to excellent understanding of the source text. The translations consistently scored marks from the top bands of the assessment grid. Grammar and choice of vocabulary were applied consistently accurately with rare slips regarding individual words such as *dawn*, *farm*, *farmer* and the phrase *you won't make it*. As far as performance in translation was concerned, this must have been the best prepared cohort since this paper's inception.

B) Section B: Written Response to Works (Literary texts) (45 marks)

It is recommended that students spend 1 hour 5 minutes on each response in Sections B and C. Students must write an extended response on either one or two of the literary texts listed in the specification. Students choose one question from a choice of two for each of their chosen literary texts. If a student answers questions on two literary texts, then they do **not** complete Section C.

In both sections B and C, Written Response to Works, each individual essay is marked using three levels-based mark grids: Critical and analytical response (AO4), Range of grammatical structures and vocabulary (AO3) and Accuracy of language (AO3). Answers are marked according to the guidance on pages 61-66 of the Sample Assessment Materials. For specific information regarding this year's indicative content, please refer to the mark scheme for the summer 2023 examinations. Bear in mind that this is not exhaustive, and students could be (and were) rewarded for any valid response that may draw on any relevant examples from the work they studied.

For guidance regarding critical responses to literary texts, please refer to the published guides How to analyse a text or a Film and Approaches to Teaching Literature on the Pearson Website.

Question 2: Poems by Cavafy

Question 2 was the most popular. Most responses showed good knowledge of the poems and offered apt critical analysis in relation to the questions asked, which was a very refreshing pattern in the literature section. Appropriate evidence was selected to substantiate points and it was impressive to see the range of appropriate quotations that exemplified a statement. In general, detailed arguments were made with some persuasive conclusions reached.

Question 2 (a) was about the portrayal of values in Cavafy's poetry and it was the most popular of the two. Most responses showed good knowledge of the poems and argued in direct relation to the questions asked, with some loss of focus when a summary of the poem was favoured rather than interpretation and argumentation. Appropriate evidence was selected to justify ideas and it was impressive to see the range of apt quotations that exemplified a statement. Some areas of weakness included:

a) Even though the focus on the poems and the questions was often secure, critical analysis and use of apt terminology were not always in evidence, especially at the higher level of 17-20 (the top band). It is important to consider the use of terms that are specific to literary analysis, when attempting this section.
b) Some candidates confused the theme of 'values' with 'character traits" and instead of addressing the theme in relation to interpreting the characters' attitudes to life, they described how characters behaved without going the extra step of analysing this behaviour in terms of values or even attributing a name (patriotism/religious faith/ sense of responsibility) to these traits. In other

words, what was missing was going the extra step to draw a conclusion that tied all these descriptions together.

Question 2 (b) was on the theme of "love between people" and was not tackled as successfully as 2 (a), as some essays relied mostly on all-inclusive summaries of poems without interpretation, without expanding on the point that this tells us about attitudes to love. There was occasional misreading of the question, when candidates wrote about love for one's country, love for God, etc.

There was a pattern of overly lengthy responses, especially in non-traditional scripts that had their essays continued in an extra booklet. These essays went into unnecessary detail, which employed narrative at the expense of critical analysis and failed to demonstrate the ability to discriminate between relevant and all-inclusive accounts.

In general, though, detailed arguments were made with some persuasive conclusions attached. Performance regarding accuracy of language was consistently successful.

Questions 3-5

Very few candidates chose these questions.
Those who chose question 3, *Achilles's fiancée* by Alki Zei, seemed to possess excellent close knowledge of the novel and understood the questions well. Only occasionally some factual details were wrong and there was a predilection for overly long descriptions.

There was no discernible pattern of performance in questions 4 and 5 due to low entry. However, more people than last year studied the short stories of Christos Economou and performance was satisfactory, but occasionally relying on narrative at the expense of analysis.

The language skills of candidates in all of these questions were very good.

Section C: Written response to works (films) (45 marks)

It is recommended that students spend 1 hour 5 minutes on their chosen response in Section C. Students must write an extended response on one of the films listed in the specification (if they only answered one question in Section B). They may choose one question from a choice of two on the film they have studied. The assessment criteria for this section are the same as the ones for Section B. Answers are marked according to the guidance on pages 61-66 of the Sample Assessment Materials and specific information regarding this year's indicative content may be found in the mark scheme for the summer 2023 examinations. For guidance regarding critical responses to films, please refer to the published guides How to analyse a Text or Film and Approaches to Teaching Film on the Pearson website.

Questions 6-9

Not many candidates chose these films and no discernible pattern of performance at either high or low level was detected, particularly in questions 7-9.

Question 6, which invited critical responses to the film "Little England", proved to be the most popular choice. The majority of the candidates opted for 6 (a), which invited a comparison of the two main characters. An area of weakness concerned the tendency to describe the characters separately, leaving it to the reader to draw conclusions about comparison.

Those who chose 6(b), a critical analysis of the "end" of the film, did not perform as well. In general, candidates had good knowledge of the film, but did not demonstrate consistently the ability to form clear interpretations and logical arguments in response to the question.

A small number of candidates chose *September.* Their essays showed their close reading of the film through descriptive and occasionally perceptive accounts of Anna's character in 8 (b).

Question 10

This was the most popular question in the film module. Question 10(a) which required an analysis of three characters that made an impression on the viewer/candidate. It was undeniable that candidates had watched the films closely and were able to recall abundant detail in relation to their attitudes and actions. Perhaps this is also why many of the responses failed to provide a full argument. A noticeable area of weakness was in relation to the absence of convincing arguments that followed naturally from the descriptive information provided, in order for a full response to the question that mattered: why were these particular profiles singled out?

Question 10 (b) invited a critical analysis of the director's approach. Answers in 10b were distinguished by excellent knowledge of cinema-specific terms and ability to argue in direct response to the question, albeit a little too exaggeratedly in favour of the film's strengths.

Conclusion

This was the first full iteration of the 9GK specification in post-pandemic conditions and it was welcome to see such a high level of performance in 9GK02, particularly in Section A and in some research-based questions. Candidates who attempt this paper are advised to familiarise themselves with the principles of assessment, in relation to AO3 in particular, which is a relatively new addition and requires the employment of terminology that is appropriate for literary and cinematic analysis. They are also advised to read the published guides on film and literary analysis, referenced earlier in this report, and build a glossary of terms that they may employ in their analysis.

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

- Read each question carefully before answering
- Keep in mind the importance of clear Greek and careful presentation in order to avoid ambiguous or illegible answers
- Where wordage is recommended, ensure that they adhere to the guidelines. Good responses are not accounts of everything one knows or everything that is true; rather they are marked by succinct, purposeful and fully developed arguments, consistent focus on the question and precision
- Read the passage carefully before translating it
- The position of the stress must be indicated consistently throughout responses in Greek
- Use of alternative translations of individual words or phrase ought to be avoided. The examiner will mark only the first available translation
- Spelling: non-grammatical misspellings are tolerated, as long as they are not ambiguous or they do not impact the clarity and communicative effectiveness of the piece
- Familiarisation with the assessment criteria for each question ensures that there is clarity regarding expectations and awareness of what is required for an effective response
- Attention to the rubric is important to avoid misunderstanding of the question in Sections B and C. Although factual knowledge of the texts and films is required, a pertinent response must link this knowledge to the specific requirements of the question and show a full evaluation of the material in direct response to the question. All-inclusive answers may earn the candidate some marks, but unless the question is addressed, these answers will not earn marks from the top tiers of the assessment criteria
- Check answers if there is time at the end, to make sure there are no omissions

Thank you for choosing to study this specification.