



# **Examiner's Report**

## **Principal Examiner Feedback**

**Summer 2018**

**Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level  
In Greek (WGK02) Paper 2  
Writing and Research**

## **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 2018

Publications Code WGK02\_01\_1806\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

## **Introduction**

This was the first examination series of the IAL WGK02 in Greek. The candidates who sat this examination generally performed well, particularly in Sections A and B of the question paper.

A good number of candidates produced competent responses, demonstrating familiarity with the rudiments of essay writing, good knowledge of the topics and texts and a level of language awareness that enabled them to apply their knowledge of Greek, in order to compose pertinent responses, exercise a degree of critical interpretation and offer factually correct details pertaining to their chosen topics and texts. There was also a considerable number of candidates who, despite evidently good language skills failed to read the questions carefully and provide succinct but comprehensive responses with appropriate exemplification (questions 2a and 2b, in particular). Many of the overtly long responses in Section C offered, contained irrelevance and unaccountable digression that did not serve the candidates' skills and knowledge well. Those answers that relied too heavily on description at the expense of analysis and interpretation did not manage to score high marks from the third category of Critical analysis and Organization and Development.

## **Section A**

Section A includes one question which requires translation into Greek. The response is marked according to descriptors that span 5 levels of achievement from Level 1 (marks 1-2) to Level 5 (marks 9-10). This grid is applied to each half of the translation and the two sub-totals are added to give a total of 20.

A good number of candidates produced satisfactory translations which showed control of meaning, good command of vocabulary and structures, with many scoring 14 marks and above. Very few candidates lacked the language skills in order to grasp more than the basic sense of the passage and transfer meaning into Greek. A small number of candidates opted for summaries of the source text, rather than translations, whereas others offered several translation alternatives instead of sticking with one. Candidates are advised against both of these practices.

A number of candidates found the sentences "As a result, they have been nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize" and "I came out of it well financially" challenging and chose to paraphrase or sum up the meaning using vocabulary that was available to them. Such responses were rewarded, as they indicated that the candidates were in control of meaning. Consequently, they were rewarded with marks from the top boundaries of the assessment grid.

Generally, the translations contained correct vocabulary and grammar, a variety of appropriate structures and few lapses. A pattern of vocabulary errors mostly concerned high frequency words such as "south" and "west", which were often wrongly rendered as "ανατολικά" and "βόρεια". These slips aside, the level of

competence in transferring meaning from English into Greek was impressively high.

## **SECTION B**

In this section, students are asked to write a 240–280-word essay, in Greek, in response to a short Greek language stimulus. Students choose to write creatively or discursively on the topic through two options provided. The assessment rewards students for communicating relevant information effectively as well as for the quality of the Greek language produced.

The majority of students performed very well in this section, with many scoring 21 marks and above. A good number of students achieved marks from the top bands (levels 4 and 5) of the categories for “Content and Communication” and “Quality of Language”, with responses to 2a scoring slightly better than responses to 2b.

Question 2 invited candidates to offer opinion regarding the usefulness of university study and in response to a short stimulus. There was the option of a discursive versus a creative piece and most students chose the discursive option. The level of performance was high and most students demonstrated the ability to express and link ideas in a logical and effective sequence and, when it came to the creative option, write with enough variety and fluency to interest the reader.

On the rare occasion that answers failed to perform at level 4 or 5, this was mostly due to omissions regarding the citing of examples, or a certain imbalance in the treatment of the topic, where opinion tilted heavily towards one side only, with nothing but cursory mention of the opposing view. In the case of the creative piece, candidates are reminded that the adoption of a correct register and tone are an important aspect of addressing the task effectively. Writing to a friend requires an informal register and a certain familiarity with the addressee.

## **SECTION C**

In section C, students must answer one question, in Greek, that relates to a topic or a text chosen from the prescribed list featured in Section 2.4 of the specification (Set topics, texts and films). A choice of two questions is offered for each of the prescribed topics and texts. Students are expected to write 300–400 words. On several occasions, this number was exceeded by far and worked against the candidate’s benefit, as the material often included extraneous and irrelevant details that detracted from the pertinence of the piece.

