



---

A-LEVEL

# Archaeology

ARCH3 World Archaeology  
Mark scheme

---

2010  
June 2015

---

Version V1 Final Mark Scheme

---

---

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' 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 [aqa.org.uk](http://aqa.org.uk)

## Marking Thematic Essays

The thematic approach in these papers enables students 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 students 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 students 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 students understanding of key themes and ideas in world archaeology (AO2) and in Section B to test students 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 students 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 student 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 student 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 students 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. In Section B points made will not go beyond everyday knowledge and there will be very little or no evidence of the study of archaeological issues.

### 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 student 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, students 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. In section B there will be a very basic grasp of the debate and/or a very limited range of points made. Discussion will not be sustained and evidence is superficial or undeveloped.

### **Level 3**                      **11-17 marks: AO1 (3) / AO2 (14)**

#### **Relevant responses**

**Either:** Responses which largely contains material relevant to this question and where the student 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.

**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 but 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 the flow of the answer may sometimes be hampered by insecure structuring of paragraphs or occasional poor expression. 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. Beware of passages of ARCH2 material without any link to context. In section B there will be a understanding of the issue for archaeology although this may be unbalanced. There will be some relevant examples but they won't be exploited. Appraisal will be limited.

---

**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 a range of 4–6 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.

**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.

At Level 4 communication skills will generally be sound. Though general spelling and grammar will be secure there will still be lapses with technical vocabulary. Organisation will be sensible 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 awareness of the range of sources (or their reliability) involved in constructing the evidence discussed. In Section B there will be a clear focus on the archaeological debate and a critical understanding of issues. A range of examples and/or positions will be considered in a balanced way before arriving at a conclusion. Accurate and relevant examples will largely be exploited.

**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 date 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 account 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 students 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. In Section B there will be a discursive approach and full engagement with the debate. A wide range of relevant examples or positions will be evaluated. There will be a logical, balanced argument and a clear, supported conclusion will be reached

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 students. 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, students 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 student’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**

Students 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****Question 1**

**01** To what extent were family units in the past comprised of only parents and children?

**[30 marks]**

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

**Indicative content**

This question is accessible for all periods, from Isaacs' model of 'home base behaviour' from Olduvai Gorge onwards. The focus should be on the composition and relationships within basic family units/households - how they were defined, who was included. This is not a question on function or on social stratification. Responses which focus on the relative position of different families in the social structure are highly unlikely to move beyond low Level 2.

There are good case studies in most periods which can be drawn on. These include studies which fuse fossil analysis and primate studies to assess evidence for pair-bonding amongst early hominids. In later periods evidence might be drawn from upper Palaeolithic hearths, the houses of early farmers in the Balkans and Anatolia, brochs and Iron Age round houses and Medieval longhouses and castles. The structure and size of buildings, artefact distribution, spatial analysis and skeletal evidence (including DNA) are all fruitful topics for discussion. The recent analysis of a murdered, corded ware, nuclear family at Eulau provides an exciting example of the way biochemical analysis is starting to answer such questions. Challenges to the question might come from high status dwellings where households included slaves, servants, wards, etc, but the emphasis must be upon physical evidence. Another fruitful example might be the triple burial from Dolni Vestonice. At the very top end, credit responses which challenge the nature of 'family' as a concept, particularly when viewed through the lens of the present.

**Question 2**

**02** What physical evidence is of most value to archaeologists in explaining the emergence of ranked societies?

**[30 marks]**

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

**Indicative content**

This is not a question on evidence for elites or ranking and answers which address a different question are unlikely to move beyond level 2. Students need to focus on periods where there was a transition from broadly egalitarian societies to those with the first evidence of elites or ranking so explanation will be more highly rewarded than description. Having identified their examples, the focus needs to be on different categories of evidence which might include artefacts, burial assemblages and monuments, buildings and inscriptions. The period may vary depending on the case studies chosen with the Chalcolithic or Bronze Age the most likely areas of focus. Rich burials such as Varna or the Amesbury Archer are likely to feature as examples but students need to consider whether these evidence permanent elites or more fleeting patterns of status or rank, and whether other evidence is needed for confirmation. The most successful responses will link the

evidence to the potential reasons for the emergence of elites which might include warfare, exchange, successful farming (and other forms of intensification) or ritual (eg mobilisation of labour in Neolithic and Bronze Age Wessex).

