



**General Certificate of Education  
June 2013**

**A2 Archaeology 2011**

**ARCH3**

**Unit 3**

**World Archaeology**

**Final**

***Mark Scheme***

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

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

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2013 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

## Marking Thematic Essays

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

## Generic Essay Levels Mark Scheme

### Below Level 1                      0 marks

#### Answers with no merit or relevance to the question set

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

### Level 1                      1-5 marks      AO1 (1) / AO2 (4)

#### Weak or undeveloped answers

**Either:** Responses at the bottom of this level (1-2 marks) may provide some information which could be relevant to the question but it will be undifferentiated from irrelevant or inaccurate material – in other words it will 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 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 account will be well-structured and should be argued consistently.

At Level 5 communication skills will be generally effective. Organisation and arguments will be clear and logical. Though spelling and grammar will be sound there will be occasional errors. Expect to see a broad range of archaeological terminology being used routinely, fluently and accurately at this level. Synoptic understanding will be good, particularly at the upper end of the range where students are likely to have a keen awareness of the nature of the evidence based and the strengths or otherwise of the data on which it rests. In Section B there will be a discursive approach and full engagement with the debate. A wide range of relevant examples or positions will be evaluated. There will be a logical, balanced argument and a clear, supported conclusion will be reached

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

### **Deciding on marks within a level**

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

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

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

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

### **Exemplification for each question**

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



## SECTION A: Themes in World Archaeology

### Theme 1: People and Society in the Past

#### Question 1

**01** How far can archaeologists understand the reasons for social ranking **and/or** stratification in the past? (30 marks)

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

#### Indicative content

The focus for this question should be on why a system emerged or the values on which it was based rather than simply identifying it e.g. wealth in land or cattle, dynasty, gender, control of trade or technology, specialism (including warriors or ritual elite), gift exchange, office etc. A stratified system has a hierarchical sense of 'classes' or 'estates'. For example Rome or Mesopotamia. Social ranking (based on status or prestige) is much broader and includes any society where some people have higher 'office', position or status than others e.g. Iron Age Wessex. Purely descriptive accounts of systems are likely to be limited to level 3. Most responses are likely to focus on burial assemblages with Vix, Sutton Hoo and the Amesbury Archer likely to figure prominently. Differentiation will depend on how well this material is related to the question. Some higher level responses may focus on attempts to analyse wealth or status in the past e.g. Shennan at Branc and these should be rewarded where this is tied to the question. Another approach is likely to take particular ranked or stratified societies e.g. Iron Age Wessex/ Danebury and to discuss how this functioned. This is likely to at least implicitly address the question and should be rewarded according to the extent to which it does so.

Responses to '**and**' should be expected to cover a similar number of examples in total and responses to '**or**'.

#### Question 2

**02** To what extent can archaeology contribute to our understanding of **either** migration **or** the health of populations in the past? (30 marks)

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

#### Indicative content

Both of these are fairly specialised aspects of the specification. They need to be covered and the 'either/or' element enables this to be done efficiently.

Migration should be interpreted broadly so accept 'Out of Africa' responses as well as those focussing on Anglo Saxons or LBK farmers. Those moving beyond description could address issues such as scale, direction, nature (violent, economic, relation with indigenous peoples etc) duration, mechanisms or impact. In addition to artefact studies and changes in burials and houses there is a wealth of recent and accessible material based on DNA studies and Isotope Analysis which are likely to feature in band 4-5 responses. Responses based solely on 1-2 individuals rather than populations will not get beyond the lower half of L3.

'Health' can encompass life expectancy, diseases, common injuries and even the application of medical knowledge. Human bone assemblages are likely to provide most of the evidence discussed although where they exist, medical kits are also very revealing. Material from shipwrecks

such as Mary Rose could be particularly useful for this essay as could material students may have studied under evolution (e.g. Neanderthals). The question is linked to populations so responses should address the overall health of large groups rather than focussing on particular individuals. Responses based solely on the female skeleton from Tell Abu Hureyra or on the Amesbury Archer are unlikely by themselves to get beyond the lower half of band 3. However, when set into context (e.g. the large sample of skeletal material from Tell Abu Hureyra) these individual examples would carry more weight.

