



**General Certificate of Education
June 2011**

A2 Archaeology 2011 ARCH3

Unit 3

World Archaeology

Final

Mark Scheme

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

Copyright © 2011 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.

Marking Thematic Essays

The thematic approach in these papers enables candidates to select indicative content from a wide variety of contexts. In Section A these contexts will differ greatly in the importance of particular types of evidence, archaeological methods and interpretative models. In Section B candidates can provide examples from a wide range of case studies, including those studied at AS level and recent archaeological news items. As a result, highly specific mark-schemes are inappropriate. The scheme must be sufficiently flexible that it can embrace whatever culture, case study and time period teachers or candidates elect to study in that particular year.

Marking guidance therefore falls into two main types. A broad hierarchy of levels based on the assessment objectives for all essays and then exemplification for each particular question. In the latter case the contexts and types of evidence listed are simply for the sake of illustration. There are many other sets of evidence, which would provide equally good answers.

The balance of assessment objectives on this paper between AO1 and AO2 is 15:75. The primary aim of the assessments in Section A is to test candidates understanding of key themes and ideas in world archaeology (AO2) and in Section B to test candidates understanding of contemporary issues and debates in world archaeology (AO2). Depending on the questions chosen they will also focus to a greater or lesser extent upon:

- The basis of archaeological knowledge and its limitations (AO2)
- The strengths and weakness of archaeological interpretation (AO2)
- The nature of and factors affecting continuity and change in the past. (AO2)

Understanding of AO1 will be a key factor in differentiating responses within levels. In Section A this particularly means the extent to which candidates employ both a synoptic and where appropriate detailed, understanding of archaeological techniques and methodology in order to argue and to evaluate alternative positions. This may also be relevant in Section B, although the way archaeologists interpret material remains and communicate their findings will more frequently be relevant (for example, the degree of understanding of heritage issues and concepts). In both cases, accurate and relevant use of archaeological terminology will be a determinant of Quality of Written Communication (QWC).

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 your team leader.

Generic Essay Levels Mark Scheme**Below Level 1 0 marks****Answers with no merit or relevance to the question set**

Responses at this level may be of reasonable length and may contain archaeological examples but they will not respond to demands of this specific question. The candidate may have incorrectly interpreted a concept or simply responded to a word or phrase in the question by writing all they can think of about that 'trigger'.

Level 1 1-5 marks AO1 (1) / AO2 (4)**Weak or undeveloped answers**

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 randomly rather than purposely linked to the question. More typically (3-5 marks) 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 been developed into higher level responses.

At Level 1, where candidates submit full essays they are likely to display poor communication skills, work being characterised by disjointed prose, poor organisation and frequent lapses of spelling and grammar. This level also includes 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. Synopticity is likely to be lacking in responses at this level.

Level 2 6-10 marks: AO1 (2) / AO2 (8)**Limited responses 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 little or no relevant archaeological examples to support their case. The weakest responses at this level may refer to regions and periods rather than sites.

At Level 2, candidates are likely to display some poor communication skills. This may include disjointed prose, poor organisation and frequent lapses of spelling and grammar. There may be some appropriate use of archaeological terminology at this level but is unlikely to be widespread. Essays of normal length may be muddled or marred by inaccuracies and irrelevant detail. This may include sections drawing exclusively on classical texts or historical sources. This level will also include very detailed essay plans and promising essays which have not been developed (e.g. very brief or truncated). Synopticity is unlikely to move beyond name-checking of methods.

Level 3 11-17 marks: AO1 (3) / AO2 (14)

Relevant responses

Either: Responses which largely contains material relevant to this question and where the candidate has begun to organise and structure their work successfully in order to meet its demands. At the bottom end this may be of similar depth to Level 2 responses but will be largely focused on issues raised by the question. Material is likely to be presented largely in a descriptive or narrative style. In most cases the nature of the evidence base will not be explored. Introductions and conclusions are likely to be limited at this level and appraisal will be simple.

