

MARKING SCHEME HISTORY APTITUDE TEST 2010

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 author is indicating agreement with the conventional view that local officials were not closely and continuously controlled from the centre, but were effectively autonomous within the limits of the law and able to set the agenda in local affairs.

This boils down to four distinct claims:

- Local officials were largely independent of central control (and/or the centre did not closely and continuously supervise local officials)
- The power of local officials was limited by the law
- Local officials set the agenda in local affairs
- Most historians already believe this

(It is implicit that the author has said something to suggest that s/he may be challenging this view, but there is no need for candidates to deal with this).

Candidates may legitimately represent this point as an argument ('The author says...') or as a historical statement ('Local officials were not...').

For 9-10 marks, candidates will correctly present all four points above, in a single, grammatical sentence which makes sense.

For 6-8 marks, candidates will correctly present three of the points above, presenting them in a single, clear and grammatical sentence, or all four points in a single sentence which is less clear, or ungrammatical, but nonetheless comprehensible.

For 3-5 marks, candidates will correctly present two of the points above in a single sentence, or will take more than one sentence to present more of them. Their answers may include misunderstandings and/or some poor expression, provided that at least two points are accurately rendered.

For 0-2 marks, candidates will fail to make even two points correctly and clearly, and/or will take more than two sentences to answer. Very poorly expressed answers should fall in this category.

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 a key feature of the author's argument. The author identifies the following strengths:

1. regular parliaments meant that social policy was defined by statute (it is implicit that this is good because statutes had national authority)
2. social policy statutes were shaped by the influence of local officials, which (a) rescued (implicitly out-of-touch) ministers from having to make the laws, (b) allowed for local/public/social initiative (albeit with limits), and (c) encouraged local compliance

S/he also identifies the following two weaknesses, but tends to minimise them:

3. the system did not produce either copious or ambitious social policy, but it is implicit that either would have been risky – inappropriate, annoying, unenforceable
4. the system was not open to mass/lower-class social influence, and the author sees this as a limitation, but not a particularly concerning one.

Of the two strengths, the second is given much more weight than the first, whereas the two weaknesses are roughly equally weighted, but the best candidates should recognise the author's view that the first weakness, if not also the second, is not particularly compelling.

For 14-20 marks, the candidate will, within 15 lines, accurately and clearly capture at least the second strength and the two weaknesses. A candidate who notes the strengths, but plays down the weaknesses, noting that the author doesn't apparently regard them as serious or unequivocal, belongs in this band (and should probably be high in it). The best answers will include the first strength as well as the second, and will explain the second strength fully and clearly (though they do not have to break it down into three points, as above); they may deal with the weaknesses as indicated above. A candidate in this band will not include any irrelevant or contingent points (eg that parliaments happened frequently, or that the system exerted a profound influence on English government and public life). Best and better answers will be clearly and concisely written. Weaker answers will be less well-written and/or less clear.

For 8-13 marks, the candidate will get something of the second strength (at least the basic point that social policy was shaped by local influence) and the two weaknesses (with only partial or no recognition of the way the author qualifies them); alternatively, s/he may get the second strength and deny that there any weaknesses, or only identify weakness no. 4. S/he will be less accurate than candidates scoring in the top band, and may make errors and/or include irrelevancies (provided that these are not so considerable as to raise serious questions about the candidate's understanding of the piece). Answers in this band may be less economically, deftly or clearly written than those in the top band; 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, the candidate may fail to grasp correctly either of the strengths in the passage and his/her handling of the weaknesses will also be poor (e.g. missing the second one out, or regarding the first as a weakness without qualification). S/he may 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 understanding 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.

This should not be a difficult question for any candidate to answer, given that all A level syllabuses, together with the IB, Pre-U and Scottish AHs, involve some investigation of action by government and some discussion of subjects'/citizens' views, or at least of 'what people thought'. The wording of the question has been carefully and deliberately chosen so as to be readily applicable to pre-modern societies, but it is worth bearing in mind that thinking about public opinion will be a more straightforward and familiar activity for students taking modern options (post-1700, or at least post-1640) than for those studying earlier periods. Even so, it should be possible for those who have studied the Crusades, or the Anglo-Norman kings, or the Yorkists and Henry VII, to consider the interactions of kings and popes with the aristocracy or the clergy, or alternatively to write a strong essay insisting that royal/papal/imperial policy was not shaped by any interaction with 'the governed', provided that a cogent case is made for that position. As far as possible, candidates should not be punished for choosing an unhelpful example, but they must nonetheless be judged on the accuracy, imagination and coherence with which they have addressed the question, as set out below.

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

- One is that they must consider the ‘interaction’ of government and the views of the governed, not simply discuss each of these things.
- Another is that they are supposed to offer an ‘assessment’, not merely a description.

For 27-40 marks, candidates will write a relevant, well-organised and clearly-written answer, which analyses the interaction between government and the attitudes of the governed and shows how it affected a particular event, act or movement. An essay which pays much more attention to either views/attitudes or the activities of government, but makes a plausible and carefully argued case for that decision, may fall in this band, provided that it at least addresses the notion of ‘interaction’. In essays in this band, evidence will be clearly marshalled to support an argument/interpretation. If the candidate chooses a doubtful example, s/he will make a very good case for why it fits the question.

For 14-26 marks, candidates will

EITHER consider the role of both government and the views of the governed in the production of a particular event, act or movement, but not their interaction

OR consider the interplay of government and people’s views, but not in relation to a specific event, act or movement

OR (worse) describe the roles of government and the views of the governed without assessing their effects on a specific event, act or movement.

OR (also worse) pay much more attention to either the views of the governed or the actions of the government, and make only a minimal case for that decision

OR (also worse) present only a *reaction* from subjects to an act of government (eg the General Strike of 1926, or the Peasants’ Revolt of 1381, presented merely as reactions to government policy, without any sense of how the people in each case might have been drawing on ideas or principles enunciated by the government, or conducting their action in certain ways to make it more appealing to the government – or without considering the way that the government reacted to the demands of the strikers/rebels).

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. Their sense of either ‘government’ or ‘the views of the governed’ may be hazy, but still reasonable – e.g. regarding the content of newspapers, or the views of prelates, as evidence of the ‘views of the governed’, without justifying that position. If the candidate chooses a doubtful example, s/he will make some sort of case for why it fits the question.

For 0-13 marks, candidates will more or less ignore either government or the views of the governed, without making any positive case for excluding the other element; alternatively, their understanding of ‘government’ or ‘the views of the governed’ may be seriously awry. There will be no serious attention either to the interaction between government and people’s views or to the assessment of that interaction. 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. Candidates in this band may choose a dubious example and make no attempt to explain why it fits.

QUESTION TWO

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.

A number of points in answer to the question can be derived from this document.

- This is an environment of woods and rivers; hunting is the major economic activity.
- This is a society that reveres and privileges the old; the speaker, despite her age, leads the women's dance and addresses the assembled company of men and women.
- This is a society in which gender roles and status are segregated.
- Women's status is inferior, but the speaker insists on the importance of the female role. The latter, while it includes marriage and procreation, is not limited to these areas. Women participate actively in the culture of tribal conflict and warrior prowess, though it is men who will display the requisite bravery and who will win the honour. But women will wear the scalps of their enemies, and vigorously engage in the ritual torture of prisoners.

More interesting, perhaps, is the standing of the text, written by a French missionary priest.

- Is his translation of the speech likely to be accurate?
- He refers to the Mi'kmaq as 'savages'. Can he sympathize with this very alien society sufficiently to understand it?
- Maillart's remark on female nature also suggests a possible line of source criticism: he appears to regard women as potentially more violent/cruel than men.

For 21-30 marks, candidates will show that they have read the text closely, accurately and thoughtfully. Candidates in this band will be distinguished [1] by making at least three points about the text, and [2] by making more sophisticated points than candidates in lower bands. First of all, they *must* show some understanding of the author's perspective, and the difficulties this presents, and may also wonder about the audience for which his account was intended. They will notice that women are given an inferior status, but one in which they undertake actions appear alien to Maillart and to us; they may also note how the ceremony inverts this status. They may recognise a land of forests and rivers, which provide not only the game which is hunted but the metaphors deployed by the speaker, and a land of bitter inter-tribal warfare. If they comment on cannibalism, they will notice that it is the prisoners who are forced to eat each other: it is not clear that the women take part. They 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. In particular, they may make little or nothing of the tone and inflection of the writer, and their observations on the text may not go far beyond a recognition that gender roles are differentiated in Mi'kmaq society and that women, though inferior, could nonetheless be

powerful in certain contexts. There may be no attention either to the environment or to the role of age (but answers lacking both of these themes may deserve a mark in the lowest band).

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, or draw upon extraneous material at the expense of proper engagement with the passage. Answers in this category may be short, or poorly expressed. Answers in this category may invoke external knowledge at the expense of a close engagement with the passage.