

# A-LEVEL ARCHAEOLOGY

ARCH3 World Archaeology  
Mark scheme

---

2010  
June 2014

---

Version/Stage: v1.0 Final

---

---

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

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 from [aqa.org.uk](http://aqa.org.uk)

## 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 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 contains 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 awareness of the range of sources (or their reliability) involved in constructing the evidence discussed. In Section B there will be a clear focus on the archaeological debate and a critical understanding of issues. A range of examples and/or positions will be considered in a balanced way before arriving at a conclusion. Accurate and relevant examples will largely be exploited.

**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****Question 1**

Discuss whether social organisation amongst hunter-gatherers in the past was influenced solely by environmental factors.

**[30 marks]**

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

**Indicative content**

Success with this question depends upon having an understanding of what Social Organisation encompasses and ideas about why particular forms may have developed in particular societies. Students will need to identify some different modes of organisation, with bands and tribes the most likely. While scale of society is an issue, students will need to attempt to explain why different scales occurred in order to reach level 4. Availability of resources, carrying capacity or developments in technology may feature, especially in relation to sedentary HGs such as the Jomon or Ertebolle. Particular events or food sources may also be discussed – for example the fission- fusion pattern of tribal organisation employed by the Blackfoot to concentrate people on buffalo hunts as at Head Smashed in. Top level answers will need to consider other possible influences on social organisation such as conflict, exchange networks, proximity to farming societies in order to evaluate the impact of environmental factors. Some students may focus on transitional stages, for example the emergence of ‘aggregation sites’ in the upper Palaeolithic. Organisation based on gender or age will also be relevant. Ethnographic examples will be relevant but the focus must be clearly on archaeological sites and evidence for level 4.

**Question 2**

Assess the impact of the adoption and development of agriculture on past societies.

**[30 marks]**

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

**Indicative content**

This question is a balance to question 1 which focussed on pre-agricultural societies. The focus might be on initial impacts such as sedentism (or not), health, gender roles, religion and family, but students may choose to take longer term views of social changes, including the emergence of ranked societies, wealth and warfare. This is perfectly valid but a distinction will be drawn between accounts that tie changes to agriculture and those that simply list changes from the last 10,000 years or so. The question is in the social section so the overwhelming emphasis should be on social outcomes although clearly there will be some overlap with other themes. This can include sedentism (theme 2) and those elements of theme 3 which focus upon society e.g. diet. Lengthy accounts of technological changes will not be relevant. Students may offer a response based on long term change in 1 or more regions (e.g. Mexico, Near East) or to explore different aspects across a range of societies in order to tease out similarities and differences. Either is valid. Note that while questions which bridge themes have always been part of this specification, this question is not about agriculture itself. Lengthy accounts of the origins or development of agriculture are

unlikely to be relevant. High level responses may consider the different impacts of adoption and of developments (e.g. intensification) but this is not essential to reach top marks.

---

**Question 3**

How far can archaeologists identify and explain social differentiation in the past by age **and/or** ethnicity?

**[30 marks]**

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

**Indicative content**

Most previous questions have focussed on gender and stratification so this is an opportunity to explore the other aspects of the specification. It is likely that most students will focus on burial evidence, including both human remains (eg life expectancy, population profiles) and grave goods (status, ranking and office). The question is deliberately open (and/or) to make it as accessible as possible. It would be equally valid for a student to focus on evidence of age related ascribed vs achieved status in grave goods or to look for ethnic markers in burial assemblages or monuments. The children buried at Sungir and the richest burial at Varna provide useful contrasting examples of achieved and ascribed status. The Norse indicators in the Scar boat burial or in the weapons and personal belongings from the Illerup Hoard provide useful sources for ethnicity. For later prehistory onwards students might discuss evidence drawn from iconography or styles of artefacts or buildings. Sites where there have been studies of the remains of large numbers of people, such as Wharram Percy, may be particularly useful. At level 4 we might expect the bulk of the response to focus upon identification, but a significant focus upon explanation should be expected for band 5. Responses that stall at identifying age or ethnicity are likely to be restricted to L3.

**Question 4**

How valid is the view that hunter-gatherers in the past frequently moved sites to access resources?

**[30 marks]**

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

**Indicative content**

This question really asks students to think about different categories of hunter-gatherers or foragers and to support, challenge or qualify the view that they collectively moved in 'nomadic' patterns of movement through the landscape in search of food. The most likely examples are from the Mesolithic and will probably discuss seasonal movement in order to exploit resources. Classic British studies such as Morton, Star Carr and Oronsay are likely to feature, with emphasis on indicators of seasonality. Ethnographic analogues are likely to feature - particularly drawing on Binford's studies of the Nunamiut. These should be linked to archaeological examples. Other sources of information might include evidence for temporary or permanent dwellings, tool kits and ecological data. The best answers will consider the range of settlement strategies such as partial mobility, task groups, tethered mobility etc. They may also challenge the assumptions that mobility was simply determined by ecology rather than other (social) factors. Where students are covering vast periods of time with their examples (e.g. Olduvai and Star Carr some recognition of differences due to time or even species should be expected in better responses. An explicit assessment of 'how valid' is required to move beyond L3.



