

HAT: MARKING SCHEME FOR THE SPECIMEN PAPER 2012

Question One

1a. In the first paragraph what does the author think that we can learn from the remains of buildings about the distinctiveness of past societies? Answer in one sentence, using your own words. (10 marks)

This is a specific question intended to test a relatively precise range of skills:

- careful and critical reading
- precision in the handling of concepts
- precision, clarity and facility of writing

In particular, this exercise demands that the candidates pay attention to and think about the text. They should show understanding of the author's words without simply translating or transcribing them.

The author argues that buildings are very revealing with regard to the distinctiveness of past societies, and in the first paragraph discusses the lessons that can be drawn from two kinds of buildings:

- i. More substantial buildings reveal distinctive cultural traditions.
- ii. More humble buildings reveal less distinctive cultural traditions, although he makes the point that all cultures vary.

For 9-10 marks, candidates will correctly and concisely cover both of these points, and, in particular, will recognise that more humble buildings will reveal cultural variations to some extent. They will do so in a single, grammatical sentence which makes sense.

For 5-8 marks, candidates will, in a single sentence, broadly grasp both points, but they may fail to express adequately the author's qualification regarding lesser buildings (e.g. by overstating the universality of the cultures of everyday life). Answers in this band may be less concise and/or more reliant either on language in the text or on extraneous knowledge, provided that they contain a single sentence and convincingly show understanding. An otherwise excellent answer which uses two sentences, or is seriously ungrammatical, or very badly expressed, belongs in this band.

For 0-4 marks, candidates will only cover 1 of the points with any clarity. It may rely too much on the wording used by the author, or prioritize historical details at the expense of an exposition of the author's views. Answers in this band may also be very poorly

expressed or contain two or more sentences without being especially accurate on the main point.

1b. How does the author account for the emergence of distinctive 'great' and 'folk' cultures? Answer in not more than 15 lines, using your own words (20 marks).

The criteria for this question are:

- careful and critical reading
- analytical approach
- precision in the handling of concepts
- precision, clarity and facility of writing

In particular, this question is intended to test the ability of candidates to read the passage as a whole and to construct (in their own words) an accurate account of the relationship between the author's argument and his evidence. Most of the evidence for this question is contained in the second and third paragraphs.

There are two essential areas for candidates to cover here:

- i. The author argues that the great culture of the elites reflects their powerful force within society, for the physical manifestations of this great culture require wealth and influence for their achievement. To this extent, both the character and evolution of great culture is clearly demarcated. However, when he turns to discuss Ancient Egypt in detail, it becomes clear that the author sees the emergence of this culture as a more uncertain *process*, and that the dominance of great culture took time. The series of rhetorical questions in the third paragraph raises doubts over the societal reach of great culture, and questions the premeditation behind such expansion.
- ii. Folk culture is seen to consist of the traditions which do not conform to the dominant great culture. Again, this appears to be a clear definition of both the character and evolution of this culture. However, the Egyptian example again suggests a more complex and uncertain process, and it is unclear how far there is a direct interplay between the great and folk traditions.

In all cases, answers must be concise. Deduct one mark for every line over 15, assuming that the candidate's handwriting is normal size (ten words per line).

For 14-20 marks, candidates will, within 15 lines, accurately and clearly cover both essential areas, and they will show awareness not only of the demarcation of cultures, but

also the reasons why they evolve in this way (in particular, they will understand that the wealth and power of the elites are preconditions for the physical manifestations of this great culture). They will also discuss the author's observations on the processes by which these distinctive cultures emerge, and acknowledge that the author recognizes that great culture does not achieve total and immediate dominance. Best and better answers will be clearly and fluently written, in the candidate's own words, with appropriate reference to the text; they will present an organised case. Weaker answers in this band will be less well-written and/or less clear and well-organised, but will still be in the candidate's own words; they may make less reference to the text, but remained focused on the author's core arguments.

For 8-13 marks, candidates will acknowledge the author's demarcation of cultures, but will fail to engage adequately with the reasons for their development, or recognise his qualifications when he considers the Egyptian example in more detail. In this band, there will be limited discussion of wealth and power as an agent of great culture, and little thought given to the author's uncertainties regarding processes of cultural development. In these ways, they will be less accurate and cogent than candidates scoring in the top band, but they will show understanding of the relationship between the argument advanced by the author and the evidence which he advances. Answers in this band may be less economically, deftly or clearly written than those in the top band; they may include minor misunderstandings; they may contain more of the original language of the passage, though still amount to more than a series of quotations.

