



---

A-LEVEL

# Archaeology

ARCH3 World Archaeology  
Mark scheme

---

2010  
June 2016

---

Version: 1.0 Final

---

---

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

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

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from [aqa.org.uk](http://aqa.org.uk)

## Marking Thematic Essays

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

## Generic Essay Levels Mark Scheme

### Below Level 1      0 marks

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

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

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

#### Weak or undeveloped answers

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

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

At Level 1, where students submit full essays they are likely to display poor communication skills, work being characterised by disjointed prose, poor organisation and frequent lapses of spelling and grammar. This level also includes responses which do address the question but are only a few sentences in length or undeveloped lists or plans which had the potential to become higher level answers. Synopticity is likely to be lacking in responses at this level. In Section B points made will not go beyond everyday knowledge and there will be very little or no evidence of the study of archaeological issues.

### Level 2                      6-10 marks: AO1 (2) / AO2 (8)

#### Limited responses with some merit

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

---

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

At Level 2, students are likely to display some poor communication skills. This may include disjointed prose, poor organisation and frequent lapses of spelling and grammar. There may be some appropriate use of archaeological terminology at this level but is unlikely to be widespread. Essays of normal length may be muddled or marred by inaccuracies and irrelevant detail. This may include sections drawing exclusively on classical texts or historical sources. This level will also include very detailed essay plans and promising essays which have not been developed (eg 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, eg causation. Arguments will tend to be generalised with a limited range of factors or criteria being considered. They will be able to reach sensible conclusions but provide very brief archaeological examples to support their case. At the lower end these will be general references to societies while better responses will typically name-check a number of sites and/or methods (Section A) or case studies (Section B) but these will not be developed. Include at this level responses which are of Level 4 or 5 quality but which have only addressed half of a question which contains two main elements.

At Level 3 communication skills may remain limited and will often be adequate at best. At the lower end of the level spelling and grammatical errors may still be frequent and answers will sometimes show limited powers of organisation. At the higher end the flow of the answer may sometimes be hampered by insecure structuring of paragraphs or occasional poor expression. Expect to see some archaeological technical language used accurately in the upper part of the band. Synoptic understanding at this level will generally be implicit rather than explicit. Beware of passages of ARCH2 material without any link to context. In section B there will be a understanding of the issue for archaeology although this may be unbalanced. There will be some relevant examples but they won't be exploited. Appraisal will be limited.

---

**Level 4**                      **18-24 marks: AO1 (4) / AO2 (20)****Sound responses**

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

**Or** Well-focused responses which address the question directly and demonstrate a good understanding of the issues raised by it. The account is likely to have a coherent structure and may be argued consistently. Typically this will be arranged in terms of points for and then points against or similarity/difference. At the bottom end of the range arguments will tend to be generalised. At the top end there will be an awareness of differing interpretations. Supporting evidence may still be limited to a few relevant examples with just a sentence on each. Detailed appraisal of specific studies will only feature at the top end.

At Level 4 communication skills will generally be sound. Though general spelling and grammar will be secure there will still be lapses with technical vocabulary. Organisation will be sensible with effective paragraphing for most of the essay although there may be passages of less well-structured writing. Expect to see archaeological terminology used routinely and accurately at this level. Better responses will cope with contradictory sources and use language which reflects the limitations of evidence discussed. There should be clear evidence of a synoptic understanding at this level, for example in awareness of the range of sources (or their reliability) involved in constructing the evidence discussed. In Section B there will be a clear focus on the archaeological debate and a critical understanding of issues. A range of examples and/or positions will be considered in a balanced way before arriving at a conclusion. Accurate and relevant examples will largely be exploited.

**Level 5**                      **25-30 marks: AO1 (5) AO2 (25)****Very good to excellent responses**

**Either:** Responses containing considerable, well focused relevant material with a good grasp of issues relating to the evidence base. Better responses will demonstrate a secure and detailed knowledge of case studies. At the top end for Themes 1–3 expect to see an understanding of relevant scientific techniques. The style will largely be Analytical although not necessarily throughout and not all the date will be appraised. Evaluation and assessment of the relative merits of different sources and lines of argument may not be fully developed. A clear conclusion will be reached about the main element in the question.

**Or** Critical, discursive responses which address the question directly and precisely, demonstrate a very good understanding of the issues raised by it. There will be an awareness of a wide range of factors or of different interpretations and an ability to order these logically. Better response will explicitly cross-reference these in order to tease out strengths and weaknesses. There should be a clear awareness of the limitations of the evidence. Appraisal of specific studies may be limited since

---

supporting evidence may include a number of brief case studies or a wide range of very short examples. The account will be well-structured and should be argued consistently.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Exemplification for each question**

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



---

**Section A: Themes in World Archaeology****Question 1**

**0 1** 'Archaeologists no longer assume that all major social changes in the past were the result of immigration or invasion.' Discuss.