### Question 3

**03** Were human or environmental factors more significant in the decline **and/or** collapse of past (modern human) societies? Explain your answer.

**[30 marks]**

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

#### Indicative content

This question featured several times in various guises in the preceding specifications. The focus is upon societies and therefore should not overlap with question 13. Students can choose whether to focus upon decline or collapse or a combination of the two. Examples are likely to include the Maya, Easter Island and examples from the near east such as Mashkan Shapir. Students who focus upon warfare especially in relation to historic periods will get credit where they draw on archaeology rather than literary sources but will need breadth - either in terms of analysis of other aspects of those societies or exploration of different examples - in order to reach higher levels. The most successful students are likely to select examples where the reasons for decline are contested by different archaeologists. Consideration of evidence might include palynology, human remains, burials, settlement patterns amongst many potential categories. Recent work on past catastrophes like tsunamis or movement of monsoon rains or the break up of the North American ice barrier could also be relevant here. The best responses are likely to recognise that there is a complex interplay between power, economics, ritual practice, resource depletion and environmental degradation as occurred on Dartmoor in the later Bronze Age.

### Question 4

**04** Discuss the evidence for seasonal exploitation of the landscape in **at least two** different cultures you have studied.

**[30 marks]**

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

#### Indicative content

While this question is likely to attract students who have studied foragers, it is equally accessible to students who have studied farming societies. Mick Aston's 'Interpreting the Landscape' is packed with examples of the way medieval farmers in particular made use of 'wild' resources including woods, rivers and upland areas at different times of the year.

Transhumance could be a particularly fruitful area of focus such as the evidence for mountain pasture and woodland farming at the linearbandkeramik site of Vahingen or the arguments of Whittle or Parker-Pearson regarding movement amongst the first farmers in southern Britain. Examples from the Mesolithic might discuss seasonal movement in order to exploit resources in relation to sites such as Morton, Goldcliffe, Star Carr and Oronsay but equally may focus on the way sites were located to exploit resources from every season such as the Ertebolle sites of Tybrind Vig or Tagerup in Denmark, and possibly Star Carr and Oronsay in Britain. Other examples might include studies from Mount Sandel, the Tagus Estuary or the Trentino Valley in Italy. Intercept hunting in particular seasons will also be relevant as at Stellmoor. Prepared essays on mobility may be relevant but alone will be insufficient for higher grades. Students need to have a strong focus upon evidence for human activity in the landscape over the year. Plant and faunal

remains are likely to dominate discussion. Ethnographic analogs drawn from examples such as Binford's studies of the Nunamiut can be relevant but must be linked to archaeological examples. Students have considerable latitude in selecting cultures but at least two must be selected to access the higher levels of the mark scheme.

Early agricultural systems may also exhibit differential spatial and temporal exploitation of landscapes, especially through seasonal flooding (Nile) with related patterns of ritual activity.

### Question 5

**05** Evaluate the contribution of particular experimental buildings to our understanding of settlements in the past.

[30 marks]

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

#### Indicative content

Students are free to focus upon the contribution of what Peter Reynolds called 'constructs' to our understanding of how ancient buildings were built and how they functioned, or can broaden it out to look at other aspects of settlement such as identification of activity areas. Discussion of the educational value of reconstructions may feature but should not be the focus in Section A questions. It will get some credit within bands but not to move between them. Examples are likely to include Butser Ancient Farm, West Stow or the (now closed) Peat Moors Visitors Centre. Students need to be able to discuss what is understood through the construction of experimental buildings which could not be determined from excavated remains. This is likely to mean a focus upon the superstructure and roof yet need not be solely focussed above ground level as the famous example from West Stow illustrates. Other aspects of settlements might include longevity, population, activity areas, how individual buildings functioned within settlements, and even relationship with the wider landscapes as at Castell Henllys. Evaluation needs to set the contribution of experimentation against other sources of insight such as ethnographies or spatial analysis of finds and features as at Black Patch. Better answers will be aware of the limitations of experimentation as well as the advantages.