For 0-7 marks, candidates will reveal only a basic understanding of the interplay of great and folk cultures. In particular, they may simply discuss the form of great culture without any link to the wealth and power of the elites. They will also fail to engage with the author's sense of change over time, and may perhaps argue that that the author sees great culture as all-pervasive. The weakest candidates may even fail to understand any of the points, or the question. They may write at excessive length – 20 lines or more – or present nothing more than a series of quotations or near-quotations. Answers which are very unclear should belong in this category, even if there are grounds for seeing some engagement of the question in them.

1c. Using a historical example with which you are familiar, write an essay of 1.5 to 3 sides about the ways in which the ideas of elites influenced, or failed to influence, the lives of ordinary people. (30 marks).

This question relates to the following criteria:

- analytical approach;
- coherent argument;
- precision in the handling of concepts and selection of evidence;

- relevance to the question;
- historical imagination;
- originality;
- precision, clarity and facility of writing.

It may be helpful to have in mind typical degree class boundaries in assessing this exercise, with the essential proviso that depth and accuracy of knowledge (as distinct from precision in its deployment) are not being tested. Essays placed in the top band will display clarity, cogency, relevance, conceptual power and – perhaps – originality. Essays falling in the larger middle band will answer the question soundly, but lack the analytical flexibility, the perceptiveness, or the argumentative coherence of a top-band answer. Essays in the bottom band will have qualities characteristic of a Lower Second or worse: a hazy or partial idea of the question; material of varying relevance; variable or poor coherence; variable or poor expression.

In the spirit of the passage, there are three basic requirements in the question which candidates should be expected to meet:

- i. They should exhibit clarity and precision in defining the ‘elites’ and ‘ordinary people’ under review; in defining the society under review; in defining the elite ideas with which the candidate is concerned; and also in defining the time-period. The elites may be political, socio-economic, ethno-racial, or religious, but this list is not intended to exclude other possibilities.
- ii. They should convey clearly the ways in which elites have sought to influence the lives of ordinary people. This could involve attempts to impose obedience to religious or civil authority, or to police or reform working or domestic life, or to protect or persecute a particular class, or to mobilize and direct a military force, or to define and enforce feudal obligations. Again, this list is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather to indicate the broad range of possible approaches.
- iii. Answers must assess the degree to which the elites in question have achieved their purposes, and superior answers will investigate the reasons for their comparative success or failure.

Markers must be prepared to show flexibility in the ways in which candidates may approach this question, which will be heavily influenced by the inherent variety of case-studies which may be used to answer the question. As long as the case-study demonstrates engagement with the broad themes stipulated above, any of these forms of study is acceptable.

For 21-30 marks: candidates will write a relevant, well-organised and clearly-written answer, which certainly addresses the three points above. The answer focuses in detail on a single relevant case. It is not merely descriptive, but rather is consistently analytical, keeping the question in mind at all times. The society under review is clearly defined, as are the identity of the elites under review. Candidates in this band may highlight the possible difficulty of precisely delineating 'elites' and 'ordinary people' in the particular society with which they are concerned. They will reflect with some subtlety on the tools that elites deploy in seeking to influence the lives of ordinary people, and on the tools that ordinary people may deploy in responding to (and possibly resisting) elite pressure. Candidates within this range will generally be alert to unintended consequences, and to the limits of elite authority. For example, elites may influence ordinary life by embodying conventions or norms that ordinary people sometimes emulate, or, conversely, by exciting animosity that results in societal or political tumult. Additionally, they will often focus on the autonomous culture that ordinary people may be able to develop independently of, and possibly in defiance of, elite desires: good answers will normally treat the limits as well as the extent of elite authority.

For 12-20 marks: candidates will present relevant evidence, and apply it somewhat to the question, but less directly, consistently and forensically. Answers in this band may be a little episodic and disparate in places, and/or lack a clear integrative thesis. They will often be differentiated from stronger answers by an inattentiveness to counter-evidence, i.e. to alternative ways that one might construe the evidence under review. A poor or vague example may have been chosen, and the answer may fail to treat discrete elite ideas, but the candidate nonetheless will endeavour to explore the power and purposes of elites within the chosen society. Especially towards the bottom of the range, answers within this band may possess only a perfunctory conclusion, or one that is inconsistent with the evidence presented in the main body of the essay, or they may lack a discrete conclusion altogether. They may also simply see elites as being all-powerful, assuming that they always get their way or, conversely, they may present an overly bald picture of heroic resistance.

