

General Certificate of Education

Archaeology 6011

Unit 4 Archaeological Theme B: Settlement and Social Organisation

Mark Scheme

2005 examination – June series

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.

ACH4**Settlement and Social Organisation**

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

Question 1

- (a) Using **Figures 1 to 3** and your own knowledge, explain the possible indicators of population movement which might occur within the archaeological record. (12 marks)

Target: AO1 (4) AO2 (8)

L1: Fragmentary or fleetingly relevant responses.

Descriptive responses based on the examples given or from memory which contain some relevant content. **1-2**

L2: Responses containing some relevant points but which are muddled, limited or poorly focused.

Able to identify forms of population movement and explicitly link some of the examples and additional material in an attempt to address the question. This may not be coherent. Alternatively, good lists or underdeveloped responses focusing on indicators.

- a) Over-reliant on Figures or own examples; descriptive with brief comments.
 - b) Plausible but very general, e.g. boats, crops, artefacts.
 - c) Focus on one example.
 - d) Focus on individual people, rather than ‘peoples’.
- 3-6**

L3: Partially successful responses: Focused but limited range or presenting a good range of relevant detail but unfocused or unbalanced.

May develop a couple of indicators or examples well or comprise of considerable material on population movements only some of which is directly relevant to answering the question.

- a) Limited to sources or own examples but dealt with well.
 - b) Good list of reasons but few examples.
 - c) Detailed on 2-3 examples but lacking range or not consistently focused.
- 7-10**

L4: Good Responses: Largely balanced and focused.

Outlines a range of indicators drawing on both these examples and additional knowledge. Able to link some of these to some of the examples. May discuss the ambivalent nature of evidence although this should be reserved for part ‘b’. **11-12**

Indicative Content

Expect most responses to focus on immigration and invasion without really differentiating in terms of how the archaeological record might be affected. Better responses may differentiate between the two and also consider other mechanisms such as forced resettlement. Most are likely to focus on ceramic evidence, perhaps with reference to ‘Beaker People’, ‘Peterborough Folk’ or on burial evidence such as different traditions in Anglo-Saxon

Cemeteries. The best responses will either provide greater depth within these examples or be more wide-ranging. Amongst the possible sources considered may be: changing assemblages or toolkits from the Palaeolithic or Mesolithic e.g. Ertebolle Culture, graphical depictions of different groups e.g. Cretans in Egyptian tomb art, currency areas, symbols and motifs e.g. La Tène, building styles, e.g. the mix of Romano-British and continental styles at West Heslerton. Credit language or documentary evidence within the bands. Linguistic evidence alone should not get above 5 marks.

- (b) Why should archaeologists be cautious about associating major changes in the archaeological record with immigration or invasion? (13 marks)

Target: AO1 (5) AO2 (8)

L1: Fragmentary or fleetingly relevant responses.

Vague responses related to an identified change in the archaeological record or responses which describe immigration or invasion without discussing archaeological evidence. **1-2**

L2: Responses containing some relevant points but which are muddled, limited or poorly focused.

Able to describe 1-2 relevant archaeological case studies but unable to address the main issue in the question. Alternatively, responses which address the question directly but provide no specific examples.

- a) Limited to Figures or own examples.
- b) Plausible but general, e.g. as if the question were on artefact distribution.
- c) Speculative – much irrelevance. **3-6**

L3: Partially successful responses: Well focused but limited range or presenting a good range of relevant detail but unfocused or unbalanced.

Direct, argued, responses which provide some supporting evidence. This may include the examples in the stimulus material if these are developed. Alternately, developed cases studies which go beyond the examples given with a commentary which highlights some problems of linking artefacts to past population movements.

- a) Focus is almost entirely on Figures or own examples.
- b) Good response on a limited range.
- c) Good list of alternatives but limited examples. **7-10**

L4: Good responses: Largely balanced and focused.

More sophisticated responses which combine an awareness of a range of difficulties in defining and identifying past population movements and a secure understanding of case studies which go beyond those in the stimulus material. Expect a focus on a major change where evidence is problematic. Responses should be clearly argued. **11-13**

Indicative Content

Several valid approaches are possible to this question. One type of response may be to focus on recent debates linking past populations to ownership of territory. These must focus on population movement, not just on ethnicity, for above Level 2. Candidates may explore the attempts by many regimes to use archaeology to trace movements of particular ethnic groups in the past. Nazi Germany is the most likely example. Alternately they may focus on debates involving various indigenous peoples where to continuity of occupation is asserted artefacts

to establish land rights. Kennewick Man may provide an example. Other well known examples such as the Pazyryk 'Princess' might be referred to, but the focus must be on immigration or invasion to be relevant.

Another approach may be to look at specific categories of evidence and consider multiple interpretations. Again, there are a wealth of possible examples: 'Celtic' metalwork, Beaker burials and even the flint assemblages of the Mousterian controversy. Discussion of evidence from human remains also falls into this category. Recent DNA research on Vikings or evidence from Anglo-Saxon cemeteries (including studies of feet) may feature here.