### Question 6

**06** To what extent have archaeologists explained the emergence of **either** sedentism **or** urban settlements in **at least two** societies you have studied?

[30 marks]

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

#### Indicative content

The choice of focus is intended to enable both students who have studied foragers and early agriculturalists and those who have focussed on the Bronze Age or later to address it. In the former instance discussion is likely to home in on economic reasons such as domestication as at Tell Abu Hureyra or particularly productive environments as at Ertebolle sites such as Tybrind Vig or Casma and Caral in Peru. Key aspects of discussion might include which came first crops or houses, and whether there are degrees of sedentism. Evidence is likely to focus upon houses and other structures but seasonal environmental evidence may also be considered. Early Neolithic Wessex might provide another good example. Students can reasonably infer 'emergence' in relation to what the evidence from this context suggests about the nature of early farming

communities, such as their largely egalitarian social structure and interactions that can be inferred from territorial distribution of long barrows (for example West Kennet) and causewayed enclosures (for example Windmill Hill). The debate about when people settled down in Wessex (was it as late as the farmed landscapes of the Middle Bronze Age?) may be a particularly fruitful area for discussion.

The Near East and Meso-America and possibly Greece/Crete are likely to be the focus for urbanisation. Emphasis is likely to be on agricultural surplus and the emergence of elites but expect some consideration of other factors - religion, war, social change etc in higher level answers. Britain may also feature but do not over-reward lengthy accounts of the Roman invasion. Expect in the case of Roman Britain some discussion of the role of pre-existing complex settlements (eg Oppida) rather than assuming a land of primitive farmers. Implicit in the question is the need to examine at least two explanations (ideally for the same context but also possible for comparable ones) and to arrive at a conclusion regarding their relative strengths.

### Question 7

**07** To what extent does archaeological evidence support the view that hunter-gatherers had successful, productive economies?

**[30 marks]**

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

#### Indicative content

This is intended as a broad question about the efficiency of forager economies. Students need to consider what 'successful, productive economics' might imply such as resources, artefacts, art and ritual and structures. The past 40 years has provided startling evidence that some societies were well above subsistence levels. Evidence might include population densities, permanent settlements, structures, burials and evidence of diet. The most likely examples come from the Baltic and Japan but also British sites such as Star Carr. The recent book by Milner et al (2013) summarises this changing perspective. For example the evidence (from shell middens) for significant exploitation of marine resources and the development of resource-hungry collective burials as at Tévéc, Brittany. It may also be possible to argue the case for Upper Palaeolithic aggregation sites and the rituals centres of south west France and the Spanish Pyrenees. In order to evaluate, students need to consider the limitations of the evidence and where the 'affluent (successful, productive economies) model' does not seem to apply. The differential rapidity with which societies took up farming may be a key indicator. This question is balanced by Q9.

**Question 8**

**08** ‘Most tools and technologies in the past were made from organic materials.’ Discuss.

**[30 marks]**

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

**Indicative content**

Both terms are used to signal to students that both utensils and large pieces of equipment, from boats to watermills to fish traps, can be discussed. ‘Organic materials’ means that artefacts made from animal or plant products can be considered. The most successful responses are where the student knows their chosen case study material in sufficient depth to evaluate significance. This means having an overview of the range (proliferation and diversity) of tools and technology in use and an awareness of the relative proportion of the organic and inorganic. Ideally several different examples should be used to explore the issue and provide coverage of a range of tools and technologies. Likely examples include Oetzi the Iceman, the Ertebolle Culture and burial evidence from ARCH1 sites such as Hochdorf. However, the question is applicable to sites from all periods where organic materials have survived well including the Mary Rose and Vindolanda.

**Question 9**

**09** Were domestic animals of greater economic value dead or alive in past societies?

Explain your answer.

**[30 marks]**

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

**Indicative content**

This question is similar to an earlier one on the non-food use of animals but the focus is quite different. The emphasis upon domestic animals provides a balance to the forager focus of Question 7. There are a number of different ways of approaching this. One might be to compare the value of slaughtered herd animals for meat, horn, skin, sinews, tallow etc, with that of secondary products including milk, eggs, wool and traction. Value might be in terms of calories, convenience (or not), predictability of supply, substitution of inferior materials or those which were time-consuming to produce. Another might be to look at the impact of each stage of the development of pastoralism in terms of evidence of population growth, settlement density or social changes. A third might be to look at several examples from different periods to determine whether the answer changes over time. The use of animals in ritual (a synoptic element from all three ARCH1 options) is also relevant whether as sacred creatures or as offerings. A wide range of evidence could potentially be used. For example Iron Age sites frequently include loom weights and spindle whorls, bones of sheep (and occasionally dogs) and sometimes elements of horse harnesses and ritual deposits. These could be supplemented with the shears from Flag Fen, the cart burial at Wetwang and examples from Iron Age art. The Anglo-Saxon period would produce similar examples while Rome could add entertainment and pack animals. Evidence from much earlier sites is more likely to emphasise the possible use of dogs as hunting companions as at Ringkloster. Differentiation will come through range but also the degree of assessment of the evidence. At the top end candidates may debate the idea of a Secondary Products revolution (Sherratt).

---

**Section B: Contemporary Issues in World Archaeology****Question 10**

**10** In the 21st century, the public value of Archaeology is described in terms of 'Heritage Assets'. What kind of an asset are archaeological remains in the United Kingdom?

**[30 marks]****Use generic levels 1–5 AO1 (5) AO2 (25)****Indicative content**

The legislation and planning guidance named in the specification has been out of date for some time but we have continued to focus upon it because of the lag before textbooks cover it. This has been frustrating to centres who have kept up to date through other media while PPS5 has come and gone and this question recognises this but is open to other students who have considered the public value of archaeology (in the current specification). Some understanding of the main component of The National Planning Policy Framework NPPF (2012) would be useful but the thrust of the question is towards the social, cultural and economic value of Archaeology. A key aspect is the concept of heritage assets and what criteria might be used to define them and how their economic and social (especially for 'communities') 'value' is measured. A second is sustainability of use of assets. Following from PPS5 (2010) is a reduced emphasis upon preservation in situ which was so significant in PPG16 and more emphasis on balancing archaeology with other needs. The key to the essay is assessment of the balance between historic assets and other needs, particularly in the planning process. The notion of asset might draw on education (including life-long learning), tourism, regional and national (and other) identities. The level at which decisions are taken and the role of HERs and EH are also relevant. Discrimination will be between those students who can provide specific cases or processes to discuss and those who only offer generalities. The English Heritage website provides some very accessible guides to recent changes.

**Question 11**

**11** 'Today collectors are the real looters, not metal-detectorists.' Discuss.

**[30 marks]****Use generic levels 1–5 AO1 (5) AO2 (25)****Indicative content**

This question combines issues previously asked in two separate questions and requires students to weigh up the pros and cons of collecting and metal detecting in order to reach a judgement. There clearly is an overlap where detectorists feed the collector market but collecting includes the international antiquities market whether legal or illegal (this could include museums). Students recognising this and also the good and bad (from an archaeological point of view) in both cases are likely to be operating at a high level. In particular the loss of context is likely to be stressed. International examples might include the Sipan Gold or Sevso treasure. Negative views of collecting are most likely. Note that an overreliance upon the Elgin Marbles is unlikely to be rewarded since the question focuses upon today rather than 200 years ago.

Positive aspects might touch on the material in museums as well as auction houses, poorer peoples (and countries) being able to ‘mine’ a resource, collecting ensuring preservation and the philanthropy of various collectors. In terms of metal detecting this is a question on impact not on legislation. Positives might include on-site use to identify fragile metal finds or to check spoil heaps and the reporting to HERs and finds liaison officers to increase our knowledge of find-sites. The Portable Antiquities Scheme and the contribution this makes to public understanding of archaeology is to be expected here. Negatives might include destruction of context, non-reporting of finds and looting (nighthawks etc). Students who raise issues such as whether finds in plough soil are in situ will get credit but a range of points is required to access higher levels.

### Question 12

**12** ‘Archaeology still has a role in the construction of national identity by modern nation states.’  
Discuss.

**[30 marks]**

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

#### Indicative content

This is a familiar issue for History but in archaeology has been less prominent. Clearly there have been societies which have explicitly tried to draw parallels with archaeological cultures, for example Saddam Hussein’s Iraq, Nazi Germany or Mussolini’s Italy. Students could consider whether Great Zimbabwe, Celts and Vikings, Ancient Greece etc have modern significance. It is explicitly not a question about indigenous peoples so most repatriation material will not be relevant except where this involves nation states. Clearly the Elgin Marbles have a relevance here given the way 19<sup>th</sup> century Greek governments used antiquities to define the heritage of their new state. However, lengthy discussions of the dispute are unlikely to be relevant. The role of archaeology in developing a sense of shared culture in schools could also be discussed. In the case of England and Wales this is not usually in relation to national identity with a significant ancient culture (Egypt, Romans) preferred at primary school it is rarely encountered in secondary education. Does prehistoric Britain, the Saxon Period or Roman Britain have any relevance to the UK compared to Hitler, the Tudors and Slavery? A fruitful area for exploration might be consideration of which aspects of heritage are promoted by the state. For example, the way Croatia is using its (impressive) new museums of the Neanderthal and the Neolithic, both to highlight its rich archaeological heritage but also to give it a unique identity for archaeological tourism. This is not a question about indigenous peoples even if couched in terms of their relationships with nation states and responses which recycle essays from previous papers are unlikely to receive much credit.

**Question 13**

**13** Discuss why archaeologists disagree about the reasons for Neanderthal extinction.

**[30 marks]**

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

**Indicative content**

The focus here is on the demise of a species rather than a particular society as in Question 3. Students need to consider a range of explanations and weigh them up against the available evidence. The limitations of that evidence and the way that new finds can quickly lead to a reappraisal of explanations should be the focus of students. Explanations may include human agency, climate, disease, interbreeding (possible Hybrids in Portugal e.g. *largo Velho*), social isolation and inability to adapt.

It is likely that differences in terms of technology, social cohesion, behaviour (including symbolic behaviour) and physique with Anatomically Modern Humans (AMH) will form the basis of discussion, eg recent evidence in the development of the hyoid bone – did Neanderthals have the physiological ability to use language, and if so did they have the cognitive ability to do so? However, the debate continues to move on and these should be augmented with more points such as evidence for cannibalism from France and Croatia and late sites such as Gibraltar. More recent research includes new dates in Russia that suggest that Neanderthals had disappeared long before AMH arrived or evidence derived from the decoded Neanderthal genome.

**Marking Grid**

|                             | <b>AO1 Archaeological skills and methods</b> | <b>AO2 Archaeological knowledge and understanding</b> |
|-----------------------------|--|---|
| Section A<br>(60 marks)     | 10   | 50  |
| Section B<br>(30 marks)     | 5  | 25  |
| <b>Total<br/>(90 marks)</b> | <b>15</b>                                    | <b>75</b>   |