



**General Certificate of Education  
June 2012**

**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 students' 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 students' 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 students' 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 © 2012 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools and colleges 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 schools and colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the school or college.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

---

## Marking Thematic Essays

The thematic approach in these papers enables students 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 students 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 students 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 students understanding of key themes and ideas in world archaeology (AO2) and in Section B to test students 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 students 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 student 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 be randomly rather than purposely linked to the question. More typically (3-5 marks) the student 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 students 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. In Section B points made will not go beyond everyday knowledge and there will be very little or no evidence of the study of archaeological issues.

**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 student 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, students 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. In section B there will be a very basic grasp of the debate and/or a very limited range of points made. Discussion will not be sustained and evidence is superficial or undeveloped.

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

#### **Relevant responses**

**Either:** Responses which largely contain material relevant to this question and where the student 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. Synoptic understanding at this level will generally be implicit rather than explicit. Beware of passages of ARCH2 material without any link to context. In section B there will be a understanding of the issue for archaeology although this may be unbalanced. There will be some relevant examples but they won't be exploited. Appraisal will be limited.

---

**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 students 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. In Section B there will be a discursive approach and full engagement with the debate. A wide range of relevant examples or positions will be evaluated. There will be a logical, balanced argument and a clear, supported conclusion will be reached.

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 students. 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, students 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 student'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**

Students 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**

How far is it possible to understand the social meaning in the past of **either** personal ornamentation **or** burial assemblages? (30 marks)

**Use generic levels 1–6 AO1 (5) AO2 (25)**

**Indicative content**

This question has a strong synoptic element linking artefacts – particularly the kind of artefacts that students may have studied for ARCH1, to social organisation, social differentiation and status. Most evidence of personal ornamentation is likely to come from burial assemblages drawn from Bronze and Iron Age Europe, Roman Europe or Egypt. However other sources may also be used, particularly individual finds (e.g. Snettisham torc) or art (e.g. frescoes at Knossos or Pompeii, reliefs such as the Yaxchilan Lintels) or artefacts (e.g. Palette of Narmer). Mosaics, ceramics, coinage and surviving clothes (Ötzi the Iceman) could all be exploited. A wide variety of burial assemblages can be expected with the Amesbury Archer and Tutankhamun prominent amongst them. In both cases the quality of the response will depend on how well students have got to grips with the social rather than ritual meaning of the evidence. At its simplest level this is likely to be discussion of status or wealth. Better responses may discuss power or be more sophisticated in their discussion of status categories including age, gender and ethnicity. High level responses will be able to offer considerable breadth or depth of examples and may discuss the problems of interpretation, e.g. Shennan's analysis of Branc or O'Shea's work on the Omaha or discussion of the nature of symbolism, e.g. in relation to beads in the Upper Palaeolithic.

**Question 2**

Evaluate the impact of **either** an economic **or** a technological change on **society** in the past. (30 marks)

**Use generic levels 1–6 AO1 (5) AO2 (25)**

**Indicative content**

As with other recent papers this question bridges two of the sub-categories but the emphasis in this case should be on a social change but must be as a response to an identified economic or technological change. A very wide range of examples of changes could be drawn on (both specific and general) as long as the discussion of the impact on society is specific. Themes could include metallurgy, agriculture, different modes of exchange, wheel-thrown pottery, sea going ships or industrialisation. The argument and analysis should focus on evidence of disruption or transformation in existing social arrangements. These might include gender relations, elites, social practices (feasting, warfare, display etc). Responses will be differentiated at the top end by their grasp of detail and of causation. Examples might range from the impact

of trade with Rome on Iron Age Britain (the 'bow-wave' impact) to the social meaning of symbolic changes in emphasis from female figurines in the Neolithic to emphasis on male status in Copper and Bronze Age burials related to increased pastoralism and metallurgy.

Responses which just identify multiple changes due to economic or technological change are unlikely to get out of level 3.

### Question 3

How did **either** individuals **or** elite groups maintain their power in the past? (30 marks)

**Use generic levels 1–6 AO1 (5) AO2 (25)**

#### Indicative content

This question is deliberately framed in such a way as to avoid a focus simply on the exercise of force but clearly this will be a key element. Other aspects might include promoting an image (coins, statues, art etc), linking rulers to deities, alliances and marriages, displays of wealth, gift giving and feasting or organisation of landholding. Monarchs and Emperors ('bread and circuses' etc) could legitimately provide case studies but the emphasis in evidence must be on physical evidence rather than texts. Classical civilisation essays should not be over-rewarded. There are many accessible examples which could be drawn on including the reliefs from Nineveh and Nimrud in the British Museum, Mayan calendars, burial monuments from round barrows to pyramids and evidence of sacrifice of others such as the grave of Pu-abu at Ur. Some of these illustrate knowledge as power through control of genealogy. The use or threat of force could include evidence of occupation (motte and bailey castles) or punitive expeditions (e.g. Trajan's column). Students at L4 and above will focus clearly upon individuals or groups and on the maintenance (not just identification of) power.