Or: Answers which address the question and demonstrate a reasonable grasp of some of the issues it raises, e.g. causation. Arguments will tend to be generalised with a limited range of factors or criteria being considered. They will be able to reach sensible conclusions but provide very brief archaeological examples to support their case. At the lower end these will be general references to societies while better responses will typically name-check a number of sites and/or methods (Section A) or case studies (Section B) 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.

At Level 3 communication skills may remain limited and will often be adequate at best. At the lower end of the level spelling and grammatical errors may still be frequent and answers will sometimes show limited powers of organisation. At the higher end the flow of the answer may sometimes be hampered by insecure structuring of paragraphs or occasional poor expression. Expect to see some archaeological technical language used accurately in the upper part of the band. Synopticity understanding at this level will generally be implicit rather than explicit. Beware of passages of ARCH2 material without any link to context.

Level 4 **18-24 marks: AO1 (4) / AO2 (20)****Sound responses**

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. Expect at least the equivalent of a sentence of detail on each site. The response must reach some conclusions – perhaps in the final paragraph. Depth of understanding of terms and case studies may be detailed 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. Typically this will be arranged in terms of points for and then points against or similarity/difference. At the bottom end of the range arguments will tend to be generalised. At the top end there will be an awareness of differing interpretations. Supporting evidence may still be limited to a few relevant examples with just a sentence on each. Detailed appraisal of specific studies will only feature at the top end.

At Level 4 communication skills will generally be sound. Though general spelling and grammar will be secure there will still be lapses with technical vocabulary. Organisation will be sensible with effective paragraphing for most of the essay although there may be passages of less well-structured writing. Expect to see archaeological terminology used routinely and accurately at this level. Better responses will cope with contradictory sources and use language which reflects the limitations of evidence discussed. There should be clear evidence of a synoptic understanding at this level, for example in an awareness of the range of sources (or their reliability) involved in constructing the evidence discussed.

Level 5 **25-30 marks: AO1 (5) AO2 (25)****Very good to excellent responses**

Either: Responses containing considerable, well focused relevant material with a good grasp of issues relating to the evidence base. Better responses will demonstrate a secure and detailed knowledge of case studies. At the top end for Themes 1–3 expect to see an understanding of relevant scientific techniques. The style will largely be Analytical although not necessarily throughout and not all the date will be appraised. Evaluation and assessment of the relative merits of different sources and lines of argument may not be fully developed. A clear conclusion will be reached about the main element in the question.

Or Critical, discursive responses which address the question directly and precisely, demonstrate a very good understanding of the issues raised by it. There will be an awareness of a wide range of factors or of different interpretations and an ability to order these logically. Better response will explicitly cross-reference these in order to tease out strengths and weaknesses. There should be a clear awareness of the limitations of the evidence. Appraisal of specific studies may be limited since supporting evidence may include a number of brief case studies or a wide range of very short examples. The account will be well-structured and should be argued consistently.

At Level 5 communication skills will be generally effective. Organisation and arguments will be clear and logical. Though spelling and grammar will be sound there will be occasional errors. Expect to see a broad range of archaeological terminology being used routinely, fluently and accurately at this level. Synoptic understanding will be good, particularly at the upper end of the range where candidates are likely to have a keen awareness of the nature of the evidence based and the strengths or otherwise of the data on which it rests.

A top level essay will bring together routes A and B. It will be consistently argued, relevant and be supported by well-chosen case and thoroughly understood case studies. Expect fluency, precise and appropriate use of technical language and a very good grasp of methodology. However, do not expect perfection for the award of maximum marks. You are looking at an essay produced under strict time constraints by a Level 3 student, not an undergraduate. Equally, there may be essays which you feel deserved even more marks. That may be the case but such gems should not be used to benchmark all other excellent scripts .

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 that 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, including 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.

Exemplification for each question

Candidates can use any relevant case studies from their course of study to illustrate their answers and support their arguments. At the very top level we should expect to see understanding of specific, relevant methodology which goes beyond that taught at ARCH 2. In each case an example has been given.

