

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 13	14 - 28	29 - 36	37 - 47	48 - 59	60 - 69	70 - 100

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 12	13 - 25	26 - 37	38 - 48	49 - 59	60 - 71	72 - 100

Higher level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 7	8 - 9	10 - 11	12 - 13	14 - 15	16 - 20

The range and suitability of the work submitted

In contrast to the downward trend noted in the last two May examination sessions, a slight majority of candidates in this session presented appropriate and well-focused research questions, although as usual there was marked variation of success among centres in this respect.

Also in contrast to recent examination sessions, context-based approaches were almost as popular as issue-based approaches this session, with around four in ten candidates choosing context-based topics.

The most successful issue-based topics included an examination of how agricultural practices and associated gender roles have changed among the Hopi people; a report on labour migration in Nepal and its impact on the families of migrants; a report applying symbolic anthropology to the interpretation of the ritualized behaviour of athletes, and an investigation into how an expatriate Bengali community in the United Kingdom maintains its cultural identity.

As usual, almost all context-based reports focused on places familiar to the candidates, *i.e.* centres, sports teams, dance studios, social clubs, public patriotic celebrations, *etc.* Among the most successful were: a study of the changes in men's roles in a traditional dance in Malawi; an imaginative application of structuralist concepts to understanding role-inversion in a high school theatre program, and a symbolic analysis of the behaviour of security guards in an urban gated community.

It should once again be noted that both issue-based and context-based reports had their own characteristic strengths and weaknesses. Issue-based reports frequently lacked detail in data presentation, and, especially if approached through a poorly focused research question, tended to yield superficial analyses. On the other hand, context-based reports frequently tended to be overly descriptive, often with unnecessary detail. Both approaches, however, are likely to lack conceptual and theoretical frameworks for analysing data, as is required by the assessment criteria (see Criterion D). This issue will be discussed further below.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A

Reversing a downward trend noted in the last two May examination sessions, a slight majority of candidates presented appropriate and well-focused research questions, and very few inappropriate questions were proposed. As was true with respect to a number of the assessment criteria, there were often marked variations in performance between centres.

Criterion B

Performance against this criterion was slightly less satisfactory than in the May 2013 examination session. Only one-third of candidates clearly justified and described their research techniques (corresponding to a mark of three out of four), and very few presented inappropriate techniques. This criterion also reflected marked differences in performance between centres. It seems clear that some teachers have taken the methodological emphasis of this component seriously, and have trained candidates in the selection, description, application and evaluation of research techniques. In contrast, several centres seem to leave selection and development of research techniques entirely up to the candidates, giving little evidence of having provided guidance. Perhaps the greatest shortcoming seen here, and a very widespread one, is the failure to completely represent the context under which research was carried out, that is, candidates did not describe one or more of the following: how informants were selected, what the independent or "background" variables distinguishing them might have been, the number of informants involved, and the circumstances as to time and place under which research instruments were administered.

Criterion C

Performance against this criterion showed some improvement over recent sessions in that one-third of the candidates presented data appropriately and with adequate detail, thus achieving at least three marks out of a possible four. Very few candidates

ignored the basic requirement of gathering data through field research. An occasional problem seen this session and in recent sessions concerns the presentation of essential data in appendices. Since appendices are not included within the 2000 word limit for the report, were this practice to be tolerated, there would be no effective limit on the report's length. Teachers need to be vigilant in guiding candidates to utilise appendices properly.

Criterion D

There was an improvement in performance in this criterion in comparison to recent examination sessions, with almost two-thirds of candidates presenting at least a rudimentary analytical framework employing anthropological concepts and/or theory. On the other hand, there is still room for great improvement with respect to this criterion: the mean for this criterion is still slightly below two marks, and only one candidate received full marks. As in all recent sessions, sound application of concepts and theory to data analysis was often hampered by candidates neglecting to define “key” concepts such as “rites of passage”, “globalization”, “commodification”, “ethnicity”, “identity”, “emic” and “etic”, etc. Many candidates, aware that they are expected to apply anthropological concepts and theory, introduce concepts or theory that they have not fully understood, hence the resulting application of theoretical approaches is often distorted or superficial.