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

This question is accessible both for students who have studied explanations for major social changes and those who have covered the evidence for population movements. It could be approached in terms of the trend in archaeology away from the C20th models of culture histories based on movements of 'peoples' towards a greater appreciation of the spread of ideas and the role of indigenous peoples in adapting them and adapting to them. Alternatively it could be approached through an appraisal of the evidence available to archaeologists studying population movement including artistic styles, settlements, burial practice, human remains and modern biochemical analysis. Another variant would be to look at one or two case studies in greater detail. The Anglo-Saxon migrations are the most likely but there is widely available material on the LBK, 'Celts', Vikings, Kurgans and Corded Ware and even the arrival of modern humans in Europe. These examples provide opportunities to engage with both sides of the debate. The Romans in Britain are likely to be commonly cited as an example of invasion but is less useful for exploring the debate. Candidates providing several examples of social changes and its causes including either immigration or invasion but without engaging closely with the question may get to the top of level 3.

**Question 2**

**0 2** How useful are ethnographic analogies in interpreting archaeological evidence of gender differences in the past?

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

While it is valid to consider some other sources of evidence including human remains and grave goods, the emphasis should be upon the utility and validity of analogies from recent, and often geographically distant, cultures in interpreting gender roles in the past. Students will need to consider several instances where such analogues have been applied in order to evaluate their strengths and weaknesses. Examples include the West African ethnographies used by Peter Drewett at Black Patch and the Homebase models of Leakey and Isaacs which they used to interpret Olduvai Gorge and Koobi Fora. The mystery house at Skara Brae may also feature. Most students are likely to focus exclusively upon female roles but the strongest may broaden this out to consider maleness and other gender constructs. For example Tim Taylor's use of Scythian analogies drawn from Herodotus and examples from modern India to interpret images on the Gundestrup Cauldron. In all cases the key to the top bands will be students' ability to draw out the strengths and weaknesses of their examples. Reasonable responses on gender but with limited engagement with the question may reach the top of level 3. For example, discussions of Castlemere or Dolni Vestonice without reference to

ethnography. A valid argument is to contrast the relative value of ethnography for different periods- for example contrasting hunter gatherers with later civilisations.

---

**Question 3**

**0 3** How useful is the concept of **either** ‘tribe’ **or** ‘civilisation’ in understanding the social organisation of cultures you have studied?

**[30 marks]**

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

**Indicative content**

The choice of terms is to accommodate both those studying hunting and early farming societies as well as those who have largely covered states. ‘Tribe’ is familiar from Service’s social evolutionary ladder and has been adapted both from colonial and classical descriptions to interpret societies in pre-history. The key to this question is to consider a number of examples from the past and assess whether their similarities make the term meaningful or whether the term gets in the way of understanding past social organisation. The best answers will be well rooted in evidence of particular societies and what it may indicate about their organisation. ‘Civilisation’ can be approached in a similar way - for example were Minoan Crete and the Maya essentially similar, or are their differences more important. Alternatively, students might consider whether the label, which carries assumptions of superiority, is appropriate. For example the way Kenneth Clark (in *Civilisation*) contrasted the Roman and Normans with the ‘Dark Ages’ of the Anglo-Saxon or Migration period.

**Question 4**

**0 4** Discuss the value of physical boundaries on sites and in the landscape as a source of information about past economies and societies.

**[30 marks]**

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

**Indicative content**

Accept any kind of boundary from borders to house walls which can be discussed with reference to archaeological evidence. Discussion could be at the micro level of an individual site or the macro level of an empire. Better answers should consider the limitations of boundaries as sources as well as their possible uses. This might include some consideration of boundaries which are not physical but this should not become the focus of the essay. Boundaries can indicate defence/unstable situations, livestock farming, property ownership, group or activity demarcation and control of populations. Hadrian’s Wall is the most likely physical boundary example to be cited but students will need to consider several other examples too. Ritual boundaries may be relevant as long as the focus is upon physical boundaries. Students can draw on local studies they may have done as a class or an individual project, including hedges, deer parks or field systems etc. A site focussed approach might examine evidence of economic buildings (kilns, barns, mills, granaries etc) from surviving traces of boundary walls. Equally intrasite analysis of the kind pioneered at Glastonbury Lake Village is also relevant although should not be accepted uncritically. The nature and names of C18th and C19th enclosures could also be relevant. Expect discussion of BOTH sites AND landscape and also BOTH economy AND society for the top band.

**Question 5**

---

**0 5** Choose **one** waterlogged site and **one** other site from the **same** period. Compare and contrast the usefulness to archaeologists researching the physical structures of each site.

