



Pearson  
Edexcel

Examiners' Report  
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2024

Pearson Edexcel GCE  
In Greek (9GK0)

Paper 02: 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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2024

Publications Code 9GK0\_02\_2406\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London, WC2R 0RL, United Kingdom

## 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 Greek 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, lack of focus and privileged description over critical analysis.

Assessment in this paper is predominantly related to the ability to use the target language in an articulate manner, effectively, accurately and pertinently, in order to address questions or prompts relating to topics and texts of written and film modalities. 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 explanation and argumentation continue to be evident and there has been no noticeable effort by certain overseas centres to comply with the expectations for this paper and the recommendations of these reports.

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 2024). 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 4: The economy post 2009/social strife. 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 *protests*, *residents*, and *refugees*. Syntactical challenges, because of interference from a literary translation from English, led some candidates to wrongly add a preposition in “Να τους παρέχουν με”. Other examples of challenges include the translation of *where* with the pronoun “που” instead of the adverb “όπου”, as in “τα Εξάρχεια είναι μια γειτονιά όπου”; the use of the incorrect case with the adverb ενάντια, as in “ενάντια της οικονομικής κρίσης” instead of the correct “ενάντια στην οικονομική κρίση”; the use of the incorrect case with the adverb “κατά”, as in the phrase “κατά την κρίση” instead of the correct “κατά της κρίσης”.

## 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 2024 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) required from candidates to analyse the ways in which Cavafy's poems engage with the theme of loss and defeat. Candidates chose historical poems to analyse the way leaders dealt with the experience of loss or impending defeat (*Αλεξανδρινοί Βασιλείς, Απολείπειν ο Θεός Αντώνιον, Η Μάχη της Μαγνησίας*), whereas others shifted their focus on a variety of more personal or philosophical poems, where an individual reflects on the loss of love or youth (*Ένας γέρος, Ο ήλιος του απογεύματος, Μέρες του 1903*). Certain responses which restricted themselves to poems with similar world views and attitudes to loss, either embedded in historical poems only or solely in the so-called 'love' poems, ended up repeating the same argument, except with different substantiation each time. The candidates who used a variety of poems, and therefore a variety of behaviours and attitudes in a mixture of philosophical, love and historical poems, scored marks from the higher bands of the assessment criteria. These responses demonstrated their competences of critical analysis with a variety of points of view

and examples, in other words going above and beyond “particular aspects of the work”.

Question 2(b) required from candidates to analyse three different aspects of Cavafy’s technique. The responses were not as successful as in 2(a). First, because the term ‘technique’ was often misunderstood and interpreted as any ‘aspect’ of Cavafy’s poetry (for example values or themes, instead of dramatic irony or symbolism) and secondly because many candidates offered wordy and close readings of poems without pinpointing the exact technique they were alluding to.

In conclusion, areas of weakness included:

a) Even though the focus on the poems and the questions was often secure in 2(a), 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 ‘techniques’ with ‘characteristics’ in 2(b).

c) Unnecessarily long responses continue **to not** earn marks from the top bands, on account of overreliance on detailed summaries of poems and close readings that do not sustain focus on the question.

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.

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 2024 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. Most of the candidates opted for 6 (a), which invited a critical response to the prompt "The film conveys a negative view of island life". In general, candidates had good knowledge of the film, and tended to side with the statement, offering apt examples such as the position of women on Andros and the impact of restrictive social conventions on both men and women, which often resulted in secrets and strained and unhappy relationships.

### **Question 10**

This was the most popular question in the film module. Question 10 (a) invited candidates to analyse the nature of relationships and give three examples to substantiate their views. It was undeniable that candidates had watched the films closely and were able to recall abundant detail in relation to the relationships between various protagonists- mostly between Yorgos and Estrea, Vassilis and Lela or Olga and Yorgos and Vassilis. A noticeable area of weakness was in relation to the absence of convincing arguments that followed naturally from the descriptive information provided and the absence of conclusive remarks that linked to the description and analysis. For a response to be considered pertinent and

comprehensive, the candidates ought to have answered this question: what do these relationships tell us about the overriding values of the period, the attitudes to country, religion, social convention etc.?

Question 10 (b) invited a critical analysis of the aptness of the title of the film. Answers were distinguished by excellent knowledge of cinema-specific terms and ability to argue in direct response to the question.

## **Conclusion**

It was welcome to see a good 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 Sections B and C, AO3 in particular, which 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
- Write and restrict their response in the space allocated to each question. Avoid writing in additional papers and certainly refrain from continuing a response on another page of the script, other than the question-specific space. The online marking system does not accommodate such infringements easily
- 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. Candidates should not write everything they know, only what is relevant to the question
- 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 phrases 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 intrusive, therefore betraying an insecure knowledge of grammar, or ambiguous
- Mixing of English and Greek characters is not tolerated, including t instead of τ and u instead of υ.
- 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.