



**General Certificate of Education**

**A2 Archaeology**

**ARCH3 World Archaeology**

**Mark Scheme**

**Specimen mark scheme for examinations in June 2010 onwards**  
**This mark scheme uses the [new numbering system](#)**

The specimen assessment materials are provided to give centres a reasonable idea of the general shape and character of the planned question papers and mark schemes in advance of the first operational exams.

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

Copyright © 2007 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**

- 01** How far can archaeologists determine the nature of family or household units in the past without the use of written evidence? *(30 marks)*

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

#### **Indicative content**

This question is accessible for all periods from Isaacs' model of 'home base behaviour' from Olduvai Gorge onwards.

This is not a question on social stratification and responses which focus on the relative position of different families in the social structure are unlikely to move beyond Level 2. The question is really about the basic units people have lived in – how were they defined, who was included and what degree of differentiation of role and status there was within them. There are good case studies in most period which can be drawn on including the houses of early farmers in the Balkans and Anatolia, Brochs and Iron Age round houses and Medieval longhouses and castles. Artefact distribution, spatial analysis and skeletal evidence are all fruitful topics for discussion. An example of relevant methodology might be the use of access analysis to determine control of space at Gurness.

#### **Question 2**

- 02** Choose **one** military, political or religious organisation that you have studied. Evaluate the contribution of archaeology to our understanding of the structure and operation of that organisation. *(30 marks)*

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

#### **Indicative content**

This question will be accessible for candidates who have studied societies from the Bronze Age onwards, although it is probably most accessible from the Iron Age onwards.

The most likely candidate is the Roman Army, and the key issue is the degree to which physical evidence has added to, moderated or contradicted written evidence. Responses which are purely based on classical texts are unlikely to get beyond Level 2. A huge range of sources are available including military architecture, inscriptions and monuments, artistic depictions, tablet, artefacts and skeletal remains. Experimental archaeology may be relevant but should not predominate. Other possibilities might include the Medieval Church, various empires of the near east and the English monarchy.

An example of relevant methodology might be the use of various scientific techniques to analyse the composition of royal coinage to determine the extent of debasement.

### Question 3

- 03** To what extent are archaeologists studying gender differences in the past reliant on burial assemblages? (30 marks)

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

#### Indicative content

This question is accessible for all periods.

Candidates need to have a good grasp of the difference between sex and gender and to consider the evidence for observable distinctions in the archaeological record. This might include skeletal evidence, artistic depictions, assemblages as well as burial evidence. The key issues include the reliability of burial evidence. For example in the past many skeletons were sexed by archaeologists on the basis of assumptions about assemblages. The relative merits of different types of evidence need to be considered and also the reliability of methods and models used to interpret evidence. Amongst the huge range of possibilities, Palaeolithic Figurines, Houses at Catal Huyuk, Wall Paintings at Pompeii are likely to feature alongside burials. An example of relevant methodology might be Hollimon's use of paleopathological evidence to understand differences in male and female health – and, by extension, activity – among the Chumash and Arikara.

### Theme 2: Sites and People in the Landscape

#### Question 4

- 04** How adequately have archaeologists explained the emergence of **either** sedentism **or** nucleated settlements in the societies you have studied? (30marks)

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

#### Indicative content

This question is intended to be accessible to those who have studied the transition between foraging and farming and those studying later periods where there is a discernible shift in settlement patterns towards concentration. This might be the reorganisation of farming settlements by medieval landowners or the emergence of settled villages in the bronze or iron ages. Shapwick is perhaps the best-known case study. Such an example where there is a wealth of published evidence could be the sole focus of an essay as long as there is detailed discussion of possible explanations. An example of a relevant methodology might be the use of geochemical techniques to try to locate early settlement around Shapwick.

### Question 5

- 05** Choose **one** waterlogged site and **one** other site from the same period.  
Compare the value to archaeologists of each site. *(30 marks)*

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

#### Indicative content

This is likely to be a popular question from the Mesolithic onwards with most responses emphasising the value of wet sites for organic remains. Likely case studies include Star Carr, Glastonbury Lake Village, Flag Fen and York. While this will be relevant, expect explicit rather than generic comparison with contemporary 'dry' sites to access higher levels. At the top end we should expect to see some candidates questioning the typicality of waterlogged sites and identifying some advantages from other sites. An example of relevant methodology might be the use of chemical analysis and powerful microscopy on textile fragments.

### Question 6

- 06** How far can archaeologists determine the structure of past buildings and the methods used in their construction? *(30 marks)*

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

#### Indicative content

This question could be tackled using examples from the Palaeolithic (e.g. Pincevent) or Mesolithic (e.g. Culverhouse) but is most likely to attract responses based on the iron age, early medieval period (Jarrow or West Stow) or the buildings of early civilisations. Experiment will be relevant both in terms of structures and methods but there should also be consideration of materials, features, artefacts and where available, artistic depictions. Higher end responses must consider the strengths and limitations of sources and techniques used by archaeologists in order to reach a conclusion. An example of a relevant methodology might be the chemical analysis of organic binding agents used in buildings at Cham in Vietnam.