## Theme 2: Sites and People in the Landscape

### Question 4

How far can archaeologists determine the fabric and construction methods used in buildings in the past? (30 marks)

**Use generic levels 1–6 AO1 (5) AO2 (25)**

#### Indicative content

This question could be tackled using examples from the Palaeolithic (e.g. Pincevent) or Mesolithic (e.g. Howick) but is most likely to attract responses based on the Iron Age (e.g. Butser, Castell Henllys), early medieval period (e.g. Jarrow or West Stow) or the buildings of early civilisations. Experiment will be relevant both in terms of structures and methods but there should also be consideration of materials, features, artefacts and where available, artistic depictions. Higher end responses must consider the strengths and limitations of sources and techniques used by archaeologists in order to reach a conclusion. An example of a relevant methodology might be the chemical analysis of organic binding agents used in buildings at Cham in Vietnam.

---

**Question 5**

Evaluate **two** different approaches to understanding patterns of settlement in the past.

*(30 marks)*

**Use generic levels 1–6 AO1 (5) AO2 (25)**

**Indicative content**

Students are at liberty to define the scope of this essay providing the focus is on settlement patterns (intersite not intrasite). This could include discussion of gathering data in order to plot settlement patterns such as Gaffney's multivariate analysis study of Hvar. Approaches might be exemplified by theoretical models such as site catchment analysis, geographic models such as Theissen polygons, Central Place Theory etc but these must be linked to archaeological examples as at Danebury and Black Patch. Another approach might include drawing on ethnographic fieldwork such as by Kent in the Kalahari or by Binford in Alaska. Again these should be related to archaeological examples. A third approach would be to look at very focussed landscape studies such as the Shapwick study where specific changes from scattered to nucleated settlements were investigated. Where similar approaches are used (e.g. 2 geographical models) responses are likely to be limited to mid-level 4.

**Question 6**

'A problem that archaeologists face when studying territories in the past is that not all boundaries were physical ones.' Discuss.

*(30 marks)*

**Use generic levels 1–6 AO1 (5) AO2 (25)**

**Indicative content**

Accept any kind of territories and boundaries which can be discussed with reference to archaeological evidence. This could be at the micro level of an individual site or the macro level of an empire. For early periods, accept hunting range, transhumance areas or tribal areas. For classical and medieval periods, there should be some discussion of how state territories were demarcated without the formal borders of the modern period. The focus of the essay should be on the relationship between territories and boundaries and the nature of archaeological evidence for either. Non-boundary evidence could include discussion of artefact typologies (e.g. Renfrew on Orkney or Anglo-Saxon brooches), analogs drawn from geography or anthropology (e.g. site exploitation territories), coinage distribution, statues and reliefs. Boundaries could be defensive, domestic (crops, humans, animals) or ritual. So while physical evidence of walls, ditches is likely to predominate, discussion of artefact distribution or 'special deposits' etc. may also be valid. Hadrian's Wall is the most likely physical boundary example to be cited with the Great Wall of China, Offa's Dyke and the Maginot Line amongst other possibilities. At level 3 and above, expect exemplification of both elements. At level 5, there should be an awareness of the role of interpretation. Ideally this would be in relation to an example where archaeologists disagree. At the top level also look for an understanding that boundaries may have several connotations and that these may vary over time. Since the focus is on territory, internal site divisions and ritual boundaries are unlikely to be relevant in most instances.

