



# General Certificate of Education

## Archaeology 6011

### *Unit 4 Settlement and Social Organisation*

# Mark Scheme

## *2006 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.

## ACH4

### Settlement and Social Organisation

---

Look at Figures 1-3 in the Sources Booklet and answer both parts of the question.

---

#### Section A

##### Quality of Written Communication

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

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

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

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

#### Question 1

- (a) Using **either Figure 1 or Figure 2**, and your own knowledge, explain how archaeologists recognise the functions of different areas on sites.  
You should **not** discuss the use of ethnographic parallels in your answer. (12 marks)

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

- L1: Fragmentary or fleetingly relevant responses.**  
Descriptive responses based on the examples given or from memory which contain some relevant content. Short lists of indicators. **1-2**
- L2: Responses containing some relevant points but which are muddled, limited or poorly focused.**  
Able to identify some sources which might be useful and/or one or two techniques and attempt to address the question. This may not be coherent. Alternately, lists of indicators, generic methods or superficial understanding of analysis on named sites. May be over-reliant on figures. **3-6**
-

- L3: **Partially successful responses: Well focused but limited range or presenting a good range of relevant detail but unfocused or unbalanced.** Effectively develops several indicators – starting to relate them to specific, relevant examples. Alternately, taking 1-2 sites and explaining how intrasite analysis of activities was carried out. Also, good insights linking the figures and other examples. **7-9**
- L4: **Good responses: Largely balanced and focused.** Outlines a range of indicators drawing on both these examples and additional named sites from their own knowledge. Differentiation between L3 and L4 will largely be on the depth and clarity of understanding of real examples and quality of argument. Able to link sources, methods and techniques used to interpret activity areas effectively and with precision. **10-12**

### Indicative Content

Responses are likely to be focused on the sort of material familiar from ACH2. This is fine for lower levels since this paper does test synoptic understanding. However, knowledge of specific sites should be expected for Levels 3 and 4. The most likely candidate is Glastonbury Lake Village and this should be rewarded equally with more exotic sites. Reward discussion of analogs excluding the use of ethnographic parallels. Do not over-reward discussion of overall function.

- (b) Referring to at least **one of Figures 1 to 3**, and your own knowledge, assess the strengths and weaknesses of ethnographic parallels for understanding the structure and function of settlements from the past. (13 marks)

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

- L1: **Fragmentary or fleetingly relevant responses.**  
Unsupported assertions or descriptive material (including points gleaned from figure 3). **1-2**
- L2: **Responses containing some relevant points but which are muddled, limited or poorly focused.**  
The bottom of the band will clearly demonstrate the germ of an understanding but will be poorly focused or expressed. More typically they will be able to identify some sources which might be useful and/or one or two techniques and attempt to address the question. This may not be coherent.
- a) Largely descriptive responses focusing on examples of ethnographic analogs.
  - b) Direct, relevant responses lacking either own examples or discussion of the figures.
  - c) Scattergun responses which include some good, relevant material.
  - d) Brief underdeveloped responses addressing the question.
- L2 responses are likely to focus on ‘how have...’ **3-6**
- L3: **Partially successful responses: Well focused but limited range or presenting a good range of relevant detail but unfocused or unbalanced.**
- a) Good answers on **only** strengths or weaknesses.
  - b) Direct, argued response with limited examples (e.g. do not include both these examples and own ones).
  - c) Very detailed descriptive response with limited comments addressing the question.
- L3 responses are likely to be unbalanced with much more attention paid to strengths **or** weaknesses. **7-10**
-

**L4: Good responses: Largely balanced and focused.**

More sophisticated responses which combine an awareness of application of ethnographic accounts and ethno-archaeology as a source of analogies for interpreting patterning of finds and features on archaeological sites. Expect a secure understanding of case studies which go beyond those in the stimulus material for 13. Responses should be clearly argued. **11-13**

**Indicative Content**

Examples of sites where analogies have been used; include Drewett's work at Black Patch, Issacs and others work in Olduvai Gorge and the application of Binford's studies to Palaeolithic and Mesolithic sites. Strengths are likely to include the benefits of observation for linking activity and deposits; moving beyond modern/western ideas about behaviour and site structure; insights into the motivation behind the layout of sites including the impact of belief and social factors. Weaknesses might include the pitfalls of crude use of direct analogies, differences in time, space and even species.