### Theme 3: Economics and Material Culture

#### Question 7

**07** How far can archaeologists identify the components of forager diets? (30 marks)

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

#### Indicative content

This question is most accessible to those studying the Mesolithic or earlier in Europe but could also be tackled by those who have studied other cultures such as Australian aboriginals. This may be a topical question given the recent Ray Mears series on television.; however, insights from modern foragers and experimentation will not be sufficient. Candidates will need to consider direct and indirect evidence of diets including skeletal remains, bone and plant assemblages, tools, features and structures. A significant consideration will be the impact of differential survival and the methods used to address gaps in the record. An example of a relevant methodology might be the use of stable isotope analysis on human skeletal remains.

#### Question 8

**08** Choose **either** the spread of metalworking **or** the spread of a particular form of ceramics that you have studied.  
Evaluate archaeological explanations of the spread of this technology. (30 marks)

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

#### Indicative content

This question is really applicable from the Neolithic onwards. In the case of ceramics the debate is one of the longest running in archaeology. Does the apparent movement of ceramic styles signify exchange, copying or the movement of peoples. There is a wealth of studies on this topic with bell beakers and amphorae likely to feature frequently. For metal working the question could be tackled in a similar way with regard to La Tene and other 'celtic' styles. It could also be addressed in terms of the spread of metal-working itself and the mechanisms involved such as movement of individuals, prestige goods chains and religion. The Amesbury Archer is a likely case study. Whichever is chosen, the quality of answer is likely to depend on how effectively different possibilities are evaluated. Examples of relevant methodologies include the use of AAS in the sourcing of copper ores and seriation studies of artefact styles.

**Question 9**

- 09** Without the use of written evidence, how far is it possible for archaeologists to establish how and why particular commodities were transported in the past? (30 marks)

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

**Indicative content**

This could be tackled in relation to any period from lithic evidence at Olduvai Gorge onwards. It is most likely to be applied from the Bronze Age onwards with metals and ceramics the most likely focus. A particular fruitful source of evidence will be shipwrecks include those at Dover, Ulu Burun or Port Vendres. Discussion of distribution patterns in relation to available technology and models for interpreting patterns will be relevant for any period. While later periods will have art, tablets and even vehicles, the question can be successfully addressed in the Mesolithic (for instance, furs from Ringkloster) or Palaeolithic (for instance beads from Castel Merle)

An example of relevant methodology might be the use of lipid analysis to study the use of ceramic vessels for the storage and transport of milk products in the late Neolithic and bronze age.

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

### **Question 10**

- 10** 'The scheduling of ancient monuments is an effective means of preserving them.'  
How far do you agree with this view? *(30 marks)*

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

#### **Indicative content**

Some knowledge of the nature of the 1979 Act is essential in order to assess the intention and impact of scheduling. It is likely that local examples which candidates are familiar with from coursework, visits or experience will feature heavily alongside better known examples. Stonehenge may well feature because it lends itself to discussion of the limits of scheduling. The particular terms of the Act, the process of scheduling, inspection and enforcement are all areas which could be discussed. Some discussion of alternatives is relevant as long as the central question is addressed.

### **Question 11**

- 11** Following the signing of the Valetta Convention, some professional archaeologists called for legislation to define who could undertake excavations.  
Should archaeologists be licensed by the Government? *(30 marks)*

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

#### **Indicative content**

Detailed knowledge of the Valetta Convention is not needed although some idea of the relevant element could be useful. The key is how successfully the candidates engage with the debate about the role of amateurs. Higher level responses will be aware of a range of intermediate positions between tight control and open access. They could also consider the implications of licensing both for those included or excluded and the wider impact on archaeology. Examples of work undertaken by amateurs or professionals should be cited in support of the argument.

**Question 12**

- 12** With reference to specific examples, evaluate the arguments for and against the repatriation of artefacts. (30 marks)

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

**Indicative content**

The Elgin Marbles are the most likely candidates for discussion but good responses should go beyond simple questions of 'rightful ownership' to consider issues such as cultural identity, scientific research, continuity of population groups and preservation and security. Top level answers are likely to ask whether all or some artefacts are considered and whether certain categories – such as ritual objects – are special cases.

**Question 13**

- 13** 'Out of Africa' or 'Multi-regional hypothesis'.  
Which explanation of modern human origins do you find more convincing? (30 marks)

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

**Indicative content**

Some knowledge of the two main theories is vital for this question. Some candidates may choose to argue for or against one of the two broad approaches but this needs to be rooted in an understanding of some of the archaeological evidence. More likely is an appraisal of the views of Wolpoff and Stringer. A wide variety of types of evidence and case studies is acceptable in support of the overall argument. This might include disagreements over the meaning of DNA evidence, time gaps, brain sizes and death rates. It would equally be acceptable to root an argument in one key aspect of the wider debate such as whether Neanderthals could adapt or interbreed with modern humans, whether there is continuity in teeth and skull shape in far eastern skeletal remains, or why only modern humans reached America and Australia.

**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>