

**HAT 2014
MARKING SCHEME**

QUESTION ONE

(a) In your own words, write a single sentence identifying the main argument of the first paragraph.

Criteria Assessed

This question is intended to assess the ability of students to critically read and understand a targeted section in the passage, and to distil what they have read into their own words with precision and clarity.

Description of Passage

The author's **main** point is that historians have transformed their ways of understanding the history of Native Americans and Europeans by emphasising the experiences of indigenous peoples rather than simply seeing them as passive victims of European conquest and colonialism. In addition, the author identifies a few elements of this approach including ideas about the persistence of indigenous societies in the wake of European conquest, the resistance and adaptation of indigenous societies, and the cooperation of indigenous societies with Europeans, which had as its result the creation of new hybrid worlds.

Awarding of Marks

- For **9-10 marks**, candidates will correctly and concisely identify the author's main point about the transformation in how historians make sense of American history. They will do so in a single grammatical sentence which makes sense.
- For **5-8 marks**, candidates will, in a single sentence, identify significant features of the author's analysis in the first paragraph, but with less precision in identifying the main point. An otherwise excellent answer which uses two sentences, or is seriously ungrammatical or very badly expressed, also belongs in this band.
- For **0-4 marks**, candidates will have failed to accurately identify any features of the author's analysis in the first paragraph. They may comment on the passage as a whole, advance extraneous information, or rely too much on the wording used by the author. Answers in this band may also be very poorly expressed or contain two or more sentences without being especially accurate on the main point covered.

(b) What does the author argue in this passage about recent attempts made by historians to integrate Native Americans into the history of colonialism in North America? Answer in not more than fifteen lines and using your own words.

Criteria Assessed

This question tests the candidate's ability to effectively summarise the main ideas in the author's argument, and to present the author's argument faithfully, economically, and in the candidate's own words.

Description of Passage

The author argues that in spite of recent developments, the 'revisionist turn' leaves much still to be done. He argues that the changes have been mainly cosmetic in nature, replacing the language and vocabulary of the subject without significantly altering the core narratives of the period. Moreover, what little has been accomplished is restricted mainly to a set of specialists in Native and early American history, beyond whom there still exists what the author calls a 'cameo theory of history',

that is, the sense that Indians had only a marginal, limited, and bit role to play in the wider narrative of European colonization and expansion. In their attempt to tell the story of conquest from the perspective of native Americans, scholars have still maintained a view of Europeans as the main motors of historical change in America. They have focused mainly on how Indians endured, resisted, and reacted to colonial expansion, but in doing so, they have stopped short of exploring how Indian policies impacted on European colonial societies themselves. The author concludes that to recover a full picture of Indian agency in this period, scholars need to develop more sophisticated models for understanding Native policies as more than simply a reaction to European colonial expansion.

Awarding of Marks

- For **14-20 marks**, candidates will, within fifteen lines, capture the main ideas of the author's argument and the logic of his reasoning faithfully and completely. The best and better answers will be clearly and fluently written, in the candidate's own words, with appropriate reference to the text. 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 show some awareness of the author's main argument about the limitations of the revisionist turn, and they will do so accurately and clearly and mostly in their own words. They may be less cogent than candidates scoring in the top band with regard to their understanding of the author's call for recovering Indian agency in American history. Answers in this band may be less economically, deftly or clearly written than those in the top band; they may include minor misunderstandings, which nonetheless do not prevent them from conveying the substance of the author's argument.
- For **0-7 marks**, candidates will provide an answer that has little relation to the ideas, argument, or evidence used in the passage. They will make little sense of the progression of the author's overall argument. The weakest candidates may even fail to understand the question entirely. They may 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 with the question.
- **N.B.** In all cases, answers must be concise. Deduct one mark for every line over fifteen, assuming that the candidate's handwriting is normal size (about ten words per line).