**[30 marks]**

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

**Indicative content**

While generic discussion of the merits of wet sites will gain some credit, students will need to focus upon structures in order to gain marks above the bottom of Level 3. Structures can be interpreted broadly so may include shipwrecks but the focus needs to be upon structures and associated technologies and materials. It would also be valid to explore the typicality and rarity of waterlogged sites (which could include underwater sites). If only 1 site chosen, L3 will be the limit.

Overall students should be considering whether archaeologists learn more from well preserved but relatively unusual waterlogged sites or from the mass of 'dry sites' which have been excavated. They might also consider gaps in what both provide and the extent to which experiment and ethnography can plug those gaps. Waterlogged examples, which might be expected to include Glastonbury and Star Carr, are likely to be used to illustrate waste material, construction techniques and the function of structures. Crannogs, Flag Fen, Swiss/German Neolithic Lake Villages and Ozette are all likely to feature. Dry sites are likely to be used to illustrate layout, repeated patterns and clues about construction techniques and above ground aspects. For example postholes and pits at Danebury might be quarried for evidence of storage structures including 4 posters and carbonised organic remains from within the pits.

---

**Question 6**

**0 6** Assess the impact of climate change **and/or** economic change on settlement patterns in the past.

**[30 marks]**

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

**Indicative content**

Students will need to have an understanding of changes in settlement patterns to succeed with this question. This might include the distribution or size of settlements, changing locations in the landscape, shifts in their relative importance (and size, complexity and features) and changes in their internal composition and layout. In the top band there should be an awareness that mono-causal explanations may be insufficient and that social or religious factors may also have been significant. Treat technological change as an aspect of economic change – eg the development of the sail or wind pumps.

For the Upper Palaeolithic and Mesolithic the extremes of the Ice Age followed by rising sea levels and the spread of trees (with accompanying impacts on fauna and flora) provide excellent routes into this question. The re-colonisation of Northern Europe and adaptation to the flooding of the North Sea Basin and many coastal areas might provide a focus, with contrasts drawn between reindeer hunter site systems, such as Pincevent and Stellmoor, and more permanent and complex settlements as at Tybrind Vig and Vedbaek. Contemporary changes in the near east which led to the start of agriculture with the growth of sedentary farming, permanent houses and tell sites are equally valid.

The growth of trade, from the Bronze Age to the Medieval Period, had a significant impact on settlements in almost every respect and could be approached through the study of sites in different locations or periods. Ostia, Hengistbury Head, Kommos, Jorvik, Ipswich, Southampton are amongst many examples.

The 'Medieval Warm Period' is associated with the spread and growth of settlements including the Norse settlement of Iceland and Greenland. The following 'Little Ice Age' is associated with contraction and abandonment. However, this period is also fruitful for assessing different causal agents. For example, were DMVs the result of climatic change, the spread of sheep farming, the reorganisation of the landscape by landowners to exploit it better or the Black Death? In Belize, the debate over the end of Maya nucleated settlement would provide an excellent case study.

For later periods students in rural centres should be able to draw on some understanding of the impact of economic decisions upon enclosures and the spread of transport systems and related settlements. For those in urban areas the growth and changing nature of industry from the Industrial Revolution onwards is a rich topic for a question such as this.

---

**Question 7**

**0 7** Excluding religious ritual, discuss the functions of art in the past.

**[30 marks]**

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

**Indicative content**

The technology and social organisation of craft production is relevant to this essay but the focus should be upon the reasons for the creation of artwork and the way it was used. Students are likely to focus upon a few examples of art and to explore them in relation to ideas such as symbolism, display, prestige goods exchange, education, communication, status, identity, legitimisation and power. Examples might include the Palette of Narmer, the Sutton Hoo treasure and Roman military equipment. For medieval periods the use of sculpture or artefacts to celebrate status or the use of art in heraldry would be relevant. Venus figurines might also be relevant but the emphasis should be upon secular uses of art. Where students draw upon classical examples, the emphasis should be upon archaeological sources. Text based approaches alone will not reach Level 3. For earlier periods the possible use of beads and artefacts (eg spear throwers) as group or ethnic signifiers in the Palaeolithic or tattoos from the Neolithic onwards would be fruitful topics for discussion.

**Question 8**

**0 8** Compare and contrast the evidence for **two** different forms of extraction of raw materials and the technology involved in those extraction methods.

**[30 marks]**

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

**Indicative content**

This question includes both evidence for underground mining and surface quarrying and the tools, technology and social organisation involved. Students may choose to detail and then contrast two case studies or to compare the evidence at each stage of the process. Sites might include Langdale Pike, Dolaucothi gold mines, Rio Tinto, Rudna Glava, Grimes Graves, Great Orme, Mount Gabriel, Charterhouse, Hallstatt or later medieval mines or quarries. Focus is likely to be on evidence of rock faces or mine shafts, discarded tools, slag or evidence of smelting. Higher 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**

**0 9** To what extent can archaeologists identify different hunting strategies and techniques in the past?

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

The key to this question is to identify a range of different examples, perhaps including ambush, drives, trapping, the use of long and short range weapons and perhaps a variety of prey from mammoths to fish. Another structure might be unselective, selective and passive hunting. Students then need to consider whether the available evidence allows for the reconstruction of the way hunting was carried out and the tools used. This might include who was hunting, the scale of hunting and the sequence of hunts as well as whether spears, arrows or nets were used. Examples range from Palaeolithic sites such as Stellmoor and Kostenki to medieval game hunts and the development of deep-sea fishing. Depending on the examples chosen it will be easier to discuss either strategy or techniques so do not expect an equal balance for top marks although both should be present. Other good examples are Head smashed in, La Cotte de St Brelade (new interpretation), Heidi Knecht's work on the evolution of weapons and the desert kites near tell Abu Hureyra. Consideration of 'to what extent' might include survival or evidence, recovery policy and use of analogies.

**Section B: Contemporary Issues in World Archaeology****Question 10**

**1 0** 'UNESCO World Heritage Status is always a good thing for archaeological sites.' Discuss.

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

This question requires students to consider the drawbacks as well as benefits of designation in relation to a number of named sites. Advantages might include pressure to protect, status, visitor numbers, improved facilities etc. Disadvantages might include damage (erosion, pollution, repair work, deliberate damage), diversion of funding or protection from other sites. There are also philosophical and political issues around the sites selected and those not chosen and the view of the past they promote. Examples might include Stonehenge, Dubrovnik, the Giza Pyramids and St Kilda. Equally students could legitimately address the question from the viewpoint that UNESCO World Heritage status does not make a difference. To get into level 4 responses should be rooted in concrete examples. Expect differentiation between responses which make sweeping assertions about UNESCO (eg what it actually funds) and those which have a more informed awareness. For example the reconstruction of the Bamiyan monuments is funded by Japan and a number of other agencies and states, not UNESCO.

**Question 11**

**1 1** 'Film and television presentations of archaeology are misleading.' Discuss.

**[30 marks]**

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

**Indicative content**

Students are likely to be familiar with a range of media presentations (from Time Team to Raiders of the Lost Ark to Bone Kickers) of archaeology and from ARCH2 will have an appreciation of the nature of the archaeological process. This question requires them to focus upon a few examples and to consider the similarities and differences between screen and real archaeology. They may also differentiate between those they consider realistic and other which they do not. Aspects for discussion might include, technology, diggers, post excavation, process, timing and purpose. Stronger responses may well break the archaeological process down into element such as site discovery, excavation, dating etc and within these compare TV representation with reality. The balance in the way programmes use personalities or experts can also be explored and perhaps the difference between foreign (eg US) programmes and those from the UK. The purpose of programmes should also be considered. For example, do controversial theories such as those of Graham Hancock make good TV but do archaeology a disservice? As with many topics, current archaeology provides plenty of resources for issues such as this with their regular archaeology in the media section.

**Question 12**

**1 2** 'The repatriation of human remains by museums and archaeologists represents a defeat for science.' Discuss.

**[30 marks]**

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

**Indicative content**

The focus of answers should not be upon the moral issues around (or arguments for) repatriation but a consideration of whether this practice is limiting scientific (including archaeological) discoveries and if so whether that is a good or bad thing. Science embraces both wider public archaeology and the specialist study of remains. The debate largely derives from the dispute around Kennewick Man in the US but has since spread to many other countries. The scientific argument centres on information about past populations but also the application of analysis to modern issues such as medical research into disease and wider research into ethnicity, migration and understanding of common humanity. Cases and arguments relating to NAGPRA, the Pequot, 'Running Moccasins' in Ohio and the UK College of Surgeons may all be relevant. Responses focused on the display of human remains or repatriation of artefacts will not be relevant.



**Question 13**

**1 3** 'The shift to meat-eating was a key turning point in human development.' Discuss.

**[30 marks]**

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

**Indicative content**

The focus here is on events in Africa between 4 and 2 mya. The earliest widely accepted evidence is from Gona, Ethiopia from 2.6 mya but there are possible earlier examples. The key to the question is to consider whether the addition of meat to early hominid diets marked a significant behavioural and technological adaptation with wider implications for human evolution. It would be legitimate for students to consider other developments from the same period (eg upright locomotion) to consider which was causal or had the most impact. The development of stone tools, mobility, pair bonding, smaller gut - larger brains (Wheeler), genetics, disease (Hypervitaminosis-A at Turkana), marrow extraction, the use of fire and cooking, species survival and expansion are all aspects which could be considered. A slightly different approach might be to consider the debate over when meat-eating began and then look at the point where it may have had a significant impact on human development. Responses which simply look at broader categories (eg all climate change- a previous question) are unlikely to be relevant given the emphasis upon 'turning point' although a specific example could be argued.

**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>