Criterion E

The positive trend remarked upon in the last two higher level internal assessment (HL IA) reports with respect to the treatment of ethical issues continued this session, with approximately two-thirds of candidates providing at least some substantial discussion of ethical issues arising in the course of field research (two or three out of three marks). As is the case of some other criteria, performance in this criterion varies between centres. The expanded guidelines relating to ethical issues in the *teacher support material (TSM)* may have helped raise awareness of the importance of these issues. Still, the great majority of candidates are not regularly dealing with the broader but less obvious issues of ethical practice in field research, such as selectivity in data gathering, representation, positionality and reflexivity. These issues have been an increasingly important concern among ethnographers over at least the last 40 years, hence it is not unreasonable to expect higher level candidates to show some degree of familiarity with them.

Criterion F

Performance against this criterion has improved slightly over the last few examination sessions. Under this criterion, which asks candidates to demonstrate “anthropological insight and imagination”, almost six in ten candidates received at least two out of a possible three marks, although the proportion of candidates receiving full marks remained about the same as in May 2013. To do well in this criterion, candidates must have presented anthropologically valid and well-focused issues, and must show some sense of what constitutes a distinctly anthropological analysis of data. Some evidence of reflexive and critical thinking about the process of data gathering and the

interpretation of data is also expected for full marks under this criterion, although as indicated in the discussion of Criterion E above, some improvement was also seen in candidates' critiques of their research methodology.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

- **Selecting and focusing the research question:** While improvement was noted in candidate performance in selecting and focusing the research question, the fact that wide variation in performance between centres existed with respect to this criterion shows there is room for improvement. Some suggestions for working through stages in the process of refining a topic idea into a focused research question are found in the guidelines for the higher level internal assessment (HL IA) found in the *Teacher Support Material (TSM)*, accessible through the Online Curriculum Centre (OCC).
- **Data presentation:** Only a minority of candidates presented data in a well-organized manner and with adequate detail, and performance has been similar in recent sessions. This component has a methodological focus, but this should not be taken to mean that data presentation should be slighted in favour of a concentration on methodological issues and theory. Both teachers and candidates will benefit not only by studying the IA guidelines and assessment criteria found in the subject guide (pages 44–48), but by studying the marked and annotated IA samples found in the *TSM*. Both the subject guide and the *TSM* may be accessed through the OCC. Teachers should plan to devote some class time to preparing candidates for the IA component, as well as allocating sufficient time for individual conferences with candidates as their projects develop. Regarding field research techniques, there are many published guides to student field research available, a number of which can be found on the Teacher Resource Exchange site of the OCC.

A specific shortcoming evidenced in the work of several candidates concerns the presentation of data in appendices. Teachers should ensure that candidates understand that appendices should be used only for ancillary material, not for the presentation of data essential to the argument of the research report.

- **Integrating concepts and theory in the analysis of data:** As related above, candidates showed some improvement overall in analysing data, although once again, there exists a marked difference in the level of performance between various centres, and almost half of the candidates did not fulfil the expectation that candidates present analytical frameworks (criterion D). There is no simple way of learning how to choose appropriate concepts and theories for the purpose of analysing data. Again, the marked and annotated sample IA reports available in the *TSM* should be carefully studied. Discussion of the assessment criteria is also essential in this regard. It appears that some teachers may not be clear as to just what constitutes an “analytical framework” When awarding marks in this criterion. This must be understood by teachers before they can properly guide candidate progress in writing the report.

- **Ethical issues:** In addition to the earlier comments with regard to the discussion of ethical issues, it should be noted that these should not be approached as isolated topics in field research. Almost every modern ethnography that is likely to be read by candidates presents the reader with discussion of serious ethical issues, which in some cases are close to the central themes of the ethnography. Engaging candidates in the ethical problems faced by professional ethnographers is the best way to help them see relationships to their own field research issues.
- **Organization and format of the report:** While there is no specific format for the HL IA report, unlike in the case of the extended essay, it is advisable for teachers to produce a suggested format for their class, intended, for example, to raise candidates' awareness of the requirements reflected in the assessment criteria, and to encourage clarity of organization. Teachers are likely to find that if they do not provide some sort of format, conscientious candidates will ask for one. Use of a table of contents, