

HAT MARKING SCHEME 2012

In 2011 the HAT was sat by 1,617 candidates in an examination exercise which incorporated scores of test centres, 47 of which were beyond the UK. These bare statistics warn markers that they can expect a wide range of responses to HAT questions, and that adherence to the mark-scheme will be important to ensure equity across such a large and diverse array of students. The need for such self-discipline is also heightened by the involvement of over 100 markers in the exercise this year. Inevitably, no mark-scheme can anticipate every candidate response, and markers must exercise their judgement in awarding marks. However, if markers believe that there is case for awarding more or fewer marks than prescribed by this scheme, they should clarify their reasons on their comments-sheet. Questions 1a and 1b require candidates to engage with the author's views in the text, and thus offer less opportunity for divergent responses. Markers should expect much more variety in answers to Questions 1c and 2, but they should still follow the scheme as closely as possible.

QUESTION ONE

1a. In the first paragraph, how does the author account for the emergence of nationalism?
Answer in one sentence using your own words.

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 sees the emergence of nationalism as the result of the interaction of various forces, and identifies two elements of this process in the first paragraph:

- i. An empowered state could be an agent of the emergence of nationalism, moulding pre-existing collective memories/traditions.
- ii. The state does not create nationalism "out of nothing", however, and the candidate must show awareness that other catalysing forces are needed. The American example suggests that a great event might fall into this category. [Note: although the American civil war is mentioned here, the specific/distinctive importance of armed conflict is not clear until the second paragraph].

For 9-10 marks, candidates will correctly and concisely cover both points, identifying the agency of the state and the role it plays, while also showing awareness of the need for other

forces to promote nationalism (and they might identify a catalysing event). They will do so in a single, grammatical sentence which makes sense.

For 5-8 marks, candidates will, in a single sentence, cover both points, but with less precision; either by failing to outline what the state does (e.g. by simply asserting the importance of the state without clarifying its role in moulding pre-existing collective memories/traditions); or by simply asserting the general importance of armed conflict as a catalyst (which is not clear until the second paragraph). 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 or neither of the points with any clarity. It may rely too much on the wording used by the author, or comment on the passage as a whole, or advance extraneous information. 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.

1b. How much importance does the author attach to armed conflict in the emergence of nationalism? Answer in not more than fifteen lines, using your own words.

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 is contained in the second paragraph.

There are four essential areas for candidates to cover here:

- i. The author is making an argument that other scholars ("theories") have not given adequate weight to the importance of armed conflict to the rise of nationalism; thus he is giving more weight than most.
- ii. The author argues that nationalism defined itself against "others", and armed conflict is seen an important agent here.
- iii. Military service is also a transformative experience for the populace, involving greater association under the leadership of elite groups.
- iv. The author does acknowledge other forces for nationalism right at the end, namely industrial change and communications. The author does not clarify their impact,

but the mention of other forces does show that armed conflict is not seen as the only catalyst of nationalism.

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 capture the sense of at least 3 of the 4 points. 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. They may even seek to clarify the author's hierarchy and sequence of causation.

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 include 2 of the 4 points, one of which must be **either i. or iv.**, to show some awareness of the emphasis/qualification advanced by the author regarding the impact of armed conflict (i.e. his historiographical position, and his acknowledgement of other forces behind nationalism). 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 fail to recognize the emphasis/qualification of points i. and iv., and simply concentrate on points ii. and iii., thereby showing little sense of the nuances of the author's overall position (and they may perhaps argue that that the author sees armed conflict as all-important). 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. Write an essay of 1.5 to 3 sides in which you assess the social and/or political impact of violent conflict on any society you have studied. Your answer may cover violent conflict within a society or in an international context.

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 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.

There are three basic requirements in the question which candidates should be expected to meet:

- i. They should provide a clear outline of the society under review (even if their analysis may focus predominantly on a particular section of that society).
- ii. They should demarcate the social and/or political impact of violent conflict within that society as precisely as possible.
- iii. In accordance with point ii., they should show awareness of the importance of forces other than violent conflict in determining the social and/or political character of that society.

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. In particular, it will be important to accept the validity of varying degrees of violent conflict, ranging from mass protest movements with violent ideas or episodes, to all-out warfare. Also, some candidates may prefer to discuss the broader societal impact of violent conflict (in terms of military structures within society, whether feudal systems or fiscal-military states), while others may focus more directly on the social and/or political impact of specific violent conflicts (whether protest movements, insurrections, civil contests, wars of religion, revolutionary wars, or nation-forming conflicts); some candidates may attempt both approaches. As long as these case-studies demonstrate engagement with the three essential areas, any of these forms of study is acceptable.

For 21-30 marks: candidates will write a relevant, well-organised and clearly-written answer, which 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 or polity under review is clearly defined, and the candidate

provides a clear sense of its character both before, and in the aftermath of, conflict, and of the specific role of violence in precipitating any change. The answer will also be alert to continuities amid change and (without overdoing it) to the role played by dynamics *other* than violence in conditioning change.

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. 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. They may also simply see violent conflict as an agent of power (toppling regimes, facilitating conquests, etc), with little thought to its broader, longer-term consequences for the social and/or political character of the society under review. Even if candidates have chosen a poor or vague example, they may be placed in this band if they have endeavoured to explore the links between violent conflict and the social or political character of the chosen society.

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 society or polity, or due to the choice of a society that was not marked by violence); 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 societies. 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.

2. The question relates to the following criteria

What can this extract tell us about social and family life in eighteenth-century Britain?