### **Question 3**

**03** How far can archaeologists explain the nature of warfare or conflict in past societies without the use of written records? (30 marks)

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

#### **Indicative content**

Focus here should be on what conflicts were like rather than generic responses on the evidence for warfare. Responses where there is not a significant focus on the question are unlikely to reach the top of band 3. Responses may focus on reasons including slavery (slave chains etc), rebellion (burnt layers from Colchester and London), conquest (Motte and Bailey Castles), raids for cattle or possible women, feuding etc. Others may focus on who took part, tactics, organisation, purpose and outcomes. Possible sites with a focus on human remains and associated artefacts might include Towton, Talheim and Eulau, Little Big Horn or the Mary Rose. Such sites are also likely to be the most fruitful when considering the nature of conflict. Artistic sources e.g. Assyrian or Egyptian reliefs, or Trajans Column may also feature but limitations in terms of conventions and purpose should be considered. Similarly, evidence of defensive tactics or siege warfare might be inferred from fortifications but other interpretations of impressive boundaries should also be considered (e.g. Danebury). Where students make a genuine attempt to relate their material to the question they are likely to be mid-band 3 or above.

## Theme 2: Sites and People in the Landscape

### Question 4

**04** 'People in the past had little impact on the natural landscape.' Discuss (30 marks)

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

#### Indicative content

This is a twist on previous questions which have focussed on the way people used their landscape. Exploitation of that environment is clearly relevant but the emphasis should be on its impact (long or short term). This could involve a narrative with commentary based on a particular landscape which has been well documented - for instance the area around Stonehenge. Others might focus on examples of economic changes and the impact on particular sites. This could include mining (e.g. Grimes Graves or Great Orme), pioneer agriculture or irrigation/drainage (e.g. Egypt or Mesopotamia). There may also be responses which focus on particular cases studies where human action may have led to environmental degradation as on Dartmoor, Copan, Blaenavon, Chaco Canyon, Easter Island and Mashkan Shapir. Some candidates may discuss landscapes altered by warfare as at WW1 sites in Belgium and France. Some essays may tackle the question head on and in particular the idea that people in the past lived in harmony with nature. These are likely to be L4 or L5 if rooted in examples.

### Question 5

**05** How far are archaeologists able to establish the reasons for the location **and/or** the abandonment of sites in the past? (30 marks)

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

#### Indicative content

Both options featured in legacy papers so this may be a question that schools and colleges have prepared with students. Expect a good focus on the questions rather than very descriptive accounts or narratives without relevant comment. Some responses to the first option may adopt a geographical approach and identify bridging points, defensive positions or proximity to resources. Others may focus on motives for initial establishment. These need to be argued and rooted in archaeology and not simply asserted. Similarly, models such as Site Catchment, Central Place etc can be relevant but need to be made so in order to get beyond mid level 3. Lengthy descriptions of CPT with or without diagrams in themselves are unlikely to be adequate responses. The most successful responses are likely to be rooted in studies of particular settlement (e.g. Shapwick), regions (e.g. Oaxaca Valley) or cultures (e.g. LBK).

Similarly, abandonment questions need to do more than identify when sites were abandoned or describe sequences. Detailed studies of particular sites over time are likely to be the most successful eg Wharram Percy, Copan, West Heslerton or Feddersen Wierde. A good grasp of context will enable students to discuss possible explanation (e.g. disease, economic dislocation, environmental change, social factors such as land ownership, warfare or migration) and use archaeological evidence to distinguish between them. Natural disasters may be mentioned as reasons for abandonment but these exceptional cases should not dominate responses.

Responses which combine location and abandonment are likely to focus on 1-2 sites in more depth and should be expected to display a greater contextual understanding than shown above but may

---

cover a narrower variety of conceptual models. Responses to 'and' should be expected to cover a similar number of examples in total and responses to 'or'.

### Question 6

**06** How successful are archaeologists in establishing social **and/or** economic relationships between different settlements in the past? *(30 marks)*

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

#### Indicative content

This is a relatively familiar type of question (usually focussing upon relative status or settlement systems) and a reasonable degree of focus in interconnection (which may include relative status) should be expected for band 3. It is particularly accessible to those who have studied established farming societies or later but could also be applied to forager site systems such as the way Waddington employed Binford's collector model in his interpretation of the Milfield Basin. Approaches are most likely to either start with particular examples from the same period or culture (such as Danebury and other local settlements in the region e.g. Winnall Down or a number of similar types of sites- e.g. Defensive sites in Medieval Northumberland such as Norham, Etal and Black Middens) and compare and contrast them in order to arrive at a conclusion. Trading or ritual sites could be dealt with in similar ways. An alternative is to focus on indicators in the archaeological record and then discuss how we might attribute status or relative function. In the former case these might include more or less evidence for high status individuals, storage, size, specialisation, ritual evidence etc. In the latter evidence of identical artefacts or related animal bones on more than one site, evidence of specialisation or differential occupation lengths and analogs based on annual cycles, mutual dependency or 'tethered mobility' are likely to be employed. It will be acceptable to use material from ARCH1 but expect a greater range in order to progress beyond mid-band 3. Some students may select a site which is well known to be high status and simply describe it/catalogue its high status elements e.g. Rome or Knossos. While this could be part of a valid approach, to get beyond middle band 3 there will need to be a serious focus on related sites within the region.

Responses to 'and' should be expected to cover a similar number of examples in total and responses to 'or'.

### Theme 3: Economics and Materials Culture

#### Question 7

**07** How successful have archaeologists been in explaining the function of **either** feasting **or** prestige goods in the past? (30 marks)

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

#### Indicative content

This question links the social and economic themes. Prestige goods have featured in previous questions but feasting has not so a choice is available to students. The key here is for students to consider social as well as economic function of either feasting or high status artefacts. There is scope for discussion in most societies from the Neolithic onwards although there are some aspects where material from the Upper Palaeolithic could be used. Some responses may draw on anthropology (expect this approach to increase as that A-Level grows) such as Potlatch or Moka and these could be useful in exploring the social dimensions but they need to be linked to archaeological examples to be relevant. Others will take particular examples and discuss possible reasons and consequences. This could have a generic element e.g. 'Celtic feasts' which is acceptable as long as it is linked to evidence (e.g. cauldrons, meat hooks) from particular sites. Responses on prestige goods could focus on a small number of examples or assemblages and explore in detail the value and meaning of each. An alternative might be start with the concept and illustrate different dimensions e.g. dowry, tribute, votive, social ties, gifts. Some responses may legitimately draw on ARCH1 examples such as votive deposits but a broader range should be expected to move beyond middle band 3. Similarly this applies where candidates simply equate prestige goods and grave goods.

#### Question 8

**08** How successful have archaeologists been in understanding the technology of mining and the processing of minerals in the past? (30 marks)

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

#### Indicative content

This question moves away from simply identifying evidence for mining to examine tools, organisation, methods and ultimately products and then determining what elements are most easily reconstructed and why. Sites might include Langdale Pike, Mount Gabriel, Grimes Graves, Great Orme, Charterhouse, Hallstatt or later medieval mines or quarries. There may even be examples based on student personal studies for ARCH4. Lower level responses are likely to be descriptive while those in band 3 and above will consider what the evidence will support. Focus is likely to be on evidence of rock faces or mine shafts, discarded tools, slag or evidence of furnaces. Experimental archaeology will be particularly relevant to processing (e.g. flint knapping) but should not dominate answers. Top level responses are likely to focus also on those elements for which direct evidence may be lacking including the people themselves, transport and networks supporting or controlling extraction and production.

---

**Question 9**

**09** To what extent can archaeologists explain examples of intensification in **either** hunting **or** farming **or** manufacturing? (30 marks)

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

**Indicative content**

This question should be accessible to students studying all periods. Implicit in it is a change or changes in an economy. On past evidence hunting and farming are likely to predominate. However, it will not be sufficient to simply describe hunting techniques or recycle responses on the origins of agriculture. Serious discussion of intensification of one of the 3 strategies should be present for high band 3 and above with a clear focus on explaining intensification or the reasons for it at level 4. Hunting questions responses are likely to revolve around technological changes such as projectile weapons, nets, boats and static traps. Examples might include Dolni Vestonici, Ertebolle sites and those from the Oaxaca Valley. Agricultural examples from later periods involving specialisation, irrigation and drainage eg Egypt might provide better examples than the Neolithic although Sherratt's 'secondary products revolution' would give an appropriate focus. Responses which focus on the start of agriculture need to explain why this constituted intensification of food production. Debates over whether changes were a response to climate change, population growth or the emergence of elites are relevant here. Manufacturing responses may be rarer and should move beyond description to examine how and why they came about. There are examples from the Upper Palaeolithic onwards (e.g. Castel-Merle) but most response are likely from Iron Age Civilisations or later including (Rome - Samian Ware etc).

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

### **Question 10**

**10** How well protected are archaeological remains in one or more of the countries in the United Kingdom? (30 marks)

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

#### **Indicative content**

Although most schools and colleges are in England and the specification focus is on English law, there is an opportunity here for students from other parts of the UK to focus on local protection and regulation. For example the adoption of European licensing in Northern Ireland or the absence of treasure trove in Scotland.

