



ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

Mark scheme

June 2003

GCE

Archaeology

Unit ACH4

Copyright © 2003 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

ACH4**Settlement and Social Organisation**

Look at Figures 1-4 in the Sources Booklet and answer both parts of the question.

Question 1

- (a) Using the Figures and your own knowledge, discuss the possible indicators of warfare which might appear within the Archaeological record. (12 marks)

Target: AO1 (4) AO2 (8)

- L1: Purely descriptive responses based on the examples given **or** from memory which contain some relevant content. **1**
- L2: Attempts to define warfare and link some of the examples and/or additional material in an attempt to address the question, although this will not be coherent. **Alternatively**, valid responses which are little more than lists. **2-4**
- L3: Outlines a range of possible indicators with some discussion. May include fleeting reference to these or other source. **Alternatively**, entirely (or almost entirely) discussion of what kind of evidence of warfare (if any) these particular examples provide. The best responses are likely to cite a similar type of example from memory. **5-7**
- L4: Both parts Level 2. Responses which clearly draw on both sources and own (including some additional examples) but are unbalanced or limited in their range. **8-10**
- L5: Discusses a range of possible indicators drawing on both the examples and additional knowledge. Top level answers may consider their terms of usefulness in relation to examples. May discuss the ambivalent nature of evidence but do not expect this. This is covered in part 'b' **.11-12**

Indicative Content

Both responses which survey a range of indicators drawn from a wide range of contexts and those that move out from examples to identify indicators are equally valid. Some distinction between warfare and other modes of violence should at least be implicit at Level 3 and Level 4 responses. However, candidates should have reserved extended discussion of limitations to part (b). Most candidates are likely to use the stimulus to list further weapons, imagery, human remains with evidence of trauma and defensive structures. Differentiation is through use of examples and also wider examples such as evidence of burning of settlements, plotting projectile distribution, mass-graves, damage to weapon edges, evidence of abrupt changes in society etc.

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

- (b) Why should archaeologists be cautious about assuming that the presence of weapons or defensive structures indicates a violent period in the past? (13 marks)

Target: AO1 (5) AO2 (8)

- L1: Vague responses containing some material of relevance or relevant assertions. **1-2**
 L2: Able to describe 1-2 relevant case studies but unable to address the main issue in the question. **Alternatively**, responses which address the question directly but provide little or no specific examples. Accept good answers here which explain how archaeologists detect warfare which go well beyond recycling part 1(a). **3-6**
 L3: Good responses which focus on sites rather than periods. **Alternatively**, unbalanced responses which consider problems reaching conclusions about whether weapons and defences were warlike or not. Examples should be cited. **7-9**
 L4: Direct, argued responses that provide some supporting evidence. This may include the examples in the stimulus material if these are developed. **Alternatively**, developed case studies that go well beyond the examples given with a commentary that highlights some problems of linking artefacts or defences to warfare. **10-12**
 L5: More sophisticated responses which combine an awareness of a range of difficulties in defining and identifying warfare and a secure understanding of case studies which go beyond those in the stimulus material. Responses should be clearly argued. **13**

Indicative Content

This question is likely to differentiate more sharply than question 1(a). The question focuses upon periods in the past rather than individual site function and the mark scheme reflects this. It is expected that candidates will consider alternative interpretations to some of the evidence they may have used in 1(a). Alternatively they may launch straight into a consideration of apparently martial evidence which was not used or intended for battle. This does lend itself to more detailed consideration of a limited range of case studies. Defences which were not used such as Martello Towers or Cold War installations may be cited. The issue of whether defensive looking boundaries or facades (Hadrians Wall, Danebury, Bagendon, Claypots etc) are military or religious, economic or social could be highlighted. Similarly the significance of weapons in other contexts e.g. as tools, status symbols or possible ethnic markers in graves could also be considered. Top end answers may consider how archaeologists might try to resolve the issue through analogy or contextual evidence. Reward but do not expect this. It is not acceptable for candidates to just write 'see previous response for evidence'. Responses that focus on other types of possible evidence of warfare e.g. human remains are without relation to weapons or defensive structures are unlikely to be relevant.

Section B

Answer **one** of the following questions.

Question 2

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

Target: AO1 (20) AO2 (5)

Indicative Content

Some weaker answers are likely to draw on generic models from secondary geography. Spring line settlements, bridging points, nodal point on communications etc. These should be credited if they relate them to archaeological examples. Detailed evidence on the emergence of particular sites (e.g. Shapwick) could be used as long as it considers initial location. Defensive and ritual sites can both clearly be relevant although these should not provide the entire foundation for the essay. Some candidates will simply see this as a question on site function and are unlikely to score above Level 3. Responses which just provide a mass of descriptive detail about possible use of a site or sites are likely to be Level 1.