QUESTION TWO

Write an essay of 1.5 to 3 sides assessing and explaining who were the 'winners' and 'losers' in any historical event, process or movement. You may answer with reference to any society, period or place with which you are familiar.

Criteria Assessed

This question assesses the candidate's ability to respond to a broad, open essay question in a relevant, coherent, and analytically sophisticated manner. It may be helpful to have in mind typical degree class boundaries in assessing this exercise, and the relevant criteria are (1) engagement with the question, (2) coherence of argument, (3) the effective use of evidence, and (4) clarity of structure and elegance of prose. But N.B., the essential proviso is that depth and accuracy of knowledge (as distinct from precision in its deployment) are not being tested here. Essays placed in the top band, therefore, will display clarity, cogency, relevance, conceptual power and – perhaps – originality. Essays falling in the 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.

Awarding of Marks

Markers must be prepared to show flexibility in the ways in which candidates may approach this question, which will be influenced heavily by the great variety of case-studies that could be used to answer the question. Some students may define ‘winners’ and ‘losers’ very broadly – e.g. as synonymous with countries, groups of people, or religious communities – others might point to particular individuals or institutions. As long as the student has given some thought to identifying a particular set of winners/losers, any of these approaches is acceptable.

- For **21-30 marks**, candidates will write a relevant, well-organised and clearly-written answer, which has adopted a sustained and consistent focus on winners and losers, however broadly defined. Answers in this band must answer the question. The candidates in this band will have thought carefully about what the question is asking and will demonstrate this with precision in their response. The very best answers in this band may problematize the language of ‘winners’ and ‘losers’ as presented in the question in a variety of ways, e.g., going beyond the categories in their analysis, questioning the utility of the terms, etc. Answers in this band are not merely descriptive, but rather they are consistently analytical, keeping the question in mind at all times. Even answers that have minor deficiencies in analysis will be in this category if they have managed to answer the question clearly and effectively.
- 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 may not appear to have thought carefully enough about what constitutes ‘winners’ and ‘losers’, and their analysis will lack the sophistication of answers in the higher band. Especially towards the bottom of the range, they may possess only a perfunctory conclusion, or one that is inconsistent with the evidence presented in the main body of the essay, or it may lack a discrete conclusion altogether. Their definition of winners and losers may be so vague as to stand in the way of any reasonable analysis. Even if candidates have chosen a poor or vague example, they may be placed in this band if they have endeavoured at least to explore a specific historical event, process or movement with reference to winners and losers.
- For **0-11 marks**, the candidate’s choice of case will generally be poor here: this may be because it is intrinsically inappropriate (e.g. due to a failure to identify a discrete winner or loser); 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 too widely or diffusely over several examples without scratching beyond the surface of any one example. They will generally lack much sense of coherence or momentum of argument, and will often be poorly written, containing 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 THREE

What does this source reveal about society in Augsburg in the sixteenth century?

Criteria Assessed

This question assesses the student's ability to act as a historian, that is, to analyse a primary source, and to use that analysis as the basis for a thoughtful, judicious interpretation of the past. As such, the relevant criteria for this question include careful and critical reading, attention to detail, historical imagination, the effective use of evidence, and precision, clarity and facility of writing.

Key Themes in Source

What follows is a brief précis of some of the more striking themes that emerge in the source. Each marker should familiarise themselves with the source, and know that candidates are likely to pay more attention to some themes than others. Not all candidates will address all themes and, importantly, many will come up with additional interpretations of the source that are not mentioned below. (In any case, it is the marking scheme—and not this description of the source below—that offers the clearest guidance on the awarding of marks.)

The source consists of a trial record of the interrogation of a young beggar named Simon Schweyer in the town of Augsburg in Germany in the mid-sixteenth century. The series of questions and answers offer a window into several general themes including, to name only a few, the experience of poverty and poor relief, courts and the legal system, childhood, family structures, crime and punishment, ideas about community, charity, strategies of survival, vagrancy, and everyday life in a German town. In this context, ideas about poverty or the poor seem linked to wider concerns about cleanliness, kinship, foreignness, seasonal work, and social stratification. This is not the first time that Simon has fallen under the suspicions of the municipal authorities, and he appears to have travelled to Augsburg several times before in search of assistance. Simon's activities as a beggar are described in relation to those of his family, Simon's father, mother, and brother all being known to the authorities. The source also reveals something too about the life of the 'working poor'—although the source never uses that term to describe them—as well as the suspicions cast on them by the authorities. Simon's father appears to make a small living out of selling hackles and pots, alongside which the other members of the family appear to be involved in begging. An important distinction emerges in Simon's testimony as to the difference between 'begging' and collecting alms, although it is unclear how this distinction is constituted either in Simon's mind or by the court authorities. The frequency of Simon's run-ins with the authorities suggests the lack of a safety net for his family, although it is also clear that he is part of a wider category of omnipresent beggars such as those who hang around Wertach Bridge. Poverty is, therefore, also rooted in a geographical or spatial context, and the authorities' concerns about beggars seem linked to wider anxieties about outsiders coming into Augsburg from Oberhausen and other areas beyond the boundaries of the city. Some candidates may comment on the nature of the source itself. Unlike a 'straight' narrative source, the trial record was produced in the context of an exchange that took place between at least two people (that is, Simon Schweyer and the official interrogating him) if not three if the scribe is also taken into consideration. As such, the source is as illuminating as a record of the concerns of the court official—as represented in his questions—as it is of the perspective of the young beggar found in his answers. It may be that the official's questions have influenced the boy's answers, and our understanding of the boy's experiences are limited in so much as they may speak only to the matter of the specific questions asked by the official. Although this episode took place amid the upheaval of the Reformation, there are no clear references to religious change per se in the source, although Simon's request for 'mercy' reminds the reader of the presence in this society of ideas of charity and clemency, which may be linked to religion.

Marking Scheme

The marking scheme below is intended to provide markers with the flexibility to reward answers that stand out, particularly in terms of independence of thought and historical imagination. Given the nature of the exercise, some candidates may interpret the evidence in unpredictable or surprising ways, which are, nonetheless, reasonable within the wider context of the passage. Candidates should not be penalised for singular interpretations, so long as they are backed up by evidence from the source.

For **27-40 marks**, candidates will show that they have read the text closely, accurately and thoughtfully and they are correspondingly able to speak in a concrete way about any of the themes raised above. They will link their analysis consistently to specific evidence from the text, and the higher marks in this band will do so with real sophistication and clarity. They will express historical imagination and/or independence of thought in their analysis of the source, especially at the higher marks within this band. Some of the strongest answers in this band will even engage with issues of source criticism, issues of authorship, and the potential for conflicting interpretations of the source (although they will not necessarily use such terms to do so). But merely raising issues of source reliability will not in itself merit the awarding of a mark in this band; rather, answers in this band will present insights that demonstrate a genuine and consistent talent for historical analysis and the strongest answers will show real sophistication and independence of thought.

For **14-26 marks**, candidates will focus mainly on describing or recounting the details contained in the source, without the sophistication or thematic analysis of candidates in the higher band. They 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 from the text. They may have engaged with one or more of the main themes, but they will be less effective at developing their analysis around specific evidence from the source. Their treatment of specific themes may be less analytical or precise, or they may stop short of adopting a specific interpretation of any particular evidence.

For **0-13 marks**, candidates will more or less have failed to offer any analysis of the text, writing comments that simply reproduce what is in it, or are substantially inaccurate. Answers in this category may simply hone in on a few particular details without a wider demonstration of analysing the source in its entirety. Answers in this band may also suffer from the introduction of external knowledge or unreasonable speculation not backed up by evidence from the text. Similarly, some answers in this band may be too short, or poorly expressed. They may simply reproduce a list of observations, without a more comprehensive sense of the wider significance of the source as a window into sixteenth-century Augsburg.