One type of response is likely to focus on legislation and planning guidance and then use examples to discuss the effectiveness. This is reasonably topical given the debates about relaxation of planning laws to encourage development but knowledge of those protective measures (eg the 1979 Act and scheduling) is needed in order to get beyond mid level 3. Higher level responses will also draw on one or more case studies in their discussion. Reward discussion of PPG 15 and 16 but also credit those with more up to date knowledge of PPS5 (Planning for the Historic Environment) and more recent changes in planning policy. An alternative approach might be to start with the MARS survey and discuss the nature of threats and what can/has been done to mitigate them. Again, case study material should be expected to reach higher levels. This is most likely with regard to key sites such as Stonehenge but we might also expect local sites that may have been studied for ARCH2 or ARCH4. Some discussion of alternatives is relevant as long as the central question is addressed. An alternative approach might be to discuss the protective roles of organisations from UNESCO to museums to local authorities but this should be rooted in an appreciation of what exactly they do and an appraisal of effectiveness. An understanding of the effectiveness of legal protection of monuments should be expected above 20 marks.

### **Question 11**

**11** Should archaeology stand in the way of building houses for a growing population? Explain your answer. (30 marks)

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

#### **Indicative content**

Detailed knowledge of PPG 16 or PPS5, or more recent planning policy, is not needed although it could be useful. This is really a debate about how archaeology should be valued and its political, moral, financial and social importance relative to other national concerns. We might expect in the current climate some discussion of how archaeology should sit with other priorities in a period of national austerity but we need to distinguish between purely emotive assertions and responses rooted in real examples or more sophisticated attempts to weigh up the value of archaeology. While there may be discussion at a general level of competing priorities the question requires students to consider different kinds of situations in order to answer yes, no, sometimes, in particular instances etc. This may tease out issues such as whether all remains are of equal value. Have 'enough' Iron Age roundhouses or Medieval villages been excavated or is each unique and worthy of preservation or proper excavation. Some students may discuss mitigation strategies and whether 'preservation by record' or 'in situ' is adequate. Expect one or two examples of developer

funded or rescue archaeology by way of illustration. This question is not about stray finds or hoards recovered by metal detectorists and speculative responses about imagined housing developments at well known sites should not be rewarded. Responses which overlook the moral dimension in the question to focus upon other types of development can gain some credit where issues are generic but a focus upon housing is essential for the upper part of level 3 and beyond.

### Question 12

**12** Is the repatriation of artefacts always right? Explain your answer. (30 marks)

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

#### Indicative content

Responses to previous questions on repatriation have provided a resounding 'yes' but emphasis here is on artefacts and that may result in more divided responses. Arguments are likely to be rooted in discussion of colonialism versus the rights of indigenous people to identity and nationhood. However, the question is couched in this way to differentiate between those essays that simply make assertions on the grounds of 'rights' and those which consider the implications of the statement and the possible range of caveats to whichever argument they prefer. Answers need to be rooted in archaeological examples rather than moral philosophy with the Elgin Marbles and Rosetta Stone likely to be the most frequent examples. We may get some retreads of the 2011 question about World Heritage and these may contain much of relevance. However, material on human remains (e.g. Kennewick Man or Otzi) is not relevant to this essay and responses which just limit themselves to 1-2 instances involving the British Museum are unlikely to get beyond level 3. Candidates may distinguish between relatively recent anthropological and art collections, military booty and royal gifts artefacts which were excavated. The best answers are likely to cover a range of issues and examples and recognise the complexity of the debate. Themes might include differences between past and present states or societies, quality of care or protection, education, tourism and whether loans can bridge the gap.

### Question 13

**13** In the last two decades, how far have fossil discoveries **and/or** advances in genetics revolutionised our understanding of human evolution? (30 marks)

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

#### Indicative content

The option here is likely to reflect different emphasis in different schools and colleges in terms of taught content. The key here is the extent to which one or more theories or debates have been revised or even overturned by recent (the last 20 years or so) discoveries. These might include Homo georgicus and whether this represents a link or offshoot between Homo habilis and erectus or whether this challenges the Out of Africa I model for all Homo erectus lines. Homo floresiensis could be considered either in terms of multi-regionalism or whether it was a separate species at all. The recent discovery and DNA analysis of the Denisova hominins or Denisovans would also provide an excellent focus of discussion. The Eve Theory is likely to be the major focus of discussion of genetics and the debate over Out of Africa II. Alternate approaches might discuss Haplogroups and the spread of more recent AMH populations or look at the impact of DNA sequencing on the debate about whether late Neanderthal and AMH populations interbred in Europe. Do not expect overviews of all these discoveries and more, a good focus and discussion of two of them would probably enable many of the key points to be addressed. However, they



should be recent examples- hence the 2 decade limit to c. 1990 onwards. Responses which don't make this distinction and are heavily weighted towards older studies will not reach the higher levels.

### 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>

### Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results Statistics](#) page of the AQA Website.

### Converting Marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) marks by using the link below.

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