

## HAT MARKING SCHEME

### QUESTION ONE

1(a)

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 first paragraph makes one essential point about the founders of religious houses: that they wanted the inhabitants of those houses to withdraw from worldly – secular, materialistic – concerns. It is implicit that worldliness is an evil (hence 'protest against the world and all its ways'). The main challenges for the candidates, besides grasping the meaning of worldliness, are [1] to get to the heart of the matter, rather than listing all the lineaments of the mundane, such as family, property etc; and [2] to express the central point without using the words in the passage (though I don't think we should be excessively strict about incidental uses of the key terms).

Candidates may legitimately represent the point as an argument ('The paragraph says...') or as a historical statement ('Founders were...').

For 9-10 marks, candidates will correctly and concisely indicate that the aims of founders were to create institutions in which people fought against (or were detached from) earthly ties and/or material interests, and they will do so in a single, grammatical sentence which makes sense.

For 5-8 marks, candidates will, in a single sentence, grasp the essential point about fighting against worldliness, and will provide some sort of explanation of what worldliness is. 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 (e.g. 'fight against things like property, commerce and social-climbing' would be acceptable for this band, whereas 'protest against worldliness', without further explanation would not be). 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 fail to decode the concept of 'worldliness', or (more serious) fail to understand that the aims of founders were that religious houses should reject it, or not understand what a founder is. Answers in this band may also be very poorly expressed or contain two or more sentences without being especially accurate on the main point.

1(b)

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. The evidence appears almost entirely in the last paragraph: the first two paragraphs are a mixture of assertion, interpretation and generalisation. When we turn to the Cistercians, however, we find that only partly do they sustain the author's claim that religious houses are 'a mirror of the world in which they lived':

- They claim to be following the 'pure Rule of St Benedict', but the detail in which they prescribe the activities of the monks apparently goes beyond this and must, in some way, be drawn from society. This supports the author's argument.
- They set about things with 'military precision', and that may reflect a militaristic strain in medieval society (in fact, it does, but the author doesn't spell this out, though he intends his readers to deduce this). This may support the author's argument.
- The Cistercians have a much clearer hierarchy than is typical of medieval society, and this must derive from their Rule; at the very least, it is not a simple reflection. This challenges the author's argument.
- Similarly, their planned economy is at odds with medieval social norms – at least on the evidence presented here. This also challenges the author's argument.

In all, therefore, the Cistercian order shows the influence of contemporary society in certain respects – it was not simply the realisation of the ancient Rule which it claimed to rest upon – but it also cut across social norms, and in ways that appear to reflect the aims of its founder(s). What the author is showing, then, is a dialogue between the religious orders and the rest of society; the former are not merely 'a mirror of the world in which they lived'.

For 14-20 marks, candidates will, within 15 lines, accurately and clearly capture the sense that, while the Cistercians were not simply following the Rule of St Benedict, they were not simply mirroring the world either. Candidates in this top group will show awareness that 'evidence' means the Cistercians, and it will be clear in their answers that the author's claim

is both supported and controverted by this evidence. 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 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 still focus on the evidence of the Cistercians and recognise its ambivalence in relation to the author's argument.

For 8-13 marks, candidates will **either** make a clear case that the evidence in the final paragraph entirely contradicts or entirely supports the author's argument, **or** make an incoherent and list-y claim (rather than an organised case) that that evidence partly supports and partly contradicts it. 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 argument and evidence (viz. they will focus on relating the material in the final paragraph to the author's claim). 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 **either** to measure the author's argument against the evidence of the Cistercians **or** to understand the passage 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 with the question in them.

Answers must be concise. Deduct one mark for every line over 16, assuming that the candidate's handwriting is normal size (ten words per line).

1(c)

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.

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

- They must explore what happened to a set of aims, ideas or principles *in society*.
- They must *assess* what happened – viz. how much change was there?
- They must *explain* the extent of change that they have argued for.

The question allows candidates to argue that there was no change in the ‘set of aims, ideas or principles’ that they are discussing. ‘In society’ may legitimately be taken to mean ‘over time’, provided that there is a clear sense of social interaction (e.g. an essay on how Luther’s ideas changed in his lifetime would need to show that his thinking was influenced by the reception of his teachings and/or by episodes such as the Peasants’ War). ‘Assess’ need not mean quantify: a candidate may characterise the changes instead, but then s/he must explain why the changes took that form (or why there was no change, if this is his/her claim).

Candidates studying any period of history should be able to come up with a suitable example, so it is reasonable to be fairly strict about what is a ‘set of aims, ideas or principles’, though a candidate who discusses the evolution of a single and loose principle should not be penalised. The question assumes that ‘aims, ideas or principles’ are, in some sense, produced outside of society and then fed into it. A rare student who wants to tackle that artificial assumption may

well deserve a top-band mark, but candidates choosing a broad political or religious creed which is already in society – chivalry, say, or communism, or Islam – should either show awareness of that fact or define their example in some way (eg the content of handbooks of knighthood; the thought of Karl Marx or of Chairman Mao; the teachings of the Koran, or whatever); if they do not, they should not get a top-band mark.

For 27-40 marks, candidates will write a relevant, well-organised and clearly-written answer, which addresses the three bullet-points above. The example will be an appropriate one, and there will be a clear understanding of what is meant by ‘in society’. In essays in this band, evidence will be clearly marshalled to support an argument/interpretation.

For 14-26 marks, candidates will

EITHER write a reasonably cogent essay which addresses at least the first bullet-point and one other, but not all three;

OR choose a poor or vague example, but explore its evolution, assess it and explain it;

Better essays in this band may have many of the conceptual virtues of those in the top band but be less well-expressed and/or less well-structured. Weaker essays in this band may present information without binding it into an argument or interpretation.

For 0-13 marks, candidates will

EITHER choose an extremely poor example, which does not fit the question (either because it is not a ‘set of aims, ideas or principles’ or because its evolution ‘in society’ is not addressed)

OR fail **both** to *assess* **and** to *explain* the evolution of an appropriate example.

Essays which are very poorly written – difficult to understand, either at the level of vocabulary and expression, or at the level of structure – belong in this band.

Question 2.

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.

A number of points in answer to the question 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.

A key theme is the psychological impact of war on society. The diarist expresses this in terms of exhaustion, and disappointed expectations. This is perhaps surprising, in the light of Britain's recent victory. The author compares her sense of deflation after the end of the War with the 'fun and laughter ... even in the darkest days of war,' which may seem paradoxical, but hints at an incipient nostalgia arising amid post-war hardship.

Another key theme is gender relations within society. The author suggests that relations between men and women have been altered by the war, with men returning like 'strangers' with 'altered outlooks.' Having experienced work, women are finding it hard to resume their old existences. At the same time, there is clearly an implicit assumption that society ought to return to traditional gender roles, with talk of women 'leaving their wartime jobs' to make way for returning men, and 'harried landladies and mothers of families' responsible for cooking. The preoccupations of the author indeed suggest continuity in gender roles.

A third theme centres on the role of the state within society. It is strong enough to maintain some troops in military service, and to organise rationing, but not to guarantee coal or food supplies, or to house the homeless. Indeed, the author suggests that material conditions have actually got worse since the end of the war ('meat is scarcer', 'milk is down to two pints a week') and the prospect of a cold winter is dreaded.

Discussion of these themes raises additional points about the status of the document as a diary account. How far can we extrapolate from one middle-class woman's subjective account? Is she making certain generalisations about other people with different experiences from her own – for example, men and the homeless? She may be aware of the subjective



status of her account, hence her formulations like 'speaking for myself.' She is also aware of how others might regard her as over-gloomy, a 'dismal Jimmy'.

For 21-30 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 standpoint, 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 make specific points about the text (eg about exhaustion, food shortages, homelessness, fear of a cold winter) but they will also be able to make some more analytical observations about social relations and structures. In particular, they might consider what the extract has to say about changing gender relations; how far have these been altered by war, and how far do traditional roles reassert themselves at its end? (Stronger candidates might seek to weigh up the conflicting pieces of evidence in the extract on this question, and to link it to the author's perspective). They may also comment on the disparity between popular expectations of peacetime, and the reality of the immediate aftermath of war. They may reflect on what the extract reveals about the power of the British state (though we would not expect all candidates in this band to do this).

Candidates in this band should also show some understanding of the author's perspective, and the difficulties this presents. They might comment on the subjective nature of a diary account (though they should not be penalised for supposing that this is a private diary, as they have not been told that it was in fact produced for a Mass-Observation survey of public opinion.) They might also comment on the author's standpoint as a housewife, as a civilian, or as a member of the middle-classes.

Candidates in this band will not make inaccurate statements about the text.

For 12-20 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 have engaged in one or more of the main themes, but will have failed to discuss the conflicting messages concerning change/continuity in the transition from peace to war (e.g. with respect to gender roles). In particular, they may make very little, or nothing, of the standpoint and status of the author.

For 0-11 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 'how British people felt in 1945' rather than making more analytical points about social relations and structures in Britain. They may be short, or poorly



expressed. They may also invoke external knowledge at the expense of a close engagement with the passage.