

GCE 2004
June Series



Mark Scheme

Archaeology (ACH4) *(Subject Code 6011)*

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

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

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from:

Publications Department, Aldon House, 39, Heald Grove, Rusholme, Manchester, M14 4NA
Tel: 0161 953 1170

or

download from the AQA website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2004 AQA and its licensors

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.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334. Registered address AQA, Devas Street, Manchester, M15 6EX.

Dr. Michael Cresswell Director General

ACH4**Settlement and Social Organisation**

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

In assessing the quality of examples used throughout this paper, differentiate between the following:

- Ex 1 Generalised examples, e.g. ‘roman villas’ or ‘brochs’.
 Ex 2 Named examples but without development, e.g. ‘Chedworth Roman Villa’ or ‘Gurness’.
 Ex 3 Detailed examples which provide specific relevant material from named examples.

Section 1

These questions are not intended as mini-essays. Candidates can respond in a number of different styles and this should be expected.

Question 1

- (a) Look at **Figures 1 and 2** and use your knowledge of other sites.

How successful have archaeologists been in working out social structure from the evidence of houses? (12 marks)

Target: AO1 (4) AO2 (8)

L1: Fragmentary or fleetingly relevant responses.

Purely (and sometimes lengthy) descriptive responses based on the examples given or from memory which contain some relevant content. Include here responses which describe social structures without relating them to houses. **1-3**

L2: Muddled, limited or poorly focused responses containing relevant points.

A: Attempts to define social structure and link some of the examples and/or additional material in an attempt to address the question, although this will not be coherent. This may take the form of extensive description with a few assertions about status or wealth.

B: Valid responses which are little more than lists of possible evidence. **4-6**

L3: Partial responses: Focused but limited or detailed but unfocused or unbalanced.

A: Outlines a range of possible indicators of social structure which could derive from houses with some discussion. May include fleeting reference to sources. Better responses may provide some additional examples.

Or

B: Entirely (or almost entirely) discussion of what kind of evidence of social structure (if any) these particular examples could provide. The best responses are likely to cite a similar type of example from memory.

Or

C: A good range of examples are used but the focus is on relevant descriptive detail with a limited range of points made. **7-9**

L4: Good responses: Largely balanced and focused.

Responses which clearly draw on at least one figure and own knowledge including additional examples and which directly address the question. At this level candidates may genuinely consider ‘how successful in relation to examples or may discuss the ambivalent nature of evidence. For 12 marks expect a clear and confident response including a range of possible indicators and drawing on both the examples and additional knowledge. **10-12**

Notes for answers

Do not move between bands on the basis of material which addresses Question (b). This may be used to move within the band if deemed appropriate. Discussion of how archaeologists can use particular types of evidence is likely to be Level 3 or above.

This question is not about use of space or identifying activity areas or how houses were used unless related to social structure. Most responses are likely to focus on social stratification. Others may discuss gender or age or group/household/family structures. The best examples are likely to consider a range.

Credit reasonable interpretations of the figures as candidates may be unfamiliar with these examples.

Exemplification

Discussion should be rooted in a detailed knowledge of particular dwellings from one or more cultures and could take the form of a cross-cultural comparison or explore differences within a society. The location, structure, layout, materials, decoration and internal fixtures may be discussed and interpreted in relation to specific features of the society’s social structure, e.g. rank and social status or what can be inferred about the role of subordinate groups including slaves, women or foreigners. Answers should be firmly contextualised in the discussion of buildings of various sizes and degrees of complexity. Candidates will discuss how complexity might be measured archeologically, e.g. by looking at experimental work on reconstruction and person hours involved in construction, the elaborateness of decoration as well as differences in size. Consideration should be given to the social structure which makes possible the communal labour which may need to be assembled, organised and fed during construction and to the economic factors underpinning this behaviour. A comparative study of contemporaneous buildings of difference sizes such as in Pompeii or the house mounds at 9N8 in the Copan Valley would provide sufficient data to support an argument. The value of these approaches should be weighed against other approaches to evaluate relative contributions to our understanding.

- (b) Look at **Figure 3** and use your knowledge of other sites.

Explain how archaeologists attempt to evaluate the status of settlements. (13 marks)

Target: AO1 (5) AO2 (8)

L1: Fragmentary or fleetingly relevant responses.

Vague responses containing some material of relevance or relevant assertions. Include here responses which confuse social and settlement status and those where relevance is implied rather than stated. **1-3**

L2: Muddled, limited or poorly focused responses containing relevant points.

A: Descriptions of relevant settlements (may include Mashkan Shapir) but with very brief comments on status.

Or

B: Responses that address the question directly, but provide one or very thin or just generic examples. These might list indicators but fail to tie them to specific examples. These may be presented in a 'scattergun' style. **4-6**

L3: Partial responses: Focused but limited or detailed but unfocused or unbalanced.

A: A number of relevant case studies (probably including Mashkan Shapir) are described, but points made about settlement status are limited. May show an awareness that the areas of the site and the buildings are linked in some economic and cultural sense which had a meaning for the inhabitants. This might be evidenced by specialisation zones, nature of artefacts or relative size.

B: Responses which highlight factors which might make Mashkan Shapir and/or other sites high status.

