

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

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

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2010 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Marking Thematic Essays

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Either: Responses at the bottom of this level (1-2 marks) may provide some information which could be relevant to the question but it will be undifferentiated from irrelevant or inaccurate material – in other words it will randomly rather than purposely linked to the question. More typically (3-5 marks) the candidate will demonstrate some understanding of the thrust of the question but is unable to respond in an adequate manner. Some understanding may be shown by the selection of relevant material although this will be presented in a 'scattergun manner' with little discrimination, explanation or attempt to use it as part of a logical argument. The account will be superficial and may be within the context of a purely narrative or descriptive framework.

Or: Alternately the response may consist of a series of assertions, some of which may be relevant to the question but which are unsupported. Nevertheless, some of these could have been developed into higher level responses.

At Level 1, where candidates submit full essays they are likely to display poor communication skills, work being characterised by disjointed prose, poor organisation and frequent lapses of spelling and grammar. This level also includes responses which do address the question but are only a few sentences in length or undeveloped lists or plans which had the potential to become higher level answers. Synopticity is likely to be lacking in responses at this level.

Level 2 6-10 marks: AO1 (2) / AO2 (8)**Limited responses with some merit**

Either: Responses which demonstrate understanding by including some material relevant to the question. However, it is likely that the candidate has been unable to organise their work successfully in order to meet the demands of the question. Typically this may include elements of a case study or the naming of 2–3 sites which are mentioned in less detail. Understanding of the issues in the question will be simplistic and there will be very little assessment of the data which will often be presented in a descriptive format.

Or: Answers which do address the question and demonstrate some understanding of the issues, perhaps making several valid points. However, there will be very little or no relevant archaeological examples to support their case. The weakest responses at this level may refer to regions and periods rather than sites.

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

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

Relevant responses

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

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 which restates one or more key point. They will 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 there may still be insecure structuring of paragraphs and weaknesses of expression breaking the flow of the answer. 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.

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 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. Include in the lower range of this level very good generic responses where there is a clear, creditworthy attempt to link them to the question – for example by linking to relevant sites.

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.

In either route, range of study or methods or argument should be a key discriminator.

At Level 4 communication skills will generally be sound. Though general by spelling and grammar will be secure, there will still be lapses with technical vocabulary. Organisation will be coherent 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 data 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 answer will be well-structured and should be argued consistently.

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

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

Deciding on marks within a level

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

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

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

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

Exemplification for each question

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

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

Evaluate archaeological explanations for a major social **or** political change. (30 marks)

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

Indicative content

This option is accessible to students of all periods but they need to select a period to access the top 2 bands. This could involve comparing historic accounts of a key turning point such as a significant battle, e.g. Little Big Horn or Towton with archaeological finds from the battlefield. Alternatively, the focus could be on a medium term political change such as the Spanish Conquest of Mexico or the growth of Wessex. Much longer timescales are possible too such as the emergence of elites in the Bronze Age or the development of Feudalism.

While there may well be an overlap with a significant economic change (e.g. the adoption of agriculture) the emphasis should be on social or political change. This does not mean that a Marxist style argument about the primacy of economic causation would not be acceptable, but the ultimate change needs to be social. Similarly, essays which explore environmental aspects of causation (e.g. Mayan collapse) would be acceptable as long as there is a focus on the social and political consequences. Emphasis must be given to archaeological sources. This is not a historiography or classics essay. Long-term social changes such as the development of gender roles or particular forms of social and political organisation such as chiefdoms or states are also good, potential topics for this question.

The most likely examples will be those associated with invasion or war such as the end of Iron Age or Roman Britain or perhaps key individual events such as the Battle of Towton. Either scale is equally acceptable. Lower level responses are likely to describe changes or to list potential sources. Better examples will discuss a range of evidence in relation to at least one possible cause, e.g. evidence of increased defences, changes in settlement patterns, evidence of economic dislocation, quality of currency. The best responses will engage with a particular debate, identifying conflicting interpretations or theories and using evidence they have studied to evaluate them.

Question 2

Assess the impact of advances in genetics on our understanding **either** the movement **or** composition of past populations. (30 marks)

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

Indicative content

This question is deliberately open so that responses focusing on species, ethnicity, health or population movement are equally valid. An understanding of the essence of scientific techniques is likely in the higher bands but the key to success here is understanding the implications of such methods and a grasp of case studies where they have been applied. For ethnic origins – and this is the more likely – candidates can approach from either sources or particular case studies, e.g. of Celts, Pioneer farmers, Saxons, Vikings, etc. Material culture, skeletal remains, burial traditions and DNA are likely to be the major sources of evidence. Reward candidates who successfully link both elements together. The way candidates respond to ‘impact’ may also be a differentiating factor. Are they aware of the way dominant ideas have been challenged by new evidence? Reference to recent breakthroughs in animal DNA research should also be credited where it is relevant. For example, in studies which have traced some (but not all) European domesticates back to Anatolia and the near east.

Question 3

What light can archaeology shed on the nature of conflict in past societies? (30 marks)

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

Indicative content

This is not a question about whether archaeology can tell us that warfare or other forms of conflict occurred but what it can tell us of the causes, scale, participants, technology, tactics, strategy and effects. There is scope here for responses from most periods although the Palaeolithic is an unlikely source of examples. From the golden age of clubbing in the Mesolithic and early Neolithic there is growing evidence from sites such as the Talheim pit of deaths and injuries which may testify to raiding, feuds or resource shortages. Developments in metallurgy in the near east and Balkans in the Bronze Age provide us with evidence of specialist armourers and warriors. Artistic sources, artefacts and burial assemblages provide scope for discussion of the techniques and technology of warfare. The value of experimental archaeology (From John Coles experiments with Bronze Age shields onwards) could also be assessed. For later periods it is legitimate for candidates to refer to written sources but the emphasis must be on what archaeology can add in order to move above half marks. Candidates with a sound knowledge from reading classical account or military histories should not be unduly advantaged.

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

Why did groups choose to be mobile in the past?

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

This question is most applicable to foragers, herders and some agricultural/horticultural societies. Expect weaker responses to describe mobility in the past. Better answers will show an understanding of reasons and begin to consider the evidence base. 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. An alternative could be agricultural mobility in early Neolithic Wessex. Ethnographic analogs are likely to feature – particularly drawing on Binford’s studies. These should be linked to archaeological examples where possible. Other sources of information might include evidence for temporary dwelling structures, tool kits and ecological data. The best answers will consider the nature of the strategy in more detail. Is it simply about food and is it structured? Does it involve whole group mobility, task groups, tethered mobility etc? They may also challenge the assumptions that such groups were generally mobile or that ecology determined the strategy rather than other (social) factors.

Question 5Assess the strengths and weaknesses of explanations for the emergence of nucleated or urban centres in one or more regions. *(30 marks)***Use generic levels 1–5 AO1 (5) AO2 (25)****Indicative content**

The Near East and Meso-America and possibly Greece/Crete are likely to be the focus of many answers here. Interpret ‘region’ flexibly. Emphasis is likely to be on agricultural surplus and the emergence of elites but expect some consideration of other factors – religion, war, social change etc in higher level answers. Britain may also feature but do not over-reward lengthy accounts of the Roman Invasion. Implicit in the question is the need to examine at least two explanations (ideally for the same context but also possible for comparable ones) and to arrive at a conclusion regarding their relative strengths. The reference to nucleation in the question allows access for candidates who have focused on local level studies, for example the Shapwick study from Medieval Somerset which demonstrated how landowners reorganised settlement patterns and encouraged nucleation.

Question 6

What sources and methods are of most use in order to reconstruct landscapes and environments in **one** period of your choice? (30 marks)

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

Indicative content

The idea behind the question was to allow students to focus on the periods they know best and also to draw on their AS studies. So, for example, geology, faunal remain, soils and varves are likely to feature in Palaeolithic responses whereas regression techniques with maps, aerial photography, botany and historic documents will play a key role in Medieval responses. Understanding of methodology is clearly central to this essay but so too is the use of case studies. This may include examples drawn from the Time Team series where reconstruction of landscape was a familiar element, e.g. Elvedon for the Pre-Glacial period. Other productive examples might include: Boxgrove, Star Carr, Heathrow, Swaldale (Fleming) or Shapwick (Aston).

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

Assess the archaeological and ethnoarchaeological evidence for the non-food use of plants in **either** hunter-gatherer **or** farming societies. (30 marks)

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

Indicative content

This essay is intended to allow wide-ranging responses in order to explore technology in its broadest sense. Responses might encompass tools and equipment, structures, fabrics, medicines, dyes and fodder. Interpret 'farming societies' generously so that examples from most pre-industrial societies (including Britain) can be accepted. Expect appropriate case studies for high mark ranges. One key discriminator will be an awareness of the nature of archaeological evidence and its limitations. Are there some uses where the evidence is thin (textiles, drugs etc) and others (structures, equipment) where it is well-substantiated? This should encompass a synoptic understanding of formation processes and indirect methods of identifying plant use. For example impressed marks on ceramics or removed of wood-boring beetles.

