



Examiner's Report Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2025

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

Summer 2025

Publications Code 9GK0_02_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

Examiner's report, 9GK0/02 Summer 2025

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. This year too, candidates who exceeded this word limit by far and continued on extra paper digressed from the requirements the question and their performance contained irrelevance, lack of focus and privileged description and all-inclusive readings of texts over critical analysis. This was particularly evident in questions 2 and 10. Many of these candidates were not able to earn marks above the 12-13 for AO4, Critical Analysis and Response.

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 and occasionally good 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 to excellent 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 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 will be accepted by the examiner if they convey the same intended meaning clearly. In this task, the assessment criteria require that the position of the stress be indicated consistently throughout this exercise. Non-

grammatical misspellings are tolerated, for example *ανάπτυξη* rather than *ανάπτuξη*, as long as they are not ambiguous or in the wrong language. Verb endings must be correct and will not be classed as spelling errors but as grammatical errors: for example, *βρίσκοντε* instead of *βρίσκονται*. Adjective and pronoun endings must be correct and will not be classed as spelling errors but as grammatical errors: for example, *πολύ κάτοικοι* instead of *πολλοί κάτοικοι*. In general, grammatical inflections, when misspelled count as errors that are not within tolerance.

The theme for this year's question 1 came from a sub-topic of Theme 2: Artistic Culture in Greece, Past and Present. Most candidates offered responses that showed acceptable to excellent understanding of the source text. Many translations consistently scored marks from the top bands of the assessment grid and the majority scored at least 12 marks out of 20. Grammar and choice of vocabulary were often applied accurately with some slips regarding individual words and phrases such as *director, international fame, demolished, monuments, cultural value*.

Syntactical challenges mostly had to do with the rendering of “of international fame” which in Greek required a genitive structure *διεθνούς φήμης*, whereas the phrase “was among those” also proved challenging, leading to incorrect constructions such as *ήταν μεταξύ αυτους* or *ήταν ανάμεσα αυτους* instead of the correct *ήταν μεταξύ αυτών/ανάμεσα σ’ αυτους*. Other common syntactical slips concerned the use of the wrong pronoun to refer to κινηματογράφους, *πολλοί τα θεωρούν* instead of the correct one *πολλοί τους θεωρούν*.

For specific information regarding this year's indicative translation, please refer to the mark scheme for summer 2025.

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 2025. 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 very good and in-depth knowledge of the poems, but not all of these offered apt critical analysis in relation to the questions asked.

Appropriate evidence was often 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 about all aspects of the poems, with close readings that included some relevance, but only tangentially. Even though a teaching approach to poetry may rely on close readings of poems, this is not always an appropriate way to respond to a question that aims to elicit a particular thematic or structural aspect. This approach was a problematic pattern, and we would like to urge candidates to reconsider this approach of writing three times as much as recommended, in order to address all aspects of the poems. It needs to be noted that any conclusive remarks that one may reach after a close reading of a poem that is not focused on the question do not derive naturally and logically from what has been discussed, because there was no focus on the question in the first place. Moreover, detailed historical accounts about the margins or origins of the poem, especially in question 2(a), often did not add anything of value to the candidate's thesis. Providing details about the reign of the Ptolemies and the demise of Mithridates are not within the expectations we have.

Question 2 (a) required from candidates to analyse the role of Alexandria in Cavafy's poems. Many essays showed a good understanding of what the city meant and stood for, but some made some leaps of assuming that any unnamed city in Cavafy's poems was meant to be Alexandria or was meant to be autobiographical. Such ungrounded assumptions were not followed by substantiating evidence and proved one-dimensional and incomplete. Successful candidates were able to select appropriate poems, such as *Απολείπειν ο θεός Αντώνιον, Ιγνατίου Τάφος* and *Μύρης Αλεξάνδρεια*, 340 μ.Χ. and go beyond a description of the contexts in which the city was mentioned to discuss its symbolic value.

Question 2(b) required from candidates to analyse three different characters that made an impression. Most responses showed excellent close knowledge of the poems. Areas of weakness had to do with long winded descriptions of the characters, what they did and what happened to them, leaving it to the examiner to draw a conclusion about their significance for the candidate.

In conclusion, areas of weakness included:

- a) Even though knowledge of the poems was secure, critical analysis and use of apt terminology were not always in evidence, especially at the level that would correspond to the 17-20 band. It is important to consider the use of terms that are specific to literary analysis, when attempting this section.
- b) 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.
- c) Rubric violations were common, especially by candidates who wrote more than recommended. In these cases, candidates continued their answer by using the space reserved for another question, which is a practice that ought to be discontinued as it causes delays and poses administrative challenges.

Performance regarding accuracy of language was consistently successful.

Questions 3, 4, 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 narrating the plot of the novel in a style and register that was not appropriate for a written essay.

There was no discernible pattern of performance in question 4 due to the low entry.

The few candidates who chose to write a response on question 5, the short stories of Economou, showed excellent close knowledge of the stories, were able to substantiate their points with appropriate evidence from relevant stories and seemed to understand the questions well. These few responses were some of the most successful in this year's 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 2025 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.

Question 6

Question 6(a) yielded mixed results in terms of candidate performance. The question on the position of women as portrayed in the film asked for three examples to offer substantiation of the candidate's arguments. Often, the three examples described three instances in the life of one woman, instead of three examples that focused on the lives of three different women. This approach proved rather limiting as the candidates kept offering three examples that all substantiated the same point. In this respect, one could not speak of a range of points ("some logical arguments are made, with some persuasive conclusions that mostly link together"), but rather one point that was exemplified three times.

Candidates who chose question 6b were very well-trained in the analysis of directorial approach and cinematic techniques and wrote responses that sustained logical arguments with some persuasive conclusions and frequent use of terminology appropriate for cinematic analysis. From identifying camera movement as an essential tool for heightening tension or showcasing emotion to soundtrack, dialogue and the overall interpretation of the plot, these candidates proved adept at providing a predominantly relevant response to the question.

Questions 7, 8, 9

Very few candidates chose these films and no discernible pattern of performance at either high or low level was detected in questions 7 and 8. Those who chose question 9 had in-depth knowledge of the film and wrote with sustained focus on the question.

Question 10

This was the most popular question in the film module. Many candidates wrote relevant responses to the questions, which could have earned more marks had they been shorter and more focused on excluding material that illustrated their knowledge of the films but not their understanding of the question. In general, and in both questions, candidates demonstrated consistent variation in the use of grammatical structures, varied use of vocabulary that allowed ideas to emerge clearly, all along using terminology appropriate for cinematic analysis.

In 10 (a) the focus of analysis was the treatment of love and romantic love, supported by three examples. Good responses focused on family and romantic relationships, e.g. between Yorgos and Estrea, Estrea and Alberto, Lela and Tsitsanis, Lela and Tasos, Tsitsanis and Zoe etc. Some responses stretched the limits of acceptability by writing unsubstantiated and hastily put together comments about love for music or one's country. In 10 (b), which required an analysis of the dramatic elements in the film, many responses excelled in identifying aspects of plot, character, theme, setting, and dialogue that contributed to the components that heightened drama and evoked audience response. A small number of candidates misinterpreted the question, as they had clearly been trained to write about the cinematic techniques that create drama; therefore, focusing on the visuals and the special effects in the film. These responses were not as successful as the ones that identified, for example, scenes that underscored the theme of doomed love or scenes whose dramatic irony foreshadowed the demise of the Jewish population of Thessaloniki.

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 and unnecessarily long 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.