**Question 5**

How far can archaeologists identify the functions of secular (non-religious) structures or secular buildings or secular rooms?

[30 marks]

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

**Indicative content**

This will be a familiar type of question and allows students to consider non-building evidence from ships to field boundaries to fish-traps. An understanding of ‘secular’ is clearly important since it is unlikely that credit will be given for tombs or temples. Answers should focus heavily on evidence from real examples rather than generic ARCH2 type responses. There is an overlap however, with discussion of methods and sources being central to the question. Responses might cover topics such as distribution of artefacts, typology of structure, invertebrates, power or water sources, location and proximity, chemical analysis and ethnographic analogues. The inclusion of rooms is deliberate in order to reward detailed understanding of complex buildings from castles to Minoan palaces. A clear, sustained focus on ‘how far’ is essential for band 5. Accounts which focus upon site function without reference to structures are unlikely to be relevant.

**Question 6**

Town-village-hamlet-farm has been used as a way of identifying a hierarchy of settlement types.

How useful is such a hierarchy for understanding settlements you have studied?

[30 marks]

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

**Indicative content**

This is also a familiar question. The focus is on the classification and typologies most archaeologists use to make sense of spatial relationships and the similarities and differences between sites. Examples can be chosen from almost any period so accept models of Mesolithic site systems based on Binford’s work or ‘kill site-base camp-seasonal meeting camp’. Most answers will focus upon later periods such as Iron Age hillforts (e.g. Cunliffe on Danebury), Roman Towns and the Oaxaca valley. The relationship between Medieval Market Towns and their hinterlands could also be productive. Credit responses which describe potential systems well to at least level 3 but reserve the band 5 for responses which engage with the issue of whether a particular model is useful or not.

---

**Question 7**

Why did societies in the past develop different patterns and types of exchange?

[30 marks]

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

**Indicative content**

The focus here should not be on identifying patterns of exchange (although clearly relevant) but on the way archaeologists try to explain them. Where, when and how did they start? What was carried, by whom, to whom, when and why? Stronger candidates may help themselves by distinguishing between patterns (what was exchanged, when and where) and types of exchange. For example the distribution patterns of Neolithic axes and gift exchange or maps of find sites (including shipwrecks) of Roman Amphorae and market exchange. Expect a familiarity with the anthropological concepts of exchange from at least the top of level 3 but alternate models such as luxury/raw materials/bulk goods are also acceptable. Answers should be firmly rooted in details of evidence from at least two different modes of exchange for level 4. At this level candidates should be offering explanations for why particular models of exchange developed. A conclusion covering both elements of the question should be expected for band 5. Students may choose to focus in depth on a couple of different examples or on a wider range of examples in less depth to tease out similarities and differences. The contrast between a series of shipwrecks and their cargoes such as the Ulu Burun, Dover Boat or Kyrenia might be particularly useful. 'Why' is likely to focus upon on the differing emphasis given to economic and social factors (including warfare) in the development of exchange systems. However, it is possible that technology, geography and ecology may also be considered. For example a focus on evidence for the availability of different modes of transport such as seagoing ships or pack animals. Examples from all periods from the Upper Palaeolithic onwards may be cited.

**Question 8**

Evaluate the economic, social and technological impact of **one** development in technology in **either** lithics **or** metallurgy.

[30 marks]

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

**Indicative content**

The key is identifying a sufficiently significant development and one where the student has good case study material available to use to evaluate impact. Examples might include copper-smelting, hand axes, bow and arrow, or cordage. Where a candidate does not distinguish a specific development, for example just talking about metallurgy, they will be limited to L3. Areas of impact might range from the social (gender relations, warfare, display, health etc.) to economic (intensification, changes in hunting strategies, exchange, specialisation). Purely descriptive accounts of a development will not get beyond half marks. A clear focus on evaluation will be needed for the top band. For example a focus upon early Balkan copper metallurgy might highlight for technology, moulds and crucibles, production of sheet ornaments and experiments with alloys.

This might be tempered with a recognition that stone, bone, antler, plant fibre, ceramics and wood continued to be the main materials used in technology. The social impact might focus upon personal ornamentation and the role in burials and defining status and the emergence of specialists. Economic impacts are likely to be limited to developments or augmentation of existing patterns of exchange of exotic items. The conclusion might be that technologically it was an important first step but that the main value was in competitive display (as at Varna) and that otherwise it did not have a great initial impact.

---

**Question 9**

How far can archaeologists overcome the problems of differential survival to reconstruct past diets?

**[30 marks]**

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

**Indicative content**

Previous questions have focussed upon hunter-gatherers but this question is accessible for all periods. Ethnographic examples may well be relevant but insights from modern foragers and experimentation alone will not be sufficient. Students will need to consider direct and indirect evidence of diets including skeletal remains, bone and plant assemblages, tools, features and structures. A clear focus upon the impact of differential survival and the methods used to address gaps in the record should be evidence to get beyond band 3. Knowledge of recent biochemical advances such as the analysis of lipids in the European Dairying or Armana Amphorae Projects will be credited although is not expected. Responses may focus on one culture or even a site if sufficient detail exists (with Roman military sites the most likely examples). Alternatively students may focus on different types of food with evidence from a disparate range of sites used to provide examples. There will be a distinction in higher bands between answers which simply identify possible diet components from many situations and those that discuss how these can be put together to gain a fuller picture of diet, For example the way overall annual diets were reconstructed at Tell Abu Hureyra. Band 5 responses must explicitly address 'how far'.



---

**Section B****Question 10**

Should there always be a bias in favour of preservation in situ?

[30 marks]

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

**Indicative content**

Preservation *in situ* was a lynchpin of PPG16 and assumptions about archaeological work in England from the late 1980s onwards. Sufficient time has elapsed for its impact to be evaluated and discussion of whether it is best in all or particular situations. Discussion might be broadened to consider the point of excavation today and arguments about the potential improvements in techniques in the future. More specific responses will focus on 1-2 case studies to examine the implications in detail. These might include discussion of techniques (piling, concrete rafts etc.) or the implications of a series of keyholes for archaeological understanding and whether geophysics can provide sufficient information without excavation. Reward students who show an awareness of a shift in emphasis away from preservation for its own sake towards the public benefit of archaeology e.g. in the IFA's Southport Group report 2013 or PPS5, or NPPF. For level 5 expect a full engagement with the debate and the use of relevant case studies to explore it. It is possible that candidates will attempt this question without an understanding of the technical use of the phrase or of PPG16. Credit will be given if related to archaeology but everyday uses of *in situ* are unlikely to reach the top of level 3

**Question 11**

'The distinction between research and rescue archaeology has become meaningless.'  
Discuss.

[30 marks]

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

**Indicative content**

The original distinctions were based on the situation in the 1960s and 70s and contrasted long term academic projects such as Cadbury Castle with often voluntary attempts to recover through rapid excavation and recording as much as possible before developers moved in or in the case of 'salvage' archaeology, while the bulldozers were at work. The words 'has become' in the question are significant. Since the late 1980s most work has been ahead of development but often planned well in advance and sometimes part of broad patterns of investigation. Does this render the rescue and research distinction obsolete or merely blur the edges. E.g. can excavation ahead of development still be research focused? The best responses (Level 5) might consider whether the mass of 'grey literature' compensates for fewer large scale projects and whether the professionalisation of field archaeology means that rescuers are also researchers as promoted at Heathrow. Rehearsed answers on justifications for research or the role of amateurs may be quarried for relevant material but in themselves are unlikely to get beyond half marks.



**Question 12**

‘The idea of community archaeology is more talked about than actually put into practice.’  
Discuss.

**[30 marks]****Use generic levels 1–5 AO1 (5) AO2 (25)****Indicative content**

Candidates should consider what community archaeology actually is and what level of involvement a community has for it to count. Responses to this question will need to have good recent examples of community archaeology to discuss in order to move beyond level 3. It is not simply about identifying amateur involvement in Archaeology. Similarly, the professional-amateur debate may be relevant here but would not alone get a response into the top levels. Higher level responses should get to grips with the underlying issues. Is it important or merely a box-ticking exercise, what is its purpose and who is promoting it? The reasons for the new emphasis on CA are also relevant. Level 4-5 students might discuss several specific projects such as Dig Manchester, the work of the CBA in Suzie Thomas's report on community archaeology, the difference between top-down and bottom-up community approaches or the impact of HLF funding on community projects. Local examples might include the Sizergh Castle project initiated by the local history society who work with the National Trust and Oxford Archaeology (North) to make a Heritage Lottery Fund bid to finance excavation. Television Archaeology may be relevant where the focus is genuinely upon community involvement as in Michael Wood's recent Leicestershire Project. Discussion of the potential impact of the NPPF and other heritage policies may also be useful.

**Question 13**

Was there an Upper Palaeolithic ‘creative explosion’?

**[30 marks]****Use generic levels 1–5 AO1 (5) AO2 (25)****Indicative content**

This requires students to define the ‘creative explosion’ and consider a range of evidence in order to conclude whether it is a useful label. While cave art is clearly important students will need to go beyond it to get beyond band 3. This might include portable art, music, settlement, division of labour and particularly technology and consider the implication for communication and adaptation. For level 5 there needs to be a clear discussion on whether there was a change with top answers considering whether it was a social or biological ‘event’. While discussion of the evidence is likely to focus upon the period after 45,000 BP, candidates will need to review earlier evidence in order to arrive at sound judgements. This is likely to focus upon earlier manifestations of creativity such as in personal adornment and symbolism. These are likely to include evidence from Africa and the Near East including Blombos Cave to determine whether Anatomically Modern Humans always

had this capability or whether it developed during the Ice Age in Europe as part of adaptation to the conditions. Some awareness of the time taken for developments to occur is important to assess whether it was an explosion or much more gradual. Causation, whether due to communication, adaptation or a 'brain event' is also relevant. It is perfectly valid for candidates to consider whether Neanderthals or *Homo heidelbergensis* were also creative but this needs to be linked to the notion of explosion or great leap forward.

---

**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>