

HAT Marking Scheme 2024

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 the late date of the manuscript tradition and the possibility of earlier oral transmission).
- Notes that the text is likely to provide a prescriptive or idealised picture of early Irish kingship and society rather than a purely descriptive one.
- Considers the significance of the distinctive form and poetic language of the text (e.g. by noting the framing of the advice for kings in terms of a mythological narrative).
- Registers that the source represents the product of a particular group within society, in receipt of a specialised and exclusive education; consequently, notes that the source may serve the interests of only some in early Irish society and in any case cannot be taken to reflect the views of all members of that society.
- Registers that there is much about the source, its original context and subsequent transmission that is not clear.
- Therefore, draws conclusions or makes suggestions with a degree of caution.
- Sees that the text is, nevertheless, full of 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 source is problematic, unhelpful or 'biased' without specifying why and how this may have shaped its representation of early Irish society.
- Tends to accept the source's statements and judgments as straightforwardly reflective of what 'people at the time' thought.
- Fails to see that the source may be presenting a subjective view, or to explore that subjectivity.
- Makes no reference to the possible context for or purpose of the source, nor to the distinctive form that it takes.
- 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 and rooted in specific detail.
- Has something to say on the importance of the sovereign's truth or truthfulness, and the link between this quality and the well-being of society as a whole.
- Registers the frequent references to agricultural products and raw materials (e.g. foodstuffs, animals, metals) and draws plausible inferences about early Irish society from this.

- Notes the hierarchical and unequal nature of Irish society (e.g. both free and unfree people, evidence of hierarchies based on age or birth, the existence of 'honour-price', several categories of specialists).
- Comments on the importance of material well-being (e.g. food, clothing, jewellery and craft goods) within the source.
- Registers the association of the ruler with warfare and justice and comments on the possible values/attitudes the source sought to promote in both cases.
- Notes that women are only mentioned in association with motherhood.
- Comments on the significance of genealogy, inheritance and descent.
- Has something to say about the moral universe revealed by the source.
- Comments on the mythological/narrative framing of the advice.
- Reflects on the kind of relationship between the ruler and the ruled that the source is promoting.

Lower level indicators

- The answer is more descriptive than analytical.
- Fails to see the potential of this text for understanding the material conditions of everyday life in early Irish society.
- Has nothing to say about the values the text seeks to promote or the moral norms that underlie it.
- Fails to analyse the association of the ruler with warfare or justice.
- Fails to note any of the evidence for the structure or hierarchy of early Irish society.
- Fails to refer anywhere either to motherhood, genealogy or inheritance.
- Has little or nothing to say about the relationship between the ruler and the ruled.
- Has nothing to say about the mythological/narrative framing of the advice.