



Pearson  
Edexcel

Examiners' Report  
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2022

Pearson Edexcel GCE  
In Greek (9GK0 02)

## **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 2022

Publications Code 9GK0\_02\_2206\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

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

## Examiner's report, 9GK0/02

### Summer 2022

#### 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. As 9GK02 resembles the old 6GK02 specification in terms of content and test design, performance was not hampered by the introduction of significantly new content. In fact, 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 introduction of assessment criteria that rely heavily not only on relevance but also on critical analysis and use of apt terminology meant that candidates with superior 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 were 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 2022). The translation is divided into 20 'chunks', and there is one mark available for the correct translation of each chunk. The mark scheme gives indicative, acceptable answers for each chunk and variants will be accepted by the examiner if they convey the same intended meaning clearly.

Question 1 draws its content from one of the following themes:

- 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)

The theme for this year's question came from a sub-topic of Theme 4, The economy after 2009; social strife and conflicts.

It was a pleasure to see that a good number of candidates offered responses that showed good understanding of the source text and satisfactory translation skills. Often enough, there was evidence of sound knowledge of structures and vocabulary and many translations flowed well, with errors that did not significantly hinder clarity and did not obscure meaning. Many candidates performed in a satisfactory manner, conveying intended meaning well, albeit with occasional slips in spelling, word order and the use of prepositions. Observed challenges pertained to the following:

- lexical challenges such as: recent demonstration, protested, landlords
- grammatical structures and the rendering of certain phrases and relative clauses:
  - 'against high rents' was often conveyed with an inaccurate case that created ambiguity, e.g., κατά τα υψηλά ενοίκια instead of κατά των υψηλών ενοικίων
  - 'they blame tourists' was rendered as Φταίνε τους τουρίστες instead of ρίχνουν το φταιξιμο στους τουρίστες or λένε πως φταίνε οι τουρίστες
  - 'asked families' (to move out) was rendered as ζήτησαν οικογένειες, which created ambiguity, instead of the correct ζήτησαν από οικογένειες
  - 'Stella, who works in this neighbourhood' was sometimes translated with the omission of the definite article in Greek and not as a relative clause, e.g., Στέλλα δουλεύει, resulting in a syntactical anomaly that affected clarity.

Occasionally, poor English or Greek prevented candidates from transferring meaning clearly, in a syntactically accurate manner and with the correct amount of specificity. A common example was the first paragraph where translation by weaker candidates often relied on guesswork.

## **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 2022 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 argued in relation to the questions asked, which was a very refreshing pattern in the literature section. Appropriate evidence was selected to justify ideas and it was impressive to see the range of apt quotations that exemplified a statement. In general, detailed arguments were made with some persuasive conclusions attached.

Even though the focus on the poems and the questions was secure, critical analysis and use of apt terminology were not always in evidence in some responses, especially at the higher level of 17-20 (the top band).

There was a pattern on 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.

Performance regarding accuracy of language was consistently successful.

Question 2(a) targeted knowledge and understanding of the way Cavafy treats the theme of religion. In general, candidates who answered this question selected relevant poems such as, Ο Ιουλιανός εν Νικομηδεία, Η αρρώστια του Κλείτου and Ιγνατίου Τάφος. They offered appropriate interpretations, justified by textual evidence, although this occasionally consisted of the retelling of the whole poem in one's own words, rather than a selected paraphrased detail or quotation that

reflected a specificity that was relevant to the question. An area where performance veered off into a territory that was not strictly related to literary analysis concerned detailed explanations of the historical background in certain poems, *Ο Ιουλιανός εν Νικομηδεία* in particular. In such cases, it would have sufficed to establish succinctly that the context of the poem pointed to an era of religious transition and explain Julian's hypocrisy in historically specific as well as diachronic terms, that draw from the content of the poem, rather than from lengthy historical accounts. History may help students understand and appreciate the poem and it is useful to establish briefly the historical framework. However, a critical analysis of the poem in relation to the question should be prioritised over an exploration of the history that informs it.

Candidates who discussed critically the instability and apparent hypocrisy of certain characters' religious beliefs (*Ο Ιουλιανός εν Νικομηδεία*, *Μύρης Αλεξάνδρεια του 340 μ.Χ.*), the expediencies that affected the religiosity of others (*Η αρρώστια του Κλείτου*), or even the ambiguous light in which certain displays of religious piety occurred (*Ιγνατίου Τάφος*) drew some persuasive conclusions that were justified with appropriately selected textual evidence. Those who relied on the biographical details of Cavafy or Julian, included appropriate evidence in an all-inclusive way, by summarising the whole poem, or presented the historical context in detail, and therefore did not always succeed in maintaining focus and presenting convincing interpretations and points of view.

