Question 1a

In the view of the author, to what extent does the availability of sources disadvantage the historian of emotions? Referring only to the first paragraph, answer in one grammatical sentence.

The challenge

Accurate comprehension and summarisation of the author’s argument in one grammatical sentence.

Summary of key points

- Modern understandings of the emotions can produce sources which are particularly useful.
- Depending on the period studied, some types of potentially useful source may not be available.
- The history of emotions does not rely on the most obvious source types.
- The limitations that the field does have are generally shared with other areas of historical study.
- The author does hint, though, that there are some (unspecified) issues to do with source availability that may be to the slight detriment of the historian of emotions.

Guidance to markers

Candidates may express the gist of the author in a variety of ways. The summary itself contains points which overlap. The main focus of markers should be on the extent to which the candidate is able to write a single, grammatical sentence which shows a high level of perception, rather than adhering to a ‘tick-box’ approach to classification.

Awarding of marks

9 to 10 marks: One grammatical sentence which shows awareness of 3 of the points in the summary, without errors.

5 to 8 marks: Will usually grasp 2 of the points; or might be more perceptive but in a long, convoluted sentence. Toward the bottom end, the summary might be quite basic.

1 to 4 marks: Very unclear; more than one sentence; or contains significant errors.
Question 1b

How does the author think that research into the history of emotions should be conducted? With reference to the passage as a whole, answer in your own words, in no more than fifteen lines.

The challenge

To show a strong comprehension of the passage, and reorganise it effectively to answer the question in a short burst of purposeful prose.

High-level indicators

- engages with the range of issues addressed by the author.
- engages with the nuance of the author’s argument.
- is able to synthesise this somewhat diffuse passage in an effective way.
- some sense of thematic organisation: for instance, source base; cross-disciplinary applications; methodology; definitions.

Lower-level indicators

- tends to describe disparate elements of the passage without making connections.
- excessive direct or near-direct quotation.
- repetition of points.
- tendency to see the author’s argument as entirely straightforward.

Awarding of marks

14-20 marks: A 15-line response which offers breadth, nuance and synthesis, in the form of a thought-through and thematised response. But this is a challenging passage, so answers can enter this band even with some rough edges.

8-13 marks: Will relate the question to the text, and will draw out some pertinent points. Toward the upper end, will certainly hit more higher- than lower-level indicators; at the bottom end, this balance may be reversed.

0-7 marks: Fails to engage with the text perceptively or with the challenge itself. May just misunderstand what the author is saying, make little reference to the text, or simply quote excessively from it. Garbled answers, responses which speculate excessively beyond the text, or which fail to answer the question also belong here.
Question 2

With regard to any historical event or process of change with which you are familiar, write an essay answering the following question: Did change come primarily from the top, from the bottom, or from any other level of society?

The challenge:

To write a well-argued, purposeful and analytical essay, which distinguishes between three social levels and prioritises them.

High-level indicators:

- Distinguishing meaningfully between all three levels within one society.
- Establishing – and perhaps problematising – a robust intermediate category.
- Prioritising between factors throughout the essay.

Lower-level indicators:

- Unproblematic or formulaic choice of levels. This pertains especially to the ‘other level of society’ category.
- Emphasis on description over analysis.
- Failure to prioritise, except perhaps rather arbitrarily in the conclusion.

Marks scheme:

21-30 marks: Tends to argue, problematise and analyse. Must distinguish meaningfully between 3 societal levels, and generate an argument which is ultimately prioritised.

12-20 marks: Answers the question to some extent, but tends toward description over analysis; offers some argument, but weakly, or only in the conclusion. Toward the bottom end, the candidate may fail to establish a useful middle category, or the essay may feel like an insufficiently adapted schoolwork essay.

0-11 marks: Will fail to establish three categories, will fail entirely to prioritise, or in some other way will manifestly fail to engage with the question. Alternatively, the essay will simply not show the skills expected of a potential undergraduate.
Question 3

What can this extract tell us about the political and social values of the author?

The challenge

Read the text sensitively and perceptively, and write a relevant, well-organised, thematic response.

High-level indicators:

- sees that the ‘values’ communicated by the author contain significant and revealing internal tensions.
- sees that Eugène and Cabet are not synonymous; that the latter creates the former in order to communicate attractively a carefully worked-out alternative to the reality of contemporary France.
- writes a thematic analysis which shows some nuance and prioritisation.
- chooses evidence carefully, represents it accurately, and connects it to other evidence purposefully.
- takes a critically engaged approach to the categories of the ‘political’ and social’.

Lower-level indicators:

- descriptive rather than analytical.
- fails to connect the gender and technological elements to ‘political and social values’.
- gets into a muddle over ‘author’, or indeed over the idea that Icaria is a fictional utopia.
- is excessively negative or unambitious about what the extract can tell us.
- tries to bring in outside knowledge, unnecessary supposition, or tends to make moral judgments.

Marks scheme

33-40 marks: A well-organised, prioritised, thematised response, which engages intelligently and perceptively with the text. Should hit most of the high-level indicators, with very little from the lower indicators.

23-32 marks: A good answer, but perhaps less analytical, thematic or direct. But it should certainly contain some high-level indicators, and few from the lower level.

13-22 marks: Answers the question, but will tend much more toward the low-level indicators than the higher level.

0-12 marks: Doesn’t answer the question; is very short; shows few Oxford undergraduate skills.