



ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

www.PapaCambridge.com

General Certificate of Education

AS Archaeology 5011

**ACH2 Post-Excavation, Dating
and Interpretation**

Mark Scheme

2008 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 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 to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2008 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.

ACH2

Post-Excavation, Dating and Interpretation

Quality of Written Communication

The assessment of the Quality of Written Communication (QWC) is judged through the assessment of the clarity and appropriateness of the archaeological material presented. There are no discrete marks for the assessment of QWC but where questions are "levels" marked, QWC will influence the mark awarded within a particular level.

As a rough guide, QWC performance is characterised by the following descriptors.

- Level 1** Language is basic, descriptions and explanations are over-simplified and lack clarity.
- Level 2** Generally accurate use of language; descriptions and explanations can be easily followed, but are not clearly expressed throughout.
- Level 3** Accurate and appropriate use of language; descriptions and explanations are expressed with clarity throughout.

Further guidance on the assessment of QWC will be given at the Standardising Meeting.

Question 1

Study **Figure 1** and use your own knowledge.

Outline the similarities and differences between the three artefacts shown. You do not need to know the names of the specific artefacts. (9 marks)

- | | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| L1: | Vague and general descriptive responses. | 1-2 |
| L2: | One dimension considered or two mentioned. | 3-4 |
| L3: | Two dimensions covered or several mentioned. | 5-7 |
| L4: | Three dimensions covered. | 8-9 |

Mark responses using technical language higher in the band.

Dimensions. Size, shape, workings/manufacturing techniques.

Question 2

Study **Figure 2** and use your own knowledge.

Explain how archaeologists use the technique illustrated and then interpret the results.

(6 marks)

L1:	Responses which attempt to describe the differences in the polishes or partial responses on one of the key parts.	1-2
L2:	1 key point explained.	3
L3:	2 key points explained.	4
L4:	3 or more key points explained.	5-6

Key points are:

A – Understanding of polish.

B – Understanding of S.E.M. use.

C – Understanding of parallel/reference material.

D – Use of experiment to create reference material.

E – Reasonable attempt to draw conclusions about use of artefacts.

Question 3

Study **Figure 3** and use your own knowledge.

Pollen cores were taken from Garry Bog close to Mount Sandel. What do the results shown in the table indicate about the local environment? (10 marks)

L1:	A few general points.	1-2
L2:	Descriptive responses and partial translations of the vegetation sequence.	3-5
L3:	Accurate translation of the vegetation sequence.	6-8
L4:	Translation of most aspects of the table in order to make a general statement about environmental change.	9-10

Credit understanding of change over time and relative significance.

Question 4

Study **Figure 4** and the plan in the Introduction (Map 3) and use your own knowledge.

Explain each of the circled elements (a), (b) and (c) in the table. (6 marks)

- Lab and sample number (**1 or 2**).
- The precise location of the sample on site (**1**).
- Uncalibrated radiocarbon date (**1**) error margin (**1**) either LOC **or** before Christ/before common era (**1**).

No marks where candidates present alternative responses.

Question 5

Study **Source 1** and use your own knowledge.

Why was it important for archaeologists to know this information before drawing conclusions from the faunal remains which were recovered? (7 marks)

- | | | |
|-----|---|------------|
| L1: | Responses which focus on the point of environmental sampling. | 1-2 |
| L2: | Responses which explain points made in the text. | 3-5 |
| L3: | Responses which show a clear understanding of the need to consider taphonomy/site formation processes/recovery processes. | 6-7 |

Mark responses using technical language higher in the band.

Potential Level 2 points include:

- A) Different sieve sizes used in different contexts therefore not wholly comparable.
- B) Use of fine meshes means that potential recovery of environmental data should be good.
- C) Soil conditions mean some materials will survive less well than others.
- D) Surviving animal bones may be atypical because of processing.
- E) Survival and recovery from this site will be different from other contemporary sites.
- F) Awareness of other techniques which might recover more data.

Question 6

Study **Figure 5** and use your own knowledge.

What evidence might enable archaeologists to construct this table? (12 marks)

- | | | |
|-----|--|--------------|
| L1: | Brief, vague, general and scattergun responses. | 1-3 |
| L2: | At least one resource clearly explained or good lists. | 4-6 |
| L3: | At least two different resources clearly explained or extensive lists with some brief relevant comments. | 7-9 |
| L4: | Three or more resources clearly explained. (Treat eels and salmon as one.) | 10-12 |

Credit reference to other sources.

- Flounders or Bass – knowledge of current ecosystems, location of estuary on map, possible fish bones (but survival dealt with in Question 5). Historic sources – understanding of Mesolithic technology.
- Storage – historical and ethnographic analogs, comparison with better preserved sites. Extrapolation from plentiful food sources in autumn and understanding of annual cycles. Charred hazelnuts.