A third approach would be to focus on one or more known invasion or immigration and to assess or compare evidence in the archaeological record. The Norman Conquest, the Spanish invasion of Mexico and the Roman conquest of much of Britain are likely candidates. This could be tackled the other way round – describing changes in the record and then weighing up possible interpretations.

High level responses will be aware of instances where assumptions or interpretations have been challenged and show some understanding of why such debates have occurred. They may be able to cite apparently ambivalent archaeological evidence (e.g. the Gundestrup Cauldron) in support of their arguments).

Section B: Marking Thematic Essays at A2

The thematic approaches in ACH4 and ACH5 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 the Principal Examiner.

Generic Essay Mark Scheme

Level 1 1-5 marks: AO1 (1-5) AO2 (0)

Weak or undeveloped answer

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 response 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 fairly 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 response

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 response

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 response

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.

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 Written Communication

The Quality of Written Communication (QWC) 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 **Levels 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 **Levels 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.

Question 2

How far are archaeologists able to establish the reasons for the abandonment of particular sites in the past? (25 marks)

Target: AO1 (20) AO2 (5)

Use generic levels.

Indicative Content

The weakest answers are likely to list very general points or borrow from the hints in questions 1 or 4 without providing contexts. Archaeological examples must feature for more than 8 marks. Most responses will either focus on a few sites and explore possible reasons for abandonment or consider a range of generic reasons and relate them to a wider range of specific examples. Ritual sites can be relevant although these should not provide the entire foundation for the essay. Low to middling essays are unlikely to deal seriously with ‘how far’, tending to focus on ‘how’ or making general assertions about the difficulty of saying anything about the past. Higher level responses will consider ‘how far’ more seriously and are likely to draw on their understanding of methodology from ACH1 and ACH2 to do so. The gradual rather sudden abandonment of many sites may be recognised at this level. While examples where war/peace, disasters, religious change etc are perfectly valid, candidates will have to consider other reasons in order to address ‘how far’. Longer term decline could include studies such as the collapse of Maya settlement in the Copan Valley, or the movement or abandonment of medieval villages, e.g. Wharram Percy. These studies are likely to focus on economic or ecological explanations. As with the 2003 question on settlement location candidates will have to decide the relative importance of environmental factors and social agency. Examples drawn from Minoan Crete or iron age hill forts might provide fruitful examples. The work of Susan Kent, Binford or other ethnographic studies might be used to examine how modern groups determine when to move sites. The issue of what constitutes a site might also be considered with attention drawn to ‘off site’ areas.

Question 3

Band → Tribe → Chiefdom → State

Discuss how far this model of social evolution could apply to **at least one** region you have studied.

You must cover **at least three** of the stage listed. (25 marks)

Target: AO1 (20) AO2 (5)

Use generic levels.

Indicative Content

Low to middling responses are likely to take the terms as unproblematic and simply illustrate them in an account of social development. Differentiation at this level is likely to be related to the amount and precision of relative detail. Some implicit consideration of ‘evolution’ is likely to be present in these narrative accounts. Late Prehistoric Britain or social developments in the Egypt, Meso America or the Middle East are the most likely candidates here. Higher level responses will approach the terms more critically. Mid to high range responses will focus on the relevance of the terms or model to their chosen areas in terms of similarity and difference. Reward, although do not expect, explicit knowledge of the debate between supporters of Service’s evolutionary model and his critics. However, some consideration of the applicability of the terms and the deterministic nature of the model should be present in the top band.

Question 4

How far are archaeologists able to determine the way in which past populations exploited the landscape surrounding their settlements? (25 marks)

Target: AO1 (20) AO2 (5)

Use generic levels.

Indicative Content

Responses which come at the question from a site-catchment or seasonal exploitation through movement angle are equally valid. In either case the emphasis should really be on the techniques and models used and a consideration of their strengths and limitations. The merits of site-catchment analysis and models derived from geography (although these need to focus on landscape use, not just ‘territory’) should be discussed in the context of specific case studies. The same is true of responses which construct the essay around sources such as pollen, animal bone, earthworks etc. Responses which take models from the archaeology of landscape (e.g. Mick Aston’s) also need to relate them to particular examples. In either case, arguments are likely to revolve around some economic activities being easier to determine than others. Accept a wide definition of exploitation. It could include power (energy) and raw materials, not just food. Ritual use may be relevant but should not be the major part of the essay. For mobile societies the way people moved (accept a wide definition of settlement) within the landscape and the reasons for those choices need to be explored. For recent periods another type of valid response might focus on the use of desktop study to project back patterns and uses of fields, woods and meadows. Expect these response to include physical evidence as well as documents. However, physical evidence could include surviving trees. Content could range from evidence of foraging (Star Carr, Ringkloster etc), major agricultural systems (e.g. Mexico or Mesopotamia) or detailed studies of individual settlements such as Shapwick or Glastonbury Lake Village. It is likely that candidates will need to refer to several case studies to cover possible ‘ways’. Expect some focus on ‘how far’ for top band marks.