



## **General Certificate of Education**

# **A2 Archaeology 6011**

**ACH4      Settlement and Social  
Organisation**

## **Mark Scheme**

*2007 examination – June series*

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2007 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

---

## ACH4

### Settlement and Social Organisation

---

Study **Figures 1 to 3** on this and the following page.  
Answer **both** parts of the question that follows.

---

#### Section A

##### Quality of Written Communication

The assessment of the Quality of Written Communication (QWC) in Section A is judged through the assessment of the clarity and appropriateness of the archaeological material presented. There are no discrete marks for the assessment of QWC but where questions are "levels" marked, QWC will influence the mark awarded within a particular level.

As a rough guide, QWC performance is characterised by the following descriptors.

- Level 1** Language is basic, descriptions and explanations are over-simplified and lack clarity.
- Level 2** Generally accurate use of language; descriptions and explanations can be easily followed, but are not clearly expressed throughout.
- Level 3** Accurate and appropriate use of language; descriptions and explanations are expressed with clarity throughout.

Further guidance on the assessment of QWC will be given at the Standardising Meeting.

#### Question 1

- (a) Using **one** of the figures and your own knowledge, explain the evidence and methods archaeologists use when attempting to reconstruct buildings from the past. (12 marks)

*Target: AO1 (4) AO2 (8)*

- L1: Fragmentary or fleetingly relevant responses.**  
Descriptive responses based on the examples given or from memory which contain some relevant content. Short lists of indicators. **1-2**
- L2: Responses containing some relevant points but which are muddled, limited or poorly focused.**  
Able to identify some sources which might be useful and/or one or two techniques and attempt to address the question. This may not be coherent. Alternately, superficial understanding of reconstructions on named sites. **3-5**

- L3: **Partially successful responses: Well focused but limited range or presenting a good range of relevant detail but unfocused or unbalanced.**  
May develop several of techniques or sources effectively – starting to relate them to specific relevant examples. Alternately, taking 1–2 site examples and describing reconstructed buildings in detail. **6-9**
- L4: **Good responses: Largely balanced and focused.**  
Outlines a range of sources and methods drawing on one of these examples and additional named sites from their own knowledge. Differentiation between L3 and L4 will largely be on the depth and clarity of understanding of how real examples were produced. Able to link sources, techniques and detailed examples effectively. **10-12**

### Indicative Content

Lower end responses will be similar to those encountered at ACH2. This is fine for these levels since this paper does test synoptic understanding. However, detailed knowledge of specific sites should be expected for Levels 3 and 4. The most likely candidate is Butser, followed by Glastonbury Lake Village. These should be rewarded equally with more exotic sites. Methods could include analysis of dug features, remains of building material, historic, artistic and ethnographic sources, engineering principles, experimentation etc. However, given Question 1(b) do not over-reward experiment. Expect significantly more to move above Level 3.

- (b) Using **at least one** of the figures and your own knowledge, consider the value to archaeology of experimental buildings. **(13 marks)**

*Target: AO1 (5) AO2 (8)*

- L1: **Fragmentary or fleetingly relevant responses.**  
Unsupported assertions or descriptive material (including points gleaned from figures). **1-2**
- L2: **Responses containing some relevant points but which are muddled, limited or poorly focused.**  
Able to describe 1–2 relevant case studies but unable to focus on ‘value’. Alternately, good responses which address the question directly but provide **no** specific examples or lists or extremely unbalanced accounts. **3-6**
- L3: **Partially successful responses: Well focused but limited range or presenting a good range of relevant detail but unfocused or unbalanced.**  
Direct, argued, responses which provide some supporting evidence from specific sites. This may include the examples in the stimulus material if these are developed. Alternately, developed case studies which go beyond the examples given with a commentary which highlights some strengths and weaknesses. **7-10**
- L4: **Good responses: Largely balanced and focused.**  
More sophisticated responses which combine an awareness of the value of experimental buildings as a source of analogies for interpreting features on archaeological sites. Expect a secure understanding of case studies which go beyond those in the stimulus material for 12+. Responses should be clearly argued. **11-13**

### **Indicative Content**

The focus should be on what archaeology might learn from such experiments. Credit other aspects of value such as communication and public engagement/entertainment within bands but do not use to move between bands. Value is likely to focus on testing of hypotheses. Expect a good level of specific knowledge for higher levels since this is a popular topic both for visits and television archaeology. Weaknesses at the bottom end are likely to revolve around 'we can never know' etc. Better responses might look at conflicting models (windows and mezzanines in roundhouses etc). The top end may consider Reynold's argument that these are not reconstructions at all.