As this was the first exam series of the WGK02 specification, candidates stayed with topics and texts familiar to them through the A level legacy specification and did not address any of the questions from the modules on *Films and documentaries*:

*Conversations about crisis in Greek society and Short stories from the Greek-speaking world.*

Comments on individual questions are as follows:

### Question 3

Very few candidates chose question 3 and all of those who did selected question 3a. This invited them to comment on the role that the Greek royal family played in the political scene of the 60s. A good number of essays showed good factual knowledge of the period and the topic and expressed their observations in good Greek. Main lapses were with regard to the aspect of critical analysis, whereby the examples cited were not followed by pertinent comments regarding the impact that certain actions had on the politics and society of Greece, during that period.

### Question 4

A very small number of candidates answered the questions on the History of Cyprus. Those who did were in possession of the appropriate facts in relation to the 1931 uprising and wrote providing relevant supporting evidence and some insightful observations.

### Question 6

Question 6 was the second most popular question among this year's candidates. In general, the level of performance was satisfactory or very good, with many candidates at Level 5 for Content and Quality of Language and Level 4, for critical analysis, organization and development. Students were able to identify the appropriate details regarding the values that motivate the characters' actions (6a) and the nature of the relationship between children and adults (6b).

Many of the responses to 6a identified love for freedom (*Ένα Τραγούδι δε φτάνει*), friendship (*Τα Δελφινάκια του Αμβρακικού*), and love for one's country/religion/family (*Πολίτικη Κουζίνα*) as the primary values that compel characters to act in a certain way.

In 4(b) candidates were in good possession of relevant details and wrote persuasive accounts about family tensions as well as caring mentorship and understanding in *Peppermint*, *Πολίτικη Κουζίνα*, *Ένα Τραγούδι δε φτάνει* etc.

Where lapses and omissions were observed, these had to do with weak introductions that did not state the student's thesis in relation to the question and generic conclusive remarks that did not link very well to the content of the essay.

### Question 7

As expected, this was the most popular question but it yielded the least successful answers in this section, especially with regard to assessment objectives AO3(Critical Analysis) and AO2(organization and development).

Question 7a invited candidates to describe and comment on the portrayal of religion in the poems. Many answers were distinguished by explanation of what transpires in poems that could be seen to tackle issues about religion and power (*Ιουλιανός εν Νικομηδεία*), religion and social integration/conformity (*Ιγνάτιου*

Τάφος) religion and various forms of love (*Η αρρώστεια του Κλείτου, Μύρης, Αλεξάνδρεια του 340 Μ.Χ.*) but were not very successful in drawing conclusive remarks that linked the material to the evaluative aspect of the question. A good response succeeded in consistently applying critical analysis and accompanying each example cited with a pertinent point.

#### Question 7b

Question 7b invited students to identify and comment on the ideals that emerge from the actions of the various characters. Candidates were correct in identifying both positive and negative tendencies (e.g. *Εν Σπάρτη versus Αλεξανδρινοί Βασιλείς*) and were successful in explaining the ideological motives behind the actions of fairly recognizable Cavafy characters (e.g. the anonymous narrator in *Ας Φρόντιζαν* or the king in *Βασιλεύς Δημήτριος*). As with question 7a, omissions and lapses were evident in the tendency to provide description at the expense of analysis.

### **Paper summary**

All in all, the candidates in this first examination series performed well and wrote their responses in good Greek.

In Section A, transfer of meaning from English into Greek was handled very well by a good number of candidates, despite slips in orthography and occasional wrong choice of vocabulary.

In Section B, students were able to write clearly and persuasively, with an impressive range of vocabulary and structures.

In Section C, there was an obvious preference for the questions on the poems of Cavafy and the film module on family and childhood. Despite evidence of very good knowledge of the films and the poems, there was also a noticeable slip in some students' ability to exercise critical interpretation of content purposefully and consistently. There was an occasional pattern of providing lengthy explanations of facts contained in the films and the poems with weak conclusive remarks that were not linked to an argument substantiated by the essay.

## Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

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