



Pearson

# **Examiners' Report**

## **Principal Examiner Feedback**

January 2020

Pearson Edexcel  
IAL

International A Level  
Greek (WGK02 01)  
Paper 1: Understanding and Written Response

## **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)

January 2020

Publications Code WGK02\_01\_2001\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2020

## Examiner's report WGK02 January 2020

### Introduction

The very small number of candidates who sat this examination performed well, particularly in Sections A and B. They transferred meaning from English into Greek demonstrating good use of vocabulary and grammar and produced competent responses, demonstrating familiarity with the rudiments of essay writing. Almost all candidates displayed a level of language awareness that enabled them to apply their knowledge of Greek, in order to compose pertinent essays, exercise a degree of critical interpretation and offer factually correct details pertaining to their chosen texts. There was one isolated example of a response that did not demonstrate necessary competences and knowledge for achieving a good grade.

### 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.

Out of the few candidates who entered this exam, almost all produced satisfactory translations which showed excellent control of meaning and good command of vocabulary and structures, scoring 15 marks and above. Occasional evidence of challenging structures and vocabulary included:

- Supervision was not always translated as επίβλεψη/επιτήρηση
- Proposals was not always translated as προτάσεις
- The erroneous rendering of "it came as no surprise" as «δεν εκπλαχθήκαμε».

### 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 with 30 marks, for communicating relevant information effectively as well as for the quality of the Greek language produced. Nearly everyone who entered for this series chose question 2(a), the discursive essay.

The majority of students performed very well in 2(a), with everyone 22 marks and above.

Few essays relied overtly on language and opinion provided in the stimulus text, instead of responding to these, and did not develop their own opinions adequately. The response that addressed 2 (b), the prompt that elicited a more personal and creative response failed to provide the necessary example to back up the main thesis and did not manage to gain good marks.

## **Section C**

In section C, students must answer one question in Greek, that relates to a topic, film 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, films and texts. Students are expected to write 300–400 words. On few occasions, this number was exceeded and worked against the candidate's benefit, as the material often included extraneous and irrelevant details that detracted from the pertinence of the piece.

Candidates in this exam series favoured the questions on the poetry of Cavafy and the module on childhood and cinema.

### **Question 6b**

The candidates who chose to answer this question demonstrated good factual knowledge of the films, often providing a good range of relevant supporting examples. Occasionally some imbalance in the response was in evidence, when the response provided overtly long and detailed descriptions of one film and rather shorter accounts of the other two. One response in particular that failed to gain higher marks in the categories of Content and Communication and Critical Analysis and Organisation and Development failed to provide adequate depth and relied on describing scenes that may have been pertinent to the theme of friendship but were not accompanied by explanations or points. Absence of a persuasive conclusion that does not contain inappropriate generalisations was also a reason why some candidates did not score highly in the category of Critical Analysis.

### **Question 7**

Most candidates chose question 7a and performed very well, gaining 23 marks and above. The essays showed excellent knowledge of the poems and good depth in the responses, going beyond a synopsis of factual details in the poems or biographical details, in order to provide explanations and make points with regard to what makes certain characters memorable or what the prevailing values and worldview that emerge in the poems are. Occasionally there was a pattern of extensive responses that did not add anything new to the preceding argument and resulted in repetition.

## **Conclusion**

In conclusion, the few candidates in this 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 most candidates, despite slips in orthography and occasional wrong choice of vocabulary.

In Section B, students were mostly able to write clearly and persuasively, with often appropriate range of vocabulary and structures.

In Section C, there was an obvious preference for the questions on the poems of Cavafy. There was evidence of very good knowledge of the poems and an occasional pattern of providing overtly long explanations of facts and hasty conclusive remarks. For more information on indicative content for all sections of this paper, please consult the January 2020 MS, posted on the Pearson website.

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