SECTION A: Themes in World Archaeology**Theme 1: People and Society in the Past****Question 1**

To what extent can archaeologists determine the size and structure of family or household units in the past without the use of written evidence? (30 marks)

Use generic levels AO1 (5) AO2 (25)

Indicative content

This question is accessible for all periods from Isaacs' model of 'home base behaviour' from Olduvai Gorge onwards. Size is most likely to be related to buildings but other dimensions such as carrying capacity may feature. This is **not** a question on buildings alone, function, or on social stratification. Responses which focus on the relative position of different families in the social structure are unlikely to move beyond Level 2. The question is really about the basic units people have lived in- how were they defined, who was included and what degree of differentiation of role and status there was within them. This includes internal differentiation based on age and gender. There are good case studies in most period which can be drawn on including the houses of early farmers in the Balkans and Anatolia, Brochs and Iron Age round houses and Mediaeval Longhouses and castles. Artefact distribution, spatial analysis and skeletal evidence are all fruitful topics for discussion. An example of relevant methodology might be the use of access analysis to determine control of space at Gurness.

Question 2

How can archaeologists identify and explain the emergence of **either** chiefdoms **or** states from physical remains? (30 marks)

Use generic levels AO1 (5) AO2 (25)

Indicative content

The particular options within this question balance Questions 1 and 7 in terms of complexity of societies studied. Option a) looks at the transition from ranked but still quite fluid hierarchies to permanent offices and largely hereditary patterns of power. From largely achieved to largely ascribed status. Depending on the indicators chosen and the periods studied the examples could come from bronze or even iron age Europe. Those indicators might include symbols of office or authority, ceremonial sites or evidence of large scale storage, feasting or warfare. b) could focus on the emergence of particular civilisations in a region such as Mesopotamia, Egypt or the Copan Valley or the extension of such a society into a new region such as the expansion of Roman power into Central and Western Europe. In the latter case more than the story of conquest will be required. Indicators might include specialist buildings, written records, calendars, coinage and evidence of bureaucratic specialists. Candidates need to be clear whether they are discussing states or chiefdoms. Answers where this is muddled are unlikely to move beyond Level 3. Discussion of possible reasons for change should be present for Level 4.

Question 3

Choose **one** military, political or religious organisation that you have studied. Evaluate the contribution of archaeology to our understanding of the structure and operation of that organisation. (30 marks)

Use generic levels AO1 (5) AO2 (25)

Indicative content

This question will be possible for candidates who have studied societies from the Bronze Age although it is probably most accessible from the Iron Age onwards. The most likely candidate is the Roman Army and the key issue is the degree to which physical evidence has added to, moderated or contradicted written evidence. Responses which are purely based on classical texts are unlikely to get beyond Level 2. A huge range of sources are available including military architecture, inscriptions and monuments, artistic depictions, tablet, artefacts and skeletal remains. Experimental archaeology may be relevant but should not predominate. Other possibilities might include the Medieval Church, various empires of the near east and the English monarchy.

An example of relevant methodology might be the use of various scientific techniques to analyse the composition of royal coinage to determine the extent of debasement.

Theme 2: Sites and People in the Landscape**Question 4**

What methods offer the best possibilities for archaeologists to discover new sites **and/or** lost landscapes? (30marks)

Use generic levels AO1 (5) AO2 (25)

Indicative content

This question enables candidates to demonstrate a synoptic understanding drawing on some knowledge gained on unit 2 but extending it and relating it to specific examples studied for unit 3. Candidates can write about either or both topics since there could be an overlap. Candidates may select core unit 2 methods such as field walking or aerial photography but must relate it to known examples and must evaluate the methods. Stronger responses will extend the range of methods to include some newer technologies which could include LiDAR or remote sensing using satellites. Examples could include the Environment Agency surveys of flood zones or the recent surveys around Tara and other ritual sites in Ireland which have revealed many new features. Low level answers on lost landscapes are likely to focus at the level of recreation using environmental data- again related to specific examples. Better answers will focus on entire landscapes and the application of new technologies. Examples include work by Wessex Archaeology under the English Channel and the Birmingham University programme to map 'Doggerland'- the North Sea bed. Both have led to the rediscovery of drowned Mesolithic

landscapes and drawn on a range of methodologies including recording finds during dredging, core sampling, 3D seismic reflection data and sonar mapping.

