HAT Marking Scheme 2021

Note: although all the marks in this grid are on a 1-5 scale, the criteria are assigned different weightings in the mark sheet.

Criteria for marking	**1 mark**	**2 marks**	**3 marks**	**4 marks**	**5 marks**
Historical insight and perceptiveness	No high-level indicators and most low-level indicators (defined below).	Few high-level and predominantly low-level indicators (defined below).	Some high-level indicators and some low-level indicators (defined below).	Several high-level indicators and few or no low-level indicators (defined below).	Clear predominance of high-level indicators, very few if any low-level indicators (defined below).
Comprehension, content and analysis	Weak understanding of the text. No high-level indicators and most low-level indicators (defined below).	Basic understanding of the text. Few high-level and predominantly low-level indicators (defined below).	Reasonable understanding of the text. Some high-level indicators and some low-level indicators (defined below).	Good understanding of the text. Several high-level indicators and few low-level indicators (defined below).	Advanced, intellectually mature understanding of the text. Clear predominance of high-level indicators, very few if any low-level indicators (defined below).
Use of evidence	The answer is written largely without reference to the text and consistently fails to substantiate points with examples; or it consistently misrepresents the text and contains a significant quotient of error.	The answer makes occasional reference to the text and substantiates a few points with examples, but tends to misrepresent the text and/or contains some errors.	The answer refers to the text regularly and attempts to substantiate several points, though with some imprecision and inaccuracy.	The answer maintains a steady focus on the text and makes a good number of well substantiated points accurately, though it may also contain a few minor errors.	The answer is densely argued with close reference to the text and consistently substantiates points with well-chosen examples, precisely deployed.

Criteria for marking	1 mark	2 marks	3 marks	4 marks	5 marks
Coverage	Very limited answer that ignores several major themes of the text.	Narrowly focussed answer that concentrates on a limited number of themes drawn from a small proportion of the text.	Attempts to explore multiple themes but is unbalanced in coverage and overlooks parts of the passage.	Explores a good range of themes while focussing on multiple features of the text.	Engages with a wide range of themes and takes account of material from throughout the text.
Structure, organisation and relevance	The answer is disorganised. It consistently fails to address the question. Paraphrases or quotes from large sections of the text.	The answer contains glimpses of organised thought but is mostly haphazard in organisation. Focus on the question is patchy. Thematic organisation limited.	Some parts of the answer are well organised and relevant to the question but others are not. Some attempt to thematise and prioritise the material.	Answer has good structure and flow and most of the material is relevant to the question. Good attempt to thematise and prioritise the material.	Answer has excellent structure and flow, maintains a clear focus on the terms of the question throughout, is structured around well-chosen themes, carefully prioritised.
Presentation and use of English	Significant weaknesses in grammatical sense and sentence structure and very limited vocabulary. Very untidy work.	Some weakness in grammatical sense and sentence structure with limited vocabulary. Untidy presentation.	Mostly correct grammatical sense and sentence structure and reasonable range of vocabulary. Clearly legible, although may be somewhat untidy.	Correct grammatical sense and sentence structure and wide range of vocabulary. Tidy presentation.	Sophisticated grammatical sense and sentence structure and a very varied vocabulary. Clearly and neatly presented.

Description of indicators

Historical insight and perceptiveness

Higher level indicators

- Contains evidence of imaginative engagement with the text and a willingness to draw plausible historical inferences from it.
- Offers a critical reading of the text.
- Reflects carefully on the quality of the evidence (e.g. by noting that this is a piece of oral evidence recorded within a literate culture, and that it was collected for folkloric rather than historical purposes).
- Offers some reflection on the use of fiction and folklore as historical evidence.
- Registers that the author may not have been able to reproduce the original telling of the tale entirely accurately (e.g. he is an elite American reporting a tale told by a French peasant woman).
- Registers that there may be important things that we do not know about the author that could have influenced his transcription and presentation of this oral account.
- Therefore draws conclusions or makes suggestions with a degree of caution.
- Sees that the text is, nevertheless, full interest and has considerable historical value.

Lower level indicators

- Contains little evidence of imaginative engagement with the text or of deductive thought
- Tends to read the text uncritically.
- Makes no attempt to evaluate the quality of the evidence, or merely asserts that the author is ‘biased’ without specifying why and how this may have shaped his representation of events.
- Tends to accept the author’s statements and judgments at face value.
- Fails to see that the author may be presenting a subjective view, or to explore the author’s subjectivities.
- Makes no reference to the distinctions between written and oral evidence.
- Asserts conclusions too emphatically without qualification, or is overly negative about the document’s historical interest and potential value.

Content and analysis

Higher level indicators

- The answer is analytically driven.
- Has something to say on the rhythms and expectations of working life, both domestic and agricultural.
- Registers the frequent references to food, eating and subsistence within the tale.

- Notes the apparently matter-of-fact acceptance of quotidian violence.
- Comments on the importance of fertility and its consequences.
- Offers some commentary on the nature of gender roles in peasant households.
- Discusses the possible uses of this text in reconstructing histories ‘from below’.
- Has something to say about the moral universe revealed by the text.
- Comments on the relationship between men and animals revealed in the text.

Lower level indicators

- The answer is more descriptive than analytical.
- Fails to see the potential of this text for understanding peasant domestic economy and everyday life.
- Dismisses the use of folklore as a historical source on the grounds that it is fantasy or ‘untrue’.
- Fails to identify the preoccupations of peasant households with food and fertility.
- Has little or nothing to day about the different roles apparently played by men and women in the text.
- Has nothing to say about violence or morality.

HAT 2021 Mark and comment sheet

Please read the revised Marking Scheme carefully, noting that it is different from previous years

Candidate Number:		**Marker Name:**	

	Comments	**Mark out of 5**	**Weighting**	**Weighted mark**
Historical insight and perceptiveness			5	
Comprehension, content and analysis			5	
Use of evidence			5	
Coverage			2	
Structure, organisation and relevance			2	
Use of English and presentation			1	
Total provisional weighted mark (out of 100)				

Any additional comments	Please use this box to note any particular strengths and/or weaknesses of the script

Final agreed weighted mark out of 100	Please provide a brief explanation for this only where there is a discrepancy of 20 or more in the provisional marks	**Agreed mark**