C: More direct responses which cover a good range of indicators of settlement status or methods of assessing status but cite few if any examples. **7-9**

L4: Good response: Largely balanced and focused.

A: Developed case settlement studies that include Mashkan Shapir with a conclusion reached about status. May suggest complexity as the key. There should be recognition that site status is assessed in relation to other sites.

Or

B: Direct, argued responses focusing on factors and which provides reasonable supporting evidence. This should include points derived from Figure 3. **10-12**

L5: Sophisticated responses.

These will combine an awareness of a range of difficulties in evaluating settlement status and a secure understanding of case studies which go beyond (but still include) Mashkan Shapir. They will discuss a range of possible indicators and may consider the difficulty in reaching final conclusions or the ambivalent nature of some evidence. **13**

Notes for answers

This question is about settlements not individual buildings and function is only relevant where it is related to status. In considering the merit of examples used, apply the differential model at the start of the mark scheme. Beware of sweeping claims and inaccuracies regarding particular sites. Where you know that the detail ascribed to a particular site is inaccurate, treat the example as generic.

Exemplification

Candidates may provide a detailed explanation of the possible economic, cultural and religious implications of the evidence in the source and other examples, identifying common factors and suggesting an urban level of complexity to account for the distribution and spatial patterning of the evidence. Will pick up on the role of artefacts, structure, size and complexity in this context. The likely range of factors include:

- Site location, e.g. on trade routes or dominating in area.
- The presence of high status buildings, e.g. ritual centres, markets, administrative buildings, palaces and public works.
- Significant defences which indicate that the site was valuable.
- Evidence of the presence of high status individual through prestige goods or ‘luxury’ elements of buildings such as gardens or expensive building materials.
- Evidence that the site was a focus for production, storage or commerce and of demonstrating the presence of specialist groups such as craft workers.
- Size and complexity in relation to other sites. Candidates are likely to draw on geographic models such as CPT to support this point.

Section B

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

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

Deciding on marks within a level

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

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

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

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

Quality of Language

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

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

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

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

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

Generic Essay 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 (1-5) AO2 (0)**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 the candidate will demonstrate some understanding of the thrust of the question but is unable to respond in an adequate manner. Some understanding may be shown by the selection of relevant material although this will be presented in a ‘scattergun manner’ with little discrimination, explanation or attempt to use it as part of a logical argument. The account will be superficial and may be within the context of a purely narrative or descriptive framework.

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

Level 2 6-9 marks: AO1 (5-7) AO2 (1-2)**Limited 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.

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

Level 3 10-13 marks: AO1 (9-11) AO2 (1-2)**Reasonable response.**

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

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

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

Sound 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. The response must reach some conclusions – perhaps in the final paragraph. Depth of understanding of terms and case studies may be very good but commentary and argument will be underdeveloped.

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

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

Good responses.

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

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

Level 6 **22-25: AO1 (18-20) AO2 (4-5)****Very good to excellent responses.**

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

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

Answer **one** of the following questions.

Question 2

“The problem that archaeologists face when studying territoriality is that not all boundaries are physical ones.” Discuss. (25 marks)

Target: AO1 (20) AO2 (5)

Notes for answers

The essay should discuss the nature of territoriality in human society. The focus should be on the ways in which such an abstract concept can be recognised from physical traces. Consideration should be given to whether different types of economic and social structures produce different concepts of territory, perhaps including those which are spiritual rather than physical. At least two different types of community should be selected to act as case studies.

Question 3

What does the existence of craft specialisation imply about the social organisation of a society? (25 marks)

Target: AO1 (20) AO2 (5)

Notes for answers

Archaeological evidence for craft specialisation should be discussed. Such evidence might include raw materials, artefacts and their debitage, waste materials, moulds and furnaces, specialist toolkits and workshops together with available artistic or literary sources. Spatial analysis of concentrations of this material might also be considered. Evidence for individual specialists might be garnered from discussion of decoration and signatures on particular artefacts. The second half of the question requires consideration of the scale of operations and evidence of the processes involved. Full responses should discuss social organisation and the economic and social milieu in which specialists operated. This might be demonstrated through the existence of structures, workshops, tool and mass production which in turn could be linked to markets and the degree of interdependence among members of a society. Suitable examples include Maya workshops at Copan, Roman ceramics production, Greek industrial production from the 5th Century BC and the prestige items from the Sutton Hoo burial.

Question 4

Discuss the ways in which power and social control might be visible in the archaeological record. (25 marks)

Target: AO1 (20) AO2 (5)

Notes for answers

While there may be some overlap with status in the material selected for this essay the focus should be on political power and the ability of individuals in the past to make others do what they wanted. A range of models might be usefully considered ranging from coercive power and enslavement at one end to more power and control based on age, gender or social prestige. Better responses should address this range and the degree to which different forms of control might expressed in physical evidence. At one end this is likely to include weapons, boundaries and symbols of authority. At the other candidates could usefully look at the use of space, evidence associating particular activities with specific groups and clues in material culture. Some understanding of the techniques and analogs used by archaeologists in analysing such materials will be required. Landscape, artefacts and buildings could all be usefully considered. For examples, medieval castles could be examined in terms of location and building sequence, cultural artefacts and the domestic use of space within them.