Question 8

How far can archaeologists identify the processes and products associated with large-scale production/manufacturing in the past? (30 marks)

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

Indicative content

This question can be interpreted quite widely so that scale can be relative to other production at the time. For example, Upper Palaeolithic manufacture of beads at Castel Merle. Analysis of beads and waste material has been used to suggest the gender and age of workers and the scale of the enterprise. Equally a focus on a particular ceramic or metal working site will pay dividends. Weaker responses are likely to identify some generic indicators or describe production. Better answers will pin down particular sites and discuss the evidence available. The best will display a grasp of a range of methods used to analyse material such as metallography, characterisation studies and use-wear analysis. Intensification of production is likely to be relevant but the overall emphasis should be on processes and products.

Question 9

Discuss the value of shipwrecks to our understanding of exchange systems. (30 marks)

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

Indicative content

Candidates are free to draw examples from any period. Interpret 'ship' liberally so allow canoes and other small craft where relevant to the question. The emphasis on systems should move candidates beyond description of wrecks or evidence of the technology of marine (or freshwater) craft. This could range from the Dover Boat through the Viking trading vessels at Roskilde to treasure-laden East Indiamen. Candidates are likely to focus on sourcing the artefacts or produce carried by these vessels (and there are opportunities for synoptic links to ARCH2 and characterisation here) but the best candidates might also consider what could be learned from wrecks about range, cargo capacity, navigation, coping with winds and currents and of course the people who owned, sailed and were carried by these ships. Popular selections are likely to include the Ulu Burun with its evidence of long range gift exchange and the Kyrenia wreck which might be seen as representing seasonal 'tramping' and more strictly commercial trade. The limitations of wrecks and the strengths of alternate of supporting sources might also be discussed.

SECTION B: Contemporary Issues in Archaeology

In Section B we are not expecting extensive case studies unless candidates are focusing on either legislation or human origins where there is a prescribed body of content they should understand. The key to these questions will be the quality of the argument. Ideally candidates will cover a range of perspectives and there will be some examples, but not as developed in Section A.

Question 10

How far do you agree that metal-detecting has been of benefit to archaeology? (30 marks)

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

Indicative content

Positives might include on-site use to identify fragile metal finds or to check spoil heaps. Reporting to SMRs and finds liaison officers to increase our knowledge of find-sites. Negatives might include destruction of context. Non-reporting of finds and looting (nighthawks, etc) candidates who consider issues such as whether finds in plough soil are in-situ or the wider debate about the inclusion (and exclusion) of amateurs from archaeology. One might expect the recent Mercian hoard to feature and it should be credited. However, both sides of the argument do still need to be considered.

Question 11

'It should be illegal to buy and sell prehistoric or classical antiquities in auction houses or online'. Discuss. (30 marks)

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

Indicative content

In Section B we are not expecting extensive case studies unless candidates are focusing on either legislation or human origins where there is a prescribed body of content they should understand. The key to this question will be the quality of the argument. In this case the consideration will largely be about protecting archaeology vs other interests. These could encompass existing business, long-standing collections, poorer peoples (and countries), 'mining' a resource, that collecting ensures preservation and the philanthropy of various collectors. Credit sophistication in arguments and the complexity of wider issues. For example are some items the product of crime whereas others are legitimate? Candidates may widen discussion to consider looting and corruption, particularly in recent war zones, e.g. Baghdad or Kabul.

Question 12

To what extent does archaeology have a role in the construction of national identity? (30 marks)

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

Indicative content

In Section B we are not expecting extensive case studies unless candidates are focusing on either legislation or human origins where there is a prescribed body of content they should understand. The key to this question will be the quality of the argument. This is a familiar issue for History but Archaeology has been less prominent. Clearly there have been societies which have explicitly tried to draw parallels with archaeological cultures, for example Saddam Hussein's Iraq or Mussolini's Italy. Candidates could consider whether Great Zimbabwe, Celts and Vikings, Ancient Greece etc. have modern significance. An alternative approach would be to look to examples of indigenous peoples using archaeology to support claims to identify and rights including nationhood. The Pequots in the USA fall in to this category and arguably the Kennewick Man dispute does too.

Question 13

Should human remains be displayed in museums? (30 marks)

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

Indicative content

This question could equally be argued at a high level by candidates with an understanding of the different perspectives: science and research, public access, attracting visitors, the views of indigenous peoples, religious or moral objections, political correctness and the increasingly difficult decisions museums have to make. It is a topic which should enable candidates to get at the relationship between archaeology and changing elite sensibilities in the 21st century. It has become a topical issue in the UK recently as in the dispute about 'Charlie' in the museum at Avebury. Ideally candidates will draw on particular examples such as the imaginative way in which the National Museum of Ireland screened bog bodies unless people really wanted to look at them. The weakest responses (as for other questions in the section) may fall back on their own emotional reaction or solely upon strongly held religious or cultural views. While this might influence the argument in contextualised responses a completely subjective essay would struggle to get to the top of band 2.

Marking Grid

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