- 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.

A number of points in answer to the questions can be derived from this document, though we would not necessarily expect even the strongest candidates to cover all of these themes, and they may be able to find others.

- **Family:** this is a society in which family relationships are important. Nearly all the people mentioned in the letter are members of Maria's (extended) family, and all the events she refers to revolve around them. She receives much-prized letters from her parents and her sister's activities are of considerable interest to her. Frequent letter-writing keeps Maria abreast of her aunt's occupations, and is an important element of the closeness between them. The fact that Serena evidently writes frequently to Maria and that she receives letters from her parents suggests that the adult members of the family also attached importance to their relationships with her. There is a sense of family culture – Maria learns about her grandfather from Serena's letters and the elegy her aunt shows her. That religion is important to this family's culture is suggested when she 'pray[s] God!' that she will learn from her Grandfather's lessons. The family also plays a role in children's upbringing and instruction: Serena received lessons from her father, which she is now transmitting to Maria, and the reference to 'moralis[ing]' points to the ways in which family members considered themselves responsible for the moral education of children in the family.
- **Childhood:** picking up on the family theme from a different angle, the letter suggests the centrality of the family to the child's world, and the relative narrowness of Maria's horizons (and may suggest that this letter might over-emphasize the importance of family in 18th C society). The letter also suggests some of the ways in which childhood was distinguished from adulthood in this period. Maria has a clear sense of herself as younger than her aunt – she refers to herself as 'romping'. The mention of Louisa attending the theatre for the first time suggests the importance of certain age-related milestones, and suggests that growing up involved entering an adult world. On the other hand, the tone of the discussion of Serena's age suggests a teasing familiarity and a kind of equality between them, rather than the distance and reserve one might expect. At the same time, the way she discusses the theatre and other entertainments suggests that adults and children might also enjoy some of the same leisure activities.
- **Social life:** Maria's social life revolves around the family, she mentions almost no-one beyond it. We learn that her time is divided between periods in the town and the country and by suggesting that she would prefer to spend more time in London, she hints at differences between urban and rural life, though we don't get much information about what she does in the country. The extract hints at the possibility of particularly urban attractions. Whilst in London, she enjoys a relatively rich cultural life – visiting Sadler's Wells and seeing the Dwarf and the Giant. Although as noted above, the theatre trip is related to growing-up, it's not clear how far these leisure activities are considered specially appropriate for children, whether they might suggest a particular eighteenth-century interest in the 'exotic' or in eccentricity, or

simply childish fascination. Other activities are more sedentary. Letter-writing and reading letters would appear to take up much of her time, and her tone suggests that she values letters as a source of entertainment. The reference to Serena's French elegy suggests the importance of language and literary culture in the family.

Discussion of these themes raises additional points about the status of the document as a source. The extract implies that there are rules about when and how letters should be written and their use as a pedagogical tool, even as Maria is dispensing her aunt from following those rules. This may raise concerns about the degree to which she is following a formula or is censored (or self-censoring) as to what and how she writes. She may be seeking to impress a well-loved aunt and authority-figure, trying to present herself in the best possible light, or less consciously, be influenced by adult directions as to how she, as a child, should behave and communicate. As suggested above, the importance given to family may be a function of the child's eye view, rather than true of wider society. More obviously, Maria is clearly a highly literate and privileged girl, how much can her experience of family life, childhood and social life and leisure tell us about the experiences of other children, or even of boys of her own class?

For 27-40 marks, candidates will show that they have read the text closely, accurately and thoughtfully, and they are correspondingly able to say something about 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 the lower bands.

Candidates in this band will be able to make specific points about the text (e.g. about family relationships, about leisure activities, about town/country distinctions), but they will also be able to make some more analytical observations about the functions of the family, the importance of letters, the distinctions between childhood and adulthood, or about social life and leisure in the 18th C. In particular, they might consider what the extract reveals about the roles of family members, what it says about notions of growing up, what the existence of the letter says about the importance attached to children, and what they deduce from the tone of the letter. They might reflect on the nature of the entertainments the girls encounter in London and what they may or may not reveal about 18th C urban culture. All candidates in this band should give some thought to authorial position; they may comment on the suggestion that she appears to be from a wealthy family (the family has two homes, Maria is clearly well educated) and reflect on how much her experience can tell us about that of children from less wealthy backgrounds, or of boys of her own class. Stronger candidates in this band will be particularly attentive to what the text reveals about childhood. They will consider all the various themes in relation to the difficulties (and advantages) of using a source produced by a child. The best candidates will speculate how far the author – as a child – might be subject to particular constraints, and may pick up on the pedagogical use of letters. Candidates at the lower end of the scale will discuss the letter's limitations in a more general sense.

For 14-26 marks, candidates will also have read the text closely and will pick up on many of the points raised above about family relationships, childhood, and leisure and social life.

They will attempt to make some more analytical observations about family and childhood, and urban leisure activities, 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 have discussed family, but will be less attentive to what the source reveals about childhood or about leisure and urban/rural distinctions. They may say very little, or nothing, about authorial position and the difficulties of using a source produced by a child, though candidates at the upper end of the scale will pick up on the fact that Maria is from a privileged background, and that her experiences may not reflect those of all children.

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 concentrate on describing what Maria has been doing rather than making more analytical points about family and childhood. They may be short, poorly expressed, or incoherent due to significant internal contradictions. They may also invoke external knowledge at the expense of a close engagement with the passage.