Higher level responses may consider whether locations are selected for economic or social reasons. Implicitly this may draw on the debate between environmental determinism and social agency. This could involve site catchment analysis or the use of geographic models. The work of Kent, Binford or other ethnographic studies might be used to examine how modern groups select sites for specific purposes. The issue of what constitutes a site might also be considered with attention drawn to ‘off site’ areas.

Question 3

To what extent can archaeologists estimate the numbers and life expectancy of past populations? (25 marks)

Target: AO1 (20) AO2 (5)

Indicative Content

This is a two part question and candidates need to address both halves to get over half marks. ‘Numbers’ requires a consideration of evidence from which archaeological demographers extrapolate in order to estimate population size. This may involve projecting historical data backwards but the answer should be rooted in physical evidence. Detailed case studies are valid as long as the emphasis is on archaeological sources. Distribution maps of settlements, the use of ethnographic analogies and models based on soil fertility are all valid areas to consider. Weak responses may rely on speculation such as estimates of numbers needed to build particular monuments. Upper bands should show an awareness of problems (to what extent) and possibilities. ‘Life expectancy’ responses are likely to focus heavily on human skeletal remains and consideration of mortality profiles. Upper bands should be aware of the problems inherent in trying to reconstruct life expectancy profiles due to limited data and/or problems assigning precise ages to skeletons. The Spitalfields research where dates obtained from skeletal analysis conflicted with other data may be cited. Generic health responses (e.g. on tooth decay) or on other analysis of bones or soft tissue are unlikely to be of relevance. Population can be discussed at any appropriate level from settlement to nation.

Question 4

Answers the contribution of wet sites to our understanding of landscapes and settlements in the past. (25 marks)

Target: AO1 (20) AO2 (5)

Indicative Content

The question is deliberately targeted on two areas where wet sites have proved valuable. It is not a general question on wet sites and information on diet, artefacts or boats, for example, is unlikely to be directly relevant. The same applies to lengthy discussion of anaerobic preservation. The question requires a two-element response and while balance between the two should not be expected, both should be present to get over half marks. It is likely that most candidates will emphasis settlements. Glastonbury, Star Carr (and perhaps Ringkloster?) are the most likely settlements to be considered with the Sweet Track featuring in accounts of landscape. Ultimately candidates have to consider what would be known without wet sites in order to make a contrast. It is likely that candidates will make an association of wet sites with organic building materials but better responses may recognise the importance of stone and brick for many periods. Higher level responses should also tackle the issue of typicality or other limitations of wet sites. Wide-ranging responses with examples are valid but the question lends itself to detailed knowledge of a narrow range of examples. Allow for differences in the way candidates allocate peat deposit within their answers as long as it seems reasoned. Settlements rather than sites was deliberately chosen for the question but higher level answers may consider what archaeologists mean by landscapes, the physical landscape or the way humans interacted with it.

Appendix: Marking Thematic Essays at A2

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.

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.

Or: Answers which do address the question and demonstrate some understanding of the issues but which contain very little or no relevant archaeological examples to support their case. Also include at this level, developed and detailed essay plans which could have become higher level essays and good responses of around half 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 band 2 responses but will be largely focussed 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 do address the question and demonstrate a reasonable understanding of the issues and reach sensible conclusions but which contain 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 they will not be developed. Include at this level responses which are of band 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 containing a good amount of relevant material either in the form of 1-2 detailed case studies or a range of 4-6 shorter examples with some relevant development. The response must contain some analysis 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.

Or: Responses which address the question directly and demonstrate a good understanding of the issue raised by it. The account is likely to be well structured and may be argued consistently. However, supporting evidence will be sparse, perhaps including several 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 band 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.**

Responses which explore issues in greater depth or achieve sharper focus in argument than at band 4. While the two elements of critical analysis and relevant supporting evidence are both present these may still be slightly unbalanced. The candidate is able to sustain a logical and structured argument supported by appropriate example, 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. Communication is largely effective but not all the data will be successfully linked to the specific demands of the question. Not all the case studies will supply sufficient detail or show sufficient discrimination in choice of detail. The response

will appraise some of the material successfully and evaluation will be present, perhaps in a developed conclusion.

Level 6 **22-25: AO1 (18-20) AO2 (4-5)**

Very good to excellent responses.

Responses at this level will demonstrate discrimination and detail through precise selection of data which is clearly related to the issues. The candidate appears confident in their grasp of their examples and is able both to successfully appraise findings and make comparisons where necessary. The essay will be well structured, largely analytical in approach and will address most aspects of the question. Discussion will involve a balanced assessment of both sides of an issue during which a clearly communicated and sustained argument will have emerged. Evaluation of the overall issue(s) will be clearly evident both during the essay and in the conclusion. There should also be an 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 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.