---

## Section B: Marking Thematic Essays at A2

The thematic approaches in ACH4 and ACH5 enable candidates to answer from many different contexts. These will in turn impose their own strictures and bias in favour of one form of evidence over another. It will be appreciated by centres that the examiners cannot supply rigid mark schemes which could only deal with a specific context. The mark scheme must be as flexible as the specification and sufficiently broad and catholic in its nature as to be capable of embracing whatsoever culture and time period teachers and candidates elect to study in that particular year. It will be clear then that older and more particularist forms of mark scheme are entirely inappropriate for our needs. Marking guidance therefore falls into two main types. A broad hierarchy of levels based on the assessment objectives for all essays and exemplification for each particular question. In the latter case the contexts and types of evidence suggested are simply for the sake of illustration. There are many other sets of evidence which would provide equally good answers.

Good examining is, ultimately, about the consistent application of judgement. Levels of response mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but cannot cover all eventualities. Where you are very unsure about a particular response, refer it to the Principal Examiner.

### Generic Essay Mark Scheme

**Level 1**                      **1-5 marks: AO1 (1-5) AO2 (0)**

#### Weak or undeveloped answer

**Either:** Responses at the bottom of this level (1-2 marks) may provide **some information** which could be relevant to the question but it will be undifferentiated from irrelevant or inaccurate material – in other words it will be randomly rather than purposely linked to the question. More typically the candidate will demonstrate some understanding of the thrust of the question but is unable to respond in an adequate manner. Some understanding may be shown by the selection of relevant material although this will be presented in a ‘scattergun manner’ with **little discrimination**, explanation or attempt to use it as part of a logical argument. The account will be superficial and may be within the context of a purely narrative or descriptive framework.

**Or:** Alternately the response may consist of a **series of assertions**, some of which may be relevant to the question but which are unsupported. Nevertheless, some of these could have developed into higher level responses. Also include at this level responses which do address the question but are only a few sentences in length or undeveloped lists or plans which had the potential to become higher level answers.

**Level 2**                      **6-8 marks: AO1 (5-7) AO2 (1-2)**

#### Limited response with some merit

**Either:** Responses which demonstrate understanding by including **some material relevant to the question**. However, it is likely that the candidate has been unable to organise their work successfully in order to meet the demands of the question. Typically this may include elements of a case study or the naming of 2-3 sites which

are mentioned in less detail. Understanding of the issues in the question will be **simplistic** and there will be very little assessment of the data which will often be presented in a descriptive format.

**Or:** Answers which do address the question and demonstrate some understanding of the issues, perhaps making several valid points. However, there will be very few or no relevant archaeological examples to support their case. The weakest responses at this level may refer to regions and periods rather than sites.

Also include at this level, developed and detailed essay plans which could have become higher level essays and good response a under a side.

**Level 3**                      **9-13 marks: AO1 (9-11) AO2 (1-2)**

**Reasonable response**

**Either:** Responses which largely contain **material relevant to this question** and where the candidate has begun to organise and structure their work successfully in order to meet its demands. This may be of similar depth to Level 2 responses but will be largely focused on issues raised by the question. Introductions and conclusions are likely to be limited at this level and **appraisal will be fairly simple**.

**Or:** Answers which **address the question** and demonstrate a reasonable understanding of many of the issues it raises. They will be able to reach sensible conclusions but provide **very brief archaeological examples** to support their case. These will typically take the form of name checks of a number of sites and/or methods but these will not be developed. Include at this level responses which are of Level 4 or 5 quality but which have only addressed half of a question which contains two main elements.