Question 5

What sources and methods are of most use in trying to understand areas of activity on sites **and/or** within buildings? *(30 marks)*

Use generic levels AO1 (5) AO2 (25)

Indicative content

This question asks candidates to focus on how archaeologists know what went on in different parts of a site or building and by implication- how these areas were demarcated. This is a more obviously synoptic question than most, drawing on understandings gained on Paper 2. However, it is not sufficient to list generic indicators such as phosphate analysis, pollen, snails and beetles. These should be contextualised and applied to examples of sites the candidates have studied. Although farmyards and workshop areas on sites like Glastonbury and Danebury are likely to feature heavily, it is possible to answer this question drawing on particular buildings such as Knossos Palace or particular medieval castles or monasteries. Aside from scientific and faunal analysis candidates might focus on artefacts, particular features, artistic depictions and distribution patterns.

Question 6

Examine the impact on settlement patterns of a change in **either** society **or** economy *(30 marks)*

Use generic levels AO1 (5) AO2 (25)

Indicative content

The opportunity here is for candidates to examine one category of evidence in depth and relate it to a particular event or longer term change. Examples could include LBK longhouses, permanent mesolithic sites, nucleated villages from the C12, Roman forts and villas, the impact of the Black Death, Norman castles and WW2 airfields. These could be tackled at a very local level (perhaps drawing on personal studies) or a much wider area. The key is being able to describe patterns both before and after the chosen 'event' and to assess the extent that any change is monocausal and universal. In some instances the change itself may not be easily visible in the archaeological record and the reasons in terms of surviving physical evidence should be explored. Specific types of evidence are likely to be discussed in less depth than on most questions but there will be a greater focus on a relatively narrow period and on a few areas.

Theme 3: Economics and Material Culture

Question 7

How far can archaeologists identify the components of hunter-gatherer diets? (30 marks)

Use generic levels AO1 (5) AO2 (25)

Indicative content

This question is most accessible to those studying the Mesolithic or earlier in Europe but could also be tackled by those who have studied other cultures such as Australian aboriginals. It is a topical question given the recent Ray Mears series on television. However, insights from modern foragers and experimentation will not be sufficient by themselves to move out of the lower half of Level 3. Candidates will need to consider direct and indirect evidence of diets including skeletal remains, bone and plant assemblages, tools, features and structures. A significant consideration will be the impact of differential survival and the methods used to address gaps in the record. An example of a relevant methodology might be the use of stable isotope analysis on human skeletal remains. Expect consideration of differential survival for Level 4.

Question 8

What were the likely events or processes that led to the emergence of agriculture in a geographical area you have studied? (30 marks)

Use generic levels AO1 (5) AO2 (25)

Indicative content

The geographic setting could be relatively narrow e.g. Oaxaca valley or wide e.g. the Near East. It will be important to discuss the evidence for early farming including faunal remains, artefacts, seeds and pollen, settlements and burials but the questions also calls for explanation. There are several ways to approach this. Candidates may choose to outline a number of theoretical explanations e.g. Braidwood or Flannery and then consider the extent to which the evidence supports them. Alternately they might focus on particular examples in depth e.g. Tel Abu Hureyra and then draw on elements of theories to interpret the evidence they have outlined.

Answers which focus on the arrival of agriculture in an area (e.g. British Isles) are relevant. However, discussion of more advanced agriculture and intensification in the Bronze Age or later is not.

Question 9

How far can archaeologists understand the nature and production of **either** clothing **or** drinks and liquid food in the past?? *(30 marks)*

Use generic levels AO1 (5) AO2 (25)

Indicative content

This question provides a specific focus for an examination of production and consumption in the past. It is accessible for most period. Evidence of both survives from the Mesolithic and in the case of clothing several sites in the Upper Palaeolithic e.g. Dolni Vestonici. The nature of clothing might include materials used, design and function while production could encompass skinning, shearing, producing plant fibres, spinning, weaving and sewing. Evidence from bog bodies or Oetzi could be relevant as would Viking Yorvik or Medieval cloth production. Drinks could range from soups to beer to milk. Discussion could include containers used, the social significance of different drinks and the geographical spread of them. These could include evidence for the development of beer in Mesopotamia, the ritual significance of chocolate in Mexico, the spread of dairying across Europe or early soups from Mesolithic Denmark. Techniques used could include analysis of lipids and other markers, typology of vessels and interpretation of art.

SECTION B: Contemporary Issues in Archaeology

Question 10

'Research excavation is no longer justifiable'. Discuss.

(30 marks)

Use generic levels AO1 (5) AO2 (25)

Indicative content

If digging is essentially destruction then should archaeologists only excavate sites when they are threatened? The question invites candidates to argue for or against this point of view or find their own compromise. Arguments might include the potential superiority of future archaeology, the use of non-invasive techniques or the interest of present populations in their heritage. Issues such as the role of amateurs or the funding of research could also be relevant. Prepared answers on the differences between research and rescue (as per ARCH2) are unlikely to get beyond Level 2. Arguing that there is sufficient developer-led archaeology or that much rescue archaeology is also research, are alternative points which could reach Level 4.

Question 11

How meaningful is the term 'World Heritage' for archaeology?

(30 marks)

Use generic levels AO1 (5) AO2 (25)

Indicative content

This question is wider than discussion of World Heritage sites. It revolves around the idea that some museums are so significant in world terms that they are justified in holding material from cultures all over the planet. This may also be couched in terms of artefacts which are relevant to all humans rather than particular modern groups. The BM and the 100 objects are likely to feature here although limited credit will be given for essays focussing on the Elgin Marbles. Alternatively candidates may consider the value and impact of some sites being designated and what it actually means. Both elements should be expected for Level 5.

Question 12

Evaluate the ways in which **at least two** museums communicate with and educate their visitors. (30 marks)

Use generic levels AO1 (5) AO2 (25)

Indicative content

This question allows students to draw on museums encountered as part of their studies on visits or perhaps working on their personal study. They should discuss the methods used by each institution giving specific examples and discuss their effectiveness, perhaps in relation to specific groups of visitors. A second approach might be to discuss the extent to which the museums do that in relation to their other functions. At least 2 different museums should be compared and contrasted. Consideration of what different audiences might want and/or the differences between communication and education are indicative of Level 5 responses.

Question 13

How far is genetics revolutionising our understanding of human evolution? (30 marks)

Use generic levels AO1 (5) AO2 (25)

Indicative content

This question will be accessible whether candidates have covered the broad sweep of human evolution or just one phase. It asks students to demonstrate a basic understanding of the science involved but to focus on the application and consider its impact. Most obviously there is the 'Out of Africa' debate and the 'African Eve' model of human origins. Other fruitful topics could include the relationship between anatomically modern humans and the Neanderthals or the origins of modern population groups (e.g. 'blood of the Vikings' or the debate about whether Mesolithic populations were replaced by incoming farmers). Conceivably candidates could focus on developments in understanding animal dna (dogs, cattle, sheep etc) and the implications for understanding human social development. Also relevant is the recently reported research on the dna of human lice and the impact on our understanding of when humans lost most body hair and when they began wearing clothes. All should be accepted.

Marking Grid

	AO1 Archaeological skills and methods	AO2 Archaeological knowledge and understanding
Section A (60 marks)	10	50
Section B (30 marks)	5	25
Total		

(90 marks)	15	75
-------------------	-----------	-----------

Copyright © 2011 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved