

**OXFORD UNIVERSITY HISTORY APTITUDE TEST 2018**  
**MARKING SCHEME**

*The challenge*

The challenge is to read the text sensitively and perceptively, and to write a relevant, well-organised response.

*Higher level indicators*

- historical insight and perceptiveness
  - grasps that the portrait of Colonna is idealised, but also that it may nevertheless reflect contemporary social and cultural values
  - registers that the passage makes revealing assumptions about gender, class, power and intellectual attainment
  - addresses genre, specifically the problems posed by the passage's use of dialogue
  - detects and articulates nuance, grasping that the passage contains unresolved ambiguities and tensions
  - registers that there are other things one might wish to know about the work before interpreting the passage with greater confidence
  - expresses conclusions, therefore, with some caution
- coverage and use of evidence
  - covers a good range of the material efficiently (this is a dense text, so comprehensive coverage is not expected)
  - chooses evidence carefully and represents it accurately
  - interprets the evidence without imposing too much moral judgment
  - treats the evidence in its own terms without intruding external knowledge
  - captures and epitomises material independently, using different prose
  - makes selective and pertinent use of quotation
- shape, structure and style
  - answers the question directly, with a clear focus on 'values'
  - takes a critically engaged approach to the categories 'social' and 'cultural'
  - organises the material coherently into thematically-arranged paragraphs
  - selects material from different parts of the passage to illustrate themes
  - writes clearly

*Lower level indicators*

- historical insight and perceptiveness
  - is more descriptive than analytical
  - is overly negative about the passage's potential to generate historical insight
  - either does not appreciate that the dialogue is fictional, or gets hung up on the fact that it is fictional
  - treats the text uncritically
  - argues inflexibly, failing to detect nuance
  - attempts to judge which claims are 'true' or 'false'
  - contains significant misunderstanding or misrepresentation of the text
- coverage and use of evidence
  - is narrowly focussed, devoting too much time to a small number of points
  - makes generalisations about society as a whole, failing to differentiate e.g. between gender and social groups

- reads the gender dynamics simplistically or focuses too narrowly upon them
- imposes too much moral judgment
- tries to smuggle in external knowledge
- shape, structure and style
  - fails to engage with the specific terms of the question
  - depends too heavily on the shape of the passage to structure an answer
  - makes excessive and unreflective use of direct quotation from the passage
  - does not write clearly

*Marking scheme*

**33-40 marks:** An impressive, well-organised, balanced answer that engages intelligently and perceptively with the passage, hitting most of the higher-level indicators and few if any of the lower level indicators.

**23-32 marks:** A good to very good answer, which answers the question in a critically engaged way, but which hits some of the lower level indicators as well as some higher-level indicators.

**13-22 marks:** A less sophisticated answer, which hits more of the lower- than higher-level indicators.

**0-12 marks:** A basic answer, which hits a predominance of lower-level indicators.