

## **Oxford Colleges History Aptitude Test: 2007 Marking Schedule**

### **General Remarks**

It is essential to the credibility of the History Aptitude Test (HAT) that, as far as possible, it is marked in a uniform way and to a common set of standards and expectations. The following guidelines have been devised in relation to the published specifications of the HAT. They have been approved by the History Admissions Subcommittee, and you need to follow them closely.

Do not award marks which are not whole numbers as the web system can only accept whole numbers. Please do not deduct marks for spelling and grammatical errors unless they obstruct the expression of meaning. In reflecting on the quality of candidates' expression, give preference to clarity over style. The use of high-quality vocabulary should not be rewarded for itself, but only when it assists the expression of relevant material.

Note that the essay exercise [1(c)] is not intended as a test of candidates' depth of knowledge, and must not be marked as such. Candidates have been advised that no special preparation or revision is required for the HAT, so it is unreasonable to expect them to write with the same depth and/or accuracy on points of detail that we would expect from prepared written work.

Please use the whole of the marking scale.

### **Marking Guidelines for Each Question**

#### **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 the text. They should show precision in the handling of concepts, and demonstrate an ability to summarize the author's words without transcribing them.

For 8-10 marks, candidates will grasp the author's central point that governments' attempts to extend their power in this period were obstructed by surviving assumptions about their proper function. Answers will identify the means by which governments hoped to extend their control (an increasingly effective administration and the creation of a shared identity), and the conservative beliefs of their subjects (essentially, that

government's role should be focused on protection). They may draw attention to the difference between the two meanings of the word 'state' mentioned in the first sentence, and to the significance of the ruler's oath of office. The argument will be summarized coherently and succinctly, and will avoid reference to material from later paragraphs.

For 5 to 7 marks, the candidate will grasp the purpose of the question and provide a reasonably competent summary of the author's argument. The answer may, however, overlook some significant points, or stray into material from other paragraphs. The quality of expression may be less strong, and there may be a tendency towards waffle or repetition.

For 0 to 4 marks, the candidate will demonstrate only a hazy awareness of the author's argument, or focus on just one or two elements in the paragraph. The answer may indicate muddle over matters of detail, repeat (with only superficial variation) the words of the author, or draw extensively on other paragraphs.

In general, candidates who go over-length should be penalized. One mark should be deducted for every additional three lines.

### **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 author's explanation for a growth in the institutions of government in this period. It is therefore focused on the ability to extract a relatively complex argument from a rather elusive piece of writing, to summarize that argument within the length required, and to present a multi-causal explanation coherently. Some candidates may be tempted to make comparisons with institutional growth in other periods with which they are familiar. Such comparisons should not necessarily be penalized, but they should not of themselves raise the final mark for this answer.

For 14 to 20 marks, the candidate will provide a well-balanced account of the reasons for the growth of government institutions (see below). The best candidates will demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of that process, and in particular an ability to link the several different elements in the author's discussion.

For 8 to 13 points, the candidate will provide a competent summary of the argument. The answer may however read more like a list than an essay, or may focus on only some of the more obvious arguments.

For 0 to 7 points, the candidate may fail to grasp the nature of the overall argument, focus exclusively on one factor, or present nothing more than a series of quotations or near-quotations. The candidate may even miss the point of the question completely.

The principal elements in the author's argument are as follows:

1. At its simplest, the growth of government institutions arose from the desire of rulers to increase their control over their subjects.
2. But new responsibilities, and the need to deal more effectively with old responsibilities, also prompted the appearance of new or enlarged government agencies.
3. Further pressure to increase the scale of administrative support came from the new demands of diplomacy, the changing demands of war and defence, and rulers' desire to demonstrate their enhanced status.
4. All this obliged rulers to increase their revenue, above all from taxation, and so to extend the number and power of the officials they employed.
5. The resulting growth of government institutions in turn created a need for further additional revenue.

The passage ends by suggesting that the growth of government was severely limited by the small size of the bureaucracy. Although this is not an essential part of an answer to the question, perceptive candidates may well note this closing twist to the argument.