**Section B: Marking Thematic Essays at A2**

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

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

## Generic Essay Mark Scheme

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

#### Weak or undeveloped answer

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

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

### Level 2                      6-9 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 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.

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

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

#### Reasonable response

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

---

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

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

**Sound response**

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

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

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

**Good response**

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

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

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

**Very good to excellent response**

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

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

**Deciding on marks within a level**

One of the purposes of examining is to differentiate between responses in order to help awarders distinguish clearly and fairly between candidates. We want to avoid too much “bunching” of marks which can lead to regression to the mean. A key element here is the way examiners approach the work. Given the constraints of time and circumstance, candidates will not produce perfect work. Ideally you should take a ‘cup half full’ rather than ‘cup half empty’ approach to responses above Level 2. This should help you to use the full range of marks available. Start by allocating the essay to the level which best describes it even though it may not be a perfect fit. If you really cannot decide between a level, award the response the top mark of the lower level where the decision is between Levels 1-2 or 2-3 and at the bottom of the higher level in all other cases.

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

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

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

## Quality of Written Communication

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

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

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

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

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

## Question 2

Evaluate **at least two** different approaches to understanding patterns of past settlement in societies you have studied. (25 marks)

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

Use generic levels.

## Indicative Content

Most responses are likely to focus on models drawn from geography, economics and anthropology. These might include: site catchment analysis/site exploitation territories related to notions of carrying capacity; Christaller or Thiessen's Geographic models: Central Place Theory XTENT; core-periphery models; ethnographic models of seasonal movement within a system, e.g. transhumance or hunting ranges. Many candidates have studied these concepts in geography and are able to describe them well. However, while candidates who have studied other subjects may benefit from depth of theoretical understanding it is important that students are rewarded for consideration of these methods in relation to archaeological examples, purely descriptive accounts of techniques should not reach Level 3. This question should be accessible to candidates regardless of the period they have studied since such methods are regularly applied to hunting camps/kill sites as well as classical and medieval settlements. Higher level response need to compare and contrast their chosen methods and evaluate their strengths and weaknesses.



### Question 3

‘Without written evidence, archaeologists can say little definite about the social structure of families or households in the past.’ Discuss. (25 marks)

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

Use generic levels.

### Indicative Content

The focus here is on the most basic living units. While knowledge of buildings is clearly central, it needs to be related to what can be said about social organisation. Building functions or construction in themselves are unlikely to be relevant. Most candidates are likely to focus on the size and layout of buildings and other structures which might include campsites. Some candidates may try to restrict the definition of written evidence to bring in inscriptions etc but the focus should be on other types of evidence. For particular periods, primate studies, models of carrying capacity, ethnographic analogies might all be used but structures are likely to be the most fruitful. This applies as much to Mesolithic hunting sites as to Medieval longhouses and castles. This is not an essay about society as a whole with regard to gender or status.

### Question 4

How far can archaeologists explain the mechanisms by which ruling elites maintained their position in the past? (25 marks)

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

Use generic levels.

### Indicative Content

Most candidates are likely to be able to identify a range of methods (force, law, taxation, gifts, ideology) and are also likely to be able to describe what they understood to have happened in particular societies. However, for upper levels in the mark scheme they need to be able to use examples from specific sites to show how archaeologists have built up such models. This is particularly the case where candidates may be drawing on historical knowledge, e.g. of Feudalism. Amongst the likely examples are Iron Age models of redistributive chieftdom such as Cunliffe’s interpretation of Danebury; Imperial monuments from Rome and other classical civilisations and the organisation and re-positioning of medieval settlements including castles and villages. This is not an essay describing the exercise of power or the nature of status.