For 0-11 marks: The candidate's choice of case will generally be poor here: this may be because it is intrinsically inappropriate (due to a failure to identify a discrete elite group or society, or due to the choice of a case that does not illuminate the relationship between elites and ordinary people); or it may be because the candidate simply does not know enough about the case to provide a persuasive analysis. Answers in this category may ignore the question by ranging widely and diffusely over a whole series of cases. They will generally lack much sense of coherence or momentum of argument, and will often be poorly written, containing many errors of syntax, spelling and punctuation. They will contain many of the flaws listed in the mid-band category, but they will be present to a greater extent.

Question Two

The Question relates to the following criteria:

- Careful and critical reading
- Historical imagination
- Originality
- Precision, clarity and facility of writing

Note that candidates are NOT expected to write a cogent or structured piece of writing about the source, though they are expected to express themselves clearly and accurately. They have been directed not to introduce extraneous material in their answers, and no credit should be given to candidates who do so.

It might help markers to distinguish between three levels of response to this passage. The strongest answers will combine all three levels, and will handle all three with equal clarity. The weakest answers may only include level i., or else attempt to make points included in levels ii. and or iii., but do so crudely and without properly substantiating them from within the extract:

- i. At the most basic level, candidates will be able to draw a series of descriptive details from the passage, for example about the provision of food and medical care, or the noise and distraction of bombardment.
- ii. At an intermediate level, candidates will be able to use the details in i. to draw some broader, analytical conclusions about frontline life, for example about the way soldiers use home-comforts like tea as a way of coping with their predicament, or about the ways in which the army developed complex logistical support systems to sustain them.
- iii. At the highest level, candidates will show awareness of the standpoint and status of the author and the document. There are a number of areas in this category that might be commented on. First, the author is writing under censorship conditions, and says that he has to be careful what he says. This does not invalidate the source, but it does mean that it needs to be carefully evaluated. Second, the writer's Indian background means that his authorial standpoint is detached from some of the scenes he is describing. Nevertheless, he does identify with the British side, talking about 'our government.' Third, censorship apart, the fact that this is a letter home may be of significance. Is the author trying to put a brave face on conditions at the

front for the sake of the people in his village? Is it significant that he is writing to a religious leader? What are the more general problems of using a subjective document like a letter as a source?

For 27-40 marks: candidates will show that they have read the text closely, accurately and thoughtfully and they are correspondingly able to comment intelligently on a number of the issues raised above. Candidates in this band will be distinguished [1] by engaging with questions of authorial position, and [2] by engaging with the major themes raised by the extract in a more sophisticated manner than candidates in lower bands. Candidates in this band will be able to pick up specific details about the text (as in level i. above) but they will also be able to make some more analytical observations (as in level ii. above) about what these details reveal about military life. They will also be able to discuss the implications of the remarks about censorship (though they may legitimately differ in the precise conclusions they draw from them, as long as they offer some substantiation from within the text). Stronger candidates may pick up on the way the author breaks off to address the censor. All candidates in this band should raise the question of how much we can extrapolate about life in the British army from a single letter from an Indian soldier. Candidates in this band will not make significantly inaccurate statements about the text.

For 14-26 marks: candidates will have made some sense of the text and touched on some of the issues raised by it, but their judgements and speculations, though relevant, may be less penetrating, less clearly expressed, or less sustainable (but still somewhat sustainable) from the text. They will handle the themes of individual experience of war and logistical organisation competently. They will also pick up on issues of censorship and authorial standpoint, but will not do so with the same level of nuance and complexity as the candidates in the top band.

For 0-13 marks: candidates will more or less have failed to interpret the text, writing comments that simply reproduce what is in it, or are substantially inaccurate. Answers in this category may simply list factual details in the passage without offering any analysis of them, and are likely to ignore the questions of authorship and censorship. They may be short, or poorly expressed. They may also invoke external knowledge at the expense of a close engagement with the passage.