---

**Theme 3: Economics and Material Culture****Question 7**

Assess the archaeological and ethnographic evidence for the **non-food** use of animals in past societies. (30 marks)

**Use generic levels 1–6 AO1 (5) AO2 (25)**

**Indicative content**

This is a companion question to the 2010 question on plants. Focus should be on the wide range of uses to which humans have put animals (both dead and alive) apart from as food. This could include evidence of the use of live animals for traction (trackways, carts, riding equipment, pack animals), secondary products such as wool for textiles (or doves and poultry for eggs) or as hunting/herding companions or pets. Products made from animals might include bone and antler tools, skins for textiles, tents or furnishings or fat for tallow. The use of animals in ritual (a synoptic element from all 3 Arch 1 options) is also relevant whether as sacred creatures or as offerings. In terms of exemplification we should expect breadth of examples – particularly of artefacts – rather than one or two in great depth since students are likely to have studied examples with particular reference to food. Nonetheless most key case studies are likely to have elements which can be used. For example Iron Age sites frequently include loom weights and spindle whorls, evidence of fields, bones of sheep (and occasionally dogs) and sometimes elements of horse harnesses and ritual deposits. These could be supplemented with the shears from Flag Fen, the cart burial at Wetwang and examples from Iron Age art. The Anglo-Saxon period would produce similar examples, while Rome could add entertainment, standards and pack animals. Evidence from much earlier sites is more likely to emphasise the production of bone and antler tools as at the Mesolithic camp at Ringkloster. This site included evidence of hunting (and probably trapping a wide variety of mammals for furs, the production of bone rings and T-shaped antler axes). Other northern Mesolithic sites could add the use of seal fat in lamps, teeth and tusks used in jewellery, amber carvings of animals, antler harpoons, antlers as part of burial assemblages and even (Star Carr) for head-dresses. Ethno-archaeological evidence will focus on elements of studies which help us interpret the past. Binford's work in Alaska and perhaps Lee's in Southern Africa might be expected. Differentiation will come through range but also the degree of assessment of the evidence.

---

**Question 8**

Compare and contrast the strategies employed by different societies you have studied to cope with uncertain food supplies. (30 marks)

**Use generic levels 1–6 AO1 (5) AO2 (25)**

**Indicative content**

Responses to this question are likely to major on storage although there may be also be an emphasis on intensification, diversification or mobility. Prepared answers on storage are unlikely to be wholly relevant. Key to success will be the grasp of evidence which can be used to demonstrate an understanding of technologies and strategies. This might include settlement patterns, trade, irrigation and drainage schemes, organic artefacts, faunal remains and residue analysis as well as storage pits, buildings and vessels. Also credit ethnographic studies where these are related to archaeological sites or cultures. Lower level answers are likely to produce descriptive work or an extended list. Better answers should contrast 2 or more societies to emphasise different strategies and to discuss possible reasons. Iron Age examples might focus on preserving seed corn and food over the winter with reference to storage pits, ceramics and briquetage as evidence for the trade in salt, animals as 'storage on the hoof' and fields might also feature perhaps alongside discussion of possible use of smoking and even 'bog butter'. While exchange may feature, it should only do so in relation to uncertain food supplies. Storage in conjunction with a trade in metals or luxury goods is unlikely to be relevant. Responses that take a very different tack might include the discussion of seasonal movement following herds, transhumance or the development of 'broad spectrum foraging' which enabled some Mesolithic societies to become largely sedentary. Classic British studies such as Morton, Star Carr and Oronsay are likely to feature, with emphasis on indicators of seasonality. An alternative could be agricultural mobility in early Neolithic Wessex. Students focusing on the Roman period could discuss the view that some of their conquests were in part designed to secure food supplies. There are many examples of storage from granaries to amphorae which could also be discussed. However, trade in wine is outside the scope of this question.

**Question 9**

Evaluate the archaeological explanations for the spread of **either** metalworking **or** a particular form of artefact you have studied. (30 marks)

**Use generic levels 1–6 AO1 (5) AO2 (25)**

**Indicative content**

This question is really applicable from the Neolithic onwards. In the case of ceramics the debate is one of the longest running in archaeology. Does the apparent movement of ceramic styles signify exchange, copying or the movement of peoples. There is a wealth of studies on this topic with the earliest ceramics, bell beakers and amphorae likely to feature frequently. The Amesbury Archer is likely to star in these responses and while valid and relevant, we should expect some other examples and a genuine depth of knowledge as the basis for higher level responses. Recent work by the Europe-wide project on the spread of dairying offers an opportunity to cover lipid analysis and the possible association of pottery for milk products with the spread of cattle. For metal working the question could be tackled in a similar way with

---

regard to La Tene and other 'Celtic' styles. It could also be addressed in terms of the spread of metal working itself and the mechanisms involved such as moment of individuals, prestige goods chains and religion. The Amesbury Archer is again likely case study. Whichever is chosen, the quality of answer is likely to depend on how effectively different possibilities are evaluated. Examples of relevant methodologies include the use of AAS in the sourcing of copper ores and seriation studies of artefact styles.

## **SECTION B: Contemporary Issues in World Archaeology**

### **Question 10**

Following the signing of the Valletta Convention, some professional archaeologists called for legislation to define who could undertake excavations.

Should archaeologists be licensed by the Government? Explain your answer. (30 marks)

**Use generic levels 1–6 AO1 (5) AO2 (25)**

#### **Indicative content**

Detailed knowledge of the Valletta Convention is not needed although some idea of the relevant element could be useful. The key is how successfully the students engage with the debate about the role of amateurs. Public engagement; high quality amateur excavations, professionals and amateurs working together. Higher level responses will be aware of a range of intermediate positions between tight control and open access. They could also consider the implications of licensing both for those included or excluded and the wider impact on archaeology. Examples of work undertaken by amateurs or professionals should be cited in support of the argument. This is not simply an amateur vs professional dialogue (there is no reason that amateurs should not be as qualified – or become licensed) nor is it directly about metal detecting. The best answers might consider which groups might benefit from licensing and why. Responses which do not focus on the issue of licensing will be limited to mid L3 at best.

### **Question 11**

The principle of 'polluter pays' means that most archaeological fieldwork in Britain can be seen as a tax on developers.

Is this principle fair? Explain your answer. (30 marks)

**Use generic levels 1–6 AO1 (5) AO2 (25)**

#### **Indicative content**

Detailed knowledge of PPG 16 or successor planning guidance is not needed although it could be useful. The key is the debate about how archaeology should be funded. We might expect in the current climate some discussion of how archaeology should sit with other priorities in a period of national austerity. Some discussion of other alternatives may also feature. The focus on the essay should really be on development and archaeology. Is it a fair relationship? Is it of

---

benefit to archaeological knowledge? Does it limit development in a harmful way? Does it simply legitimise the destruction of remains? The impact on archaeology in terms of the fragmentary nature of excavation, commercialisation and even pay levels could also be discussed. Expect one or two examples of developer funded archaeology as illustration.

### **Question 12**

Should modern religious and ethnic groups have a veto over the excavation, study and display of human remains from the past? Explain your answer. (30 marks)

**Use generic levels 1–6 AO1 (5) AO2 (25)**

#### **Indicative content**

Judging by responses to previous questions on repatriation and identity the answer is likely to be a resounding 'yes'. This is likely to be rooted on discussion of colonialism versus the rights of indigenous people to identity and nationhood. The Pequots in the USA fall in to this category as do recent high profile repatriation cases involving groups from Africa, New Zealand and Australia. The display issue may also focus on the recent debate about 'Charlie' at Avebury and the increasing sensitivity in museums about displaying any human remains. Better responses will be balanced with consideration of the rights of science (arguably for all people) with Kennewick Man being the most well known example and the rights or interest of the general public to see and learn from exhibits. Other examples could include distinctions between current and archaic religions or whether innovations in display such as holograms are an acceptable substitute. Prepared answers on repatriation are unlikely to be fully/mostly relevant if they focus on artefacts or modern states.

### **Question 13**

How important has climate change been as a factor in human development? Explain your answer. (30 marks)

**Use generic levels 1–6 AO1 (5) AO2 (25)**

#### **Indicative content**

In responding to this question students might either choose to focus on a key 'turning point' or to look at a broader sweep with exemplification from a range of examples. Some mention of other factors against which 'importance' can be measured should be present at least in the conclusion of better responses but we should not expect much if any focus on them in the main body given the time available. Discussion might focus on evidence for Africa becoming increasingly dry around 3mya and the changes in human ancestors related to diet, locomotion and behaviour. A focus on Europe might look at the ebb and flow of glaciation and different responses by archaic hominids including the way Neanderthals adapted to periods of intense cold. There are many possibilities for those focussing on AMHs including Ice Age adaptations (technology, social organisation and genetic variations), the relationship between the Younger Dryas and early agriculture, rising sea levels and changing diet, settlement and technology in the Mesolithic and colder-wetter spells such as that in the late Bronze Age. The demise of C14 Viking Greenland in the 'little ice age' provides a good medieval example.

**Marking Grid**

	<b>AO1 Archaeological skills and methods</b>	<b>AO2 Archaeological knowledge and understanding</b>
Section A (60 marks)	10	50
Section B (30 marks)	5	25
<b>Total (90 marks)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>75</b>

UMS conversion calculator [www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion](http://www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion)