



General Certificate of Education

Archaeology 6011

Unit 5 Archaeological Theme C: Material Culture, Technology and Economics

Mark Scheme

2005 examination – June series

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

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

ACH5

Material Culture, Technology and Economics

Study Figures 1 to 3 in the enclosed Sources Booklet and then answer both parts of the question below.

Knowledge of the specific site is not required.

Question 1

- (a) Discuss the evidence for storage and stored products in the archaeological record. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(8) AO2(4)

- L1: **Fragmentary or fleetingly relevant responses.**
Descriptive responses based on the examples given or from memory which contain some relevant content. **1-2**
- L2: **Muddled, limited or poorly focused responses containing relevant points.**
Able to identify some forms of evidence and explicitly link some of the examples and additional material in an attempt to address the question. This may not be coherent. Alternatively, good lists or undeveloped responses focusing on indicators. **3-6**
- L3: **Partially successful responses: Focused but limited or detailed but unfocused or unbalanced.**
May develop a couple of indicators well or comprise of considerable material on one side of the argument or on one topic only some of which is directly relevant to answering the question. **7-10**
- L4: **Good responses: Largely balanced and focused.**
Outlines a range of indicators drawing on both these examples and additional knowledge. Able to link some of these to some of the examples. **11-12**

Indicative Content

Description and assessment of the reliability of a range of evidence for storage practices in the past. This should cover the main types of evidence such as structures, containers, residues, documents and meat on the hoof as well as any appropriate methods of preservation such as pickling, salting and drying. Storage of energy might also be included alongside social storage.

- (b) Why is an understanding of storage facilities so important to the study of past economic systems? (13 marks)

Target: AO1(5) AO2(8)

- L1: **Fragmentary or fleetingly relevant responses.**
Descriptive response based on the examples given or from memory which contain some relevant content. **1-2**
- L2: **Muddled, limited or poorly focused responses containing relevant points.**
Able to identify some forms of evidence and explicitly link some of the examples and additional material in an attempt to address the question. This may not be coherent. Alternately, good lists or undeveloped responses focusing on indicators. **3-6**
- L3: **Partially successful responses: Focused but limited or detailed but unfocused or unbalanced.**
May develop a couple of indicators well or comprise of considerable material on one side of the argument or on one topic only some of which is directly relevant to answering the question. **7-10**
- L4: **Good responses: Largely balanced and focused.**
Outlines a range of indicators drawing on either these examples and/or additional knowledge. Able to link some of these to some of the examples. **11-13**

Indicative Content

An awareness of some of the evidence for storage practices in the past such as structures, containers, residues, carbonised stored product, models and artistic representations or more indirect evidence like entomological indicators of storage in the form of diagnostic types of grain beetle. The discussion should then move to the social implications of storage and its absence; in particular the emergence of specialists supported by surplus foodstuff and their role in the development of complex markets within a society depends more on accumulation of wealth and in which individuals are compelled to be more dependent on each other together with an appreciation of storage as a factor in individual and state wealth and status. There should be some demonstration of awareness of limitations.

Section B

Marking Thematic Essays at A2

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

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

Generic Essay Mark Scheme.

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

Weak or undeveloped answer

Either: Responses at the bottom of this level (1-2 marks) may provide **some information** which could be relevant to the question but it will be undifferentiated from irrelevant or inaccurate material – in other words it will be randomly rather than purposefully linked to the question. More typically the candidate will demonstrate some understanding of the thrust of the question but will be 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’ fashion 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: Alternatively 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. Also include at this level responses which do address the question but are only a few sentences in length or undeveloped lists or plans which had the potential to become higher level answers.

Level 2 6-9 marks: AO1 (5-7) AO2 (1-2)

Limited response with some merit

Either: Responses which demonstrate understanding by including **some material relevant to the question**. However, it is likely that the candidate has been unable to organise their work successfully in order to meet the demands of the question. Typically this may include elements of a case study or the naming of 2-3 sites which are mentioned in less detail. Understanding of the issues in the question will be **simplistic** and there will be 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. Also include at this level, good, detailed essay plans and promising essays which have not been developed.

Level 3 10-13 marks: AO1 (9-11) AO2 (1-2)

Reasonable response

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

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

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

Sound response

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

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

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

Good response

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

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

Level 6 **22-25 marks: AO1 (18-20) AO2 (4-5)**

Very good to excellent response

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

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

Deciding on marks within a level

One of the purposes of examining is to differentiate between responses in order to help awarders distinguish clearly and fairly between candidates. We want to avoid too much ‘bunching’ of marks, which can lead to regression to the mean. A key element here is the way that 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 a ‘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 one level and another 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 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 Written Communication might influence the award of marks within a given level of response and complement the information given elsewhere.

Quality of Written Communication

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

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

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

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

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

Question 2

Discuss the ways in which environmental change and intensification might have disrupted past economies. (25 marks)

Target: AO1(20) AO2(5)

Use generic levels.

Indicative Content

A discussion of the theoretical approaches to this topic exploring contexts other than environmental pressure as well as the nature of such environmental catastrophic models, including anthropogenic factors which may have contributed to environmental degradation and subsequent collapse. These ideas should be set firmly in a context such as that of the Maya or Mesopotamia in order to allow a conclusion to be reached based on a particular data set. Dartmoor Reaves, Flag Fen, Highland Clearances, Medieval sheep-farming and DMVs.

Question 3

How successful have archaeologists been in using ethnographic parallels and experiments to understand how tools were made in the past? (25 marks)

Target: AO1(20) AO2(5)

Use generic levels.

Indicative Content

Answers might discuss Hawke's reasoning in suggesting that cognitive aspects of society as based on mind and thought processes are less likely to leave unequivocal traces in the archaeological record than those aspects such as technology where material remains are plentiful for all periods and at least superficially seem susceptible to an intuitive approach in our attempts to understand their form and function. This could be illustrated with a study of well understood technologies from the past, from which we can learn a great deal in their own right, aided by ethnographic analogy compared with a more cognitive study perhaps looking at the meaning and symbolism and artefacts. A full answer will also consider the limitations of what seems the more straightforward approach; in other words even 'simple' technology can be misleading if we approach from a biased point of view. A suitable context here would be a discussion of flint tool technology combined with an ethnographic example such as the Kim Yal in Papua New Guinea which gives the opportunity not only to compare recent stone tool manufacture and also Heidi Knecht's work on experimental projectile points in the Upper Palaeolithic. The Boxgrove Site.

Question 4

“Production cannot be understood fully without a knowledge of extraction.”

Discuss this statement in relation both to artefacts and to production and extraction processes you have studied. (25 marks)

Target: AO1(20) AO2(5)

Use generic levels.

Indicative Content

A certain amount of data about extraction from at least one period is expected at the heart of this essay but since it clearly is possible to understand production through other approaches these may well form the bulk of the argument. Artefacts themselves, together with moulds, debitage, associated tools and features, artistic and textual sources should loom large. Candidates can only access Level 5 if there is some recognition that there is more to the question than simply ‘extraction’.