**Level 4**                      **14-17 marks: AO1 (12-14) AO2 (2-3)**

**Sound response**

**Either:** Responses largely containing **well focused, relevant material** organised in the form of 1-2 detailed case studies or a range of 4-6 shorter examples with some relevant development. The response must reach **some conclusions** – perhaps in the final paragraph. Depth of understanding of terms and case studies may be very good but commentary and argument will be underdeveloped.

**Or:** Well focused responses which address the question directly and demonstrate a **good understanding of the issues** raised by it. The account is likely to have a coherent structure and may be argued consistently. However, **supporting evidence will still be sparse**, perhaps including a few relevant examples with just a sentence on each. Detailed appraisal of specific studies will not therefore be possible. Include at this level responses which are of Level 6 quality but which have only addressed half of a question which contains two main elements.

---

**Level 5**                      **18-21 marks: AO1 (15-17) AO2 (3-4)****Good response**

**Either:** Responses containing **considerable, well focused relevant material** either in the form of 1-2 detailed case studies or a range of 4-6 shorter examples with some relevant development. Expect at least the equivalent of a sentence on each. **Analysis will be present** although this will not necessarily be consistent and not all the data will be appraised. Evaluation and assessment of the relative merits of different sources and lines of argument will be limited. A conclusion will be reached about the main element in the question.

**Or:** Responses which address the question directly and precisely, demonstrate **a very good understanding of the issues** raised by it. The account will be well structured and should be argued consistently. Appraisal of specific studies may be limited since supporting evidence will be relatively thin. This may include under developed case studies or a wide range of very short examples.

**Level 6**                      **22-25: AO1 (18-20) AO2 (4-5)****Very good to excellent response**

Responses which explore issues in **greater depth or achieve sharper focus in argument** than at Level 5. While the two elements of critical analysis and relevant supporting evidence are both present these **may still be slightly unbalanced**. The essay will be well structured, largely analytical in approach and will address most aspects of the question. The candidate is able to sustain a logical and structured argument supported by appropriate examples, drawn from a particular archaeological context or from several. At this level two or three well developed and detailed case studies should be expected or at least 4 shorter ones, each of which contain several sentences of relevant material. The candidate will demonstrate an ability to successfully appraise some of the evidence and make comparisons. However, not every piece of data will necessarily be successfully linked to the specific demands of the question. Similarly, not all the case studies will supply sufficient detail or show sufficient discrimination in choice of material. Evaluation will be present, perhaps in a developed conclusion which answers the question. There should also be some awareness of the limitations of the evidence.

Reserve 25 marks for **exceptional responses**. These may display an ability to stand back from the detail; to consider a range of interpretations and reach a personal but well supported judgement, which appreciates the interconnectedness of things.

**Deciding on marks within a level**

One of the purposes of examining is to differentiate between responses in order to help awarders distinguish clearly and fairly between candidates. We want to avoid too much “bunching” of marks which can lead to regression to the mean. A key element here is the way examiners approach the work. Given the constraints of time and circumstance, candidates will not produce perfect work. Ideally you should take a ‘cup half full’ rather than ‘cup half empty’ approach to responses above Level 2. This should help you to use the full range of marks available. Start by allocating the essay to the level which best describes it even though it may not be a perfect fit. If you really cannot decide between a level, award the response the top



---

mark of the lower level where the decision is between Levels 1-2 or 2-3 and at the bottom of the higher level in all other cases.

Where you are confident about a level, you should start by placing the essay on one of the middle marks for that level. Next consider whether you feel that mark to be about right, slightly generous or slightly harsh in comparison with other responses at that level. In the latter cases move the essay out to the lower or higher mark in the level. In making decisions away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves whether the response is:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded)?
- well-presented as to general use of syntax, spelling, punctuation and grammar?

The latter two points indicate how the candidate's quality of language might influence the award of marks within a given level of response and complement the information given elsewhere.

### **Quality of Written Communication**

The Quality of Written Communication (QWC) exhibited by the candidates will influence his or her level of performance, and performance within a particular level, as can be seen from the descriptors which follow here.

At **Levels 1 and 2**, candidates are likely to display poor communication skills, work being characterised by disjointed prose, poor organisation and frequent lapses of spelling and grammar.

At **Level 3**, communication skills are likely to remain limited and may be adequate at best. At the lower end of the level spelling and grammatical errors are likely to be frequent and answers will show limited powers of organisation. At the higher end there may still be insecure structuring of paragraphs and weaknesses of expression breaking the flow of the answer.

At **Levels 4 and 5**, communication skills will be generally effective and organisation serviceable. Though spelling and grammar will be sound there may be passages of less well directed writing or an overly schematic approach.

At **Level 6**, the candidate will show strong communication skills, with arguments logically structured, in good English, coherently expressed and cogently developed.

---

**Question 2**

Discuss the nature and functions of boundaries for a period you have studied. *(25 marks)*

*Target: AO1 (20) AO2 (5)*

Use generic levels.

**Indicative Content**

Accept any kind of boundaries which can be discussed with reference to archaeological evidence. For example: defensive, domestic (crops, humans, animals), ritual and social including territorial. So while physical evidence of walls, ditches is likely to predominate, discussion of artefact distribution, 'special deposits' etc will also be valid. Expect both elements in the question to be addressed for Level 3 and above: what boundaries comprised of and what they signified. At Level 5 and above there should be an awareness of the role of interpretation. Ideally this would be in relation to an example where archaeologists disagree. Jericho and Hadrian's Wall are the most likely to be cited. Reward understanding of why archaeologists disagree. At the very top level look for an understanding that boundaries may have several connotations and that these may vary over time. Detailed and developed responses that ignore 'period' could reach 15 marks, but more typically will be Level 3. Responses which are solely about territory should not be marked above Level 3.

**Question 3**

Using a region with which you are familiar, discuss how archaeologists have been able to establish the reasons for the emergence of complex societies. *(25 marks)*

*Target: AO1 (20) AO2 (5)*

Use generic levels.

**Indicative Content**

Weaker answers may provide descriptive or narrative accounts of the development of complex societies where the question is only addressed implicitly. Better responses will focus on possible factors and then attempt to identify similarities and differences. The highest levels may demonstrate a grasp of theoretical models but this should not necessarily be expected. Interpret complexity broadly, this is not solely about classical civilisations. Where candidates identify a significant increase in complexity give them credit. This could encompass the final Mesolithic in Northern Europe or the Upper Palaeolithic society based at Dolni Vestonici if the case is argued. More likely are the Bronze and Iron Age in Wessex, the Oaxaca Valley, Mesopotamia and Egypt. Detailed and developed responses which ignore 'region' could reach 15 marks but more typically will be Level 3.

---

**Question 4**

To what extent can archaeologists understand the nature of warfare in the past without the aid of historical records? (25 marks)

*Target: AO1 (20) AO2 (5)*

Use generic levels.

**Indicative Content**

Many responses will address 'how' rather than the question set. Depending on how well that is done, these responses can reach the middle bands. Expect some attempt to evaluate for more. Responses based on written records alone are unlikely to gain much credit. Similarly, responses which address 'can archaeologists identify warfare in the archaeological record?' are unlikely to get out of band 3. The question is primarily about different types or levels of warfare. For historic periods this might revolve around tactics, organisation and technology. For earlier periods focus might be on raiding vs armies, aims and outcomes, participants as well as technology. Both responses which survey a range of indicators drawn from a wide range of contexts and those that focus on one or two examples in depth are equally valid. Some attempt to define should at least be implicit in Level 4 and 5 responses. A wide range of evidence should be evident in the upper levels. This might include such as evidence of burning of settlements, plotting projectile distribution, mass-graves, skeletal trauma, grave goods, damage to weapon edges, changes in weaponry etc. Well-argued responses which concentrate on critically evaluating archaeological evidence for warfare should be allowed to reach the highest level.