Question 2(b) targeted knowledge and understanding of Cavafy's treatment of history. Many candidates chose this question and performance showed that they had been well-prepared. In fact, many of the essays in this section contained an overabundance of information that was sometimes presented in a list-like fashion, identifying the various categories of historicity (*ψευδοϊστορικά*, *ιστορικοφανή* and *ιστοριογενή*) and ultimately serving as a detailed report, rather than a critical exploration of what these different categories mean, what purpose they serve and which historical poems fit these categories. When this detailed display of knowledge serves as a two-page introduction that describes, among others, the historical event of the Donations of Alexandria or the aftermath of the Battle of Corinth in 146 B.C., it detracts from a convincing interpretation of a literary text and logical arguments that are justified by appropriately selected textual evidence. 20 marks out of 45 in this section are reserved for critical analysis, therefore the 'information' value of performance must be linked to interpretation. References to a historiographical or *ιστοριογενές* poem that was born out of historical material, such as *Αλεξανδρινοί βασιλείς*, are useful when they are accompanied by an explanation that Cavafy used historical material selectively, in order to criticise a type of behaviour, that is rooted in historical time, but is also of diachronic relevance. Some candidates were able to write with this level of critical engagement, establishing relevant details regarding the historical material, but never losing sight of the poetry.

### Questions 3-5

Very few candidates chose these questions. Those who chose question 3 wrote mostly plot summaries and did not present persuasive arguments based on interpretation. Often, factual details regarding the novel by Alki Zei were inaccurate, showing a superficial reading of the book.

No one chose question 4

Only a handful of candidates chose question 5 and no discernible pattern of performance at either high or low level was detected.

### 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 2022 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

Very few candidates chose these films and no discernible pattern of performance at either high or low level was detected. Performance regarding critical analysis ranged from satisfactory (9-12) to good (13-15), with responses to the film *Little England* and *September* standing out as the most insightful and expressed in articulate writing. The small number of candidates who chose to study the film *Νοτιάς* showed their close reading of the film through descriptive and occasionally perceptive accounts of the Stavros' temporary friendships with peers and the meaningful bond between Sotiris, Thanos and Stavros.

### Question 10

This was the most popular question in the film module. Question 10(a) which targeted knowledge and understanding of society in *Ουζερί Τσιτσάνης* was chosen by most candidates who studied this film. The majority of responses portrayed convincingly, with relevant supporting detail, a society on the cusp of serious change, deeply affected by the Nazi occupation and divided by different ideologies and religions. Many candidates engaged with question 10(a) critically and made

astute observations, analysing, for example, dominant perspectives about the role of women and the commonalities of gender stereotypes across class and religion. Some candidates who had studied the film and had close knowledge of the plot and characters, argued along the wrong lines in places, putting emphasis on the description of specific characters instead of identifying a visible characteristic of the society (for example patriotism, conflict, attitude to gender, camaraderie) and exploring it by referring to specific groups or characters for substantiation.

Responses to 10(b) ranged from good to excellent, especially when they analysed aspects of the cinematography. Essays in this section showed knowledge of appropriate terminology to discuss a film, identified a range of relevant elements that affected their enjoyment and assessment of *Ουζερί Τσιτσάνης* and drew intelligent and articulate conclusions. Examples of insightful commentary included references to the plot, which did not include summaries of it; the theme (doomed love, racial hatred etc.); cinematic techniques like camera movement and photography (from zooming into details to add to dramatic tension to the camera panning out to add movement, perspective and depth to static scenes); acting (the theatrical stiltedness of certain protagonists); costume design, music and many others.

In general, responses to question 10 were marked by relevance and convincing and justified links between the material and its interpretation.

## **Conclusion**

This was the first full iteration of the 9GK specification and it was welcome to see such a high level of performance in 9GK02, particularly in Section A and in some research-based questions on old and new texts and films from Sections B and C. Research-based questions in this question paper work in similar ways to the research-based questions in the old specification, that were based on topics and texts: one is expected to show good knowledge of the topic and engage in critical analysis by focusing on a particular question, all along demonstrating skills of organisation and development and knowledge and application of language. The new assessment descriptors regarding AO3 (Range of grammatical structures and vocabulary) and AO4 (Critical and Analytical Response) add clarity to expectations regarding the level of demand. To provide a critical and analytical response, students should select only relevant material and link their points of view to it, to justify and develop their arguments. 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 your 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 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.