### **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.

The question requires candidates to identify ‘the most important factors’ responsible for changing the relations of rulers and ruled in their chosen period. They should therefore be willing to justify and explain their selection: they should not take the importance of what they want to discuss for granted, nor should they provide just a list of factors they consider worthy of consideration. The passage set may well alert candidates to some topics for their own discussion, and they are of course at liberty to make links between ideas presented in the text and the material in their essays. They should be rewarded if they do so effectively and imaginatively. But in all cases, they must do more than merely repeat what is in front of them in the text.

Answers may focus on change at either national or local level: on the growth of the franchise in a more recent period for example, or the shifting balance of power between lord and tenants in an earlier period. Discussion of changing relations within a social, military or ecclesiastical context is as acceptable as discussion of changing relations within a political, constitutional or economic context. In general, markers are urged to err on the side of generosity where a candidate appears to have chosen a less than ideal example for discussion: it is important to bear in mind the extent to which candidates are constrained by the syllabus they have studied at school. But it is appropriate to penalize a candidate who presents an example that has nothing to do with any changing power relationship, or one who seizes on an event from his/her course without explaining why it constitutes a suitable case study of change in such a relationship.

For 30-40 marks, the candidate will identify the key factors in a well-chosen example of changing power relations, and write in an argumentative and analytical manner, justifying and explaining why those factors were of particular importance, and considering and accommodating alternative or less significant explanations. The essay will be coherent and clearly-expressed. The very best answers will consider a range of factors and how they related to each other while maintaining clarity and control; such answers may be original and imaginative in approach, conceptually advanced, or alert to the wider implications of the case-study under discussion.

For 15-29 marks, candidates will have chosen a reasonable or good example of a changing power relationship, and will have made some attempt to justify their choice of factors. Answers in this category may however be more descriptive and less analytical than those in the top band. They may be less coherent, less well-structured, and/or less well-expressed; they may pay less attention to alternative factors, or demonstrate less sensitivity to the significance of past priorities. They may be intelligent, but too brief to allow for sufficiently complex analysis. Recycled school essays which are well-handled but show no evidence of broader thought may fit this category, provided that the example chosen is adequate and the essay meets the terms of the question.

For 0-14 marks, candidates will have focused their discussion on a culpably inadequate example, or failed to justify their selection of factors. They may have written a wholly

descriptive essay, or have taken for granted the causal link between the changes in power relations they are discussing and the factors they assert were responsible. Of the various flaws in these essays, choosing a poor example should be regarded as the most easily forgiven, and problems arising from a poor choice should not be penalized twice.

## 2.

This 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. There are a number of significant points arising in the text that candidates may be expected to comment upon:

- The importance of the writing of history for the construction of national identity.
- The implication that nationalist Korean histories are not readily to hand, suggesting that Korean nationalism was only in a state of formation rather than being fully-fledged.
- Japan was occupying Korea and ruled with a strong hand: this was resented by at least a significant minority.
- Trusted authority figures, who were perceived as having access to ‘advanced’ ideas, facilitated political innovation by example, protection or encouragement. Candidates may correctly infer that Pastor Kim and Miss Golden’s school was an atypical conduit of western influence in Korea, but this should not be considered necessary for top marks.
- Gender and age stereotyping inform the depiction of school girls disseminating patriotic literature which is used to radicalize an emerging male militant cadre.
- The extract evidently recalls events in the past and its story conforms to a nationalist and teleological narrative of patriotic emergence, sacrifice and eventual triumph. Candidates may correctly infer that the author is a nationalist recalling her experiences after the defeat of Japan, but these details should not be considered necessary for top marks.

Students might tackle a number of issues, or pursue particular points in more detail.

For 21-30 marks, candidates will show that they have read the text closely, accurately and thoughtfully, and that they are able to say something about a number of the issues suggested above. Such candidates will display an ability to generalize and speculate. What makes a history book so valued? Why is Miss Golden’s confrontation with her

pupils so ambiguous? It does not matter if their speculations are factually wrong, provided that they are reasonable ones to make from this extract.

For 12-20 marks, candidates will have made some sense of the text and thought of some things to say, but their judgements, though relevant, may be less penetrating, less clearly-expressed, or less easily sustainable from the text. They might, for example, focus excessively on Japanese repression, or the girl's courage. Weaker answers in this category may invoke external knowledge at the expense of close engagement with the passage.

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 draw substantially upon extraneous material at the expense of a close engagement with the passage.

Answers in this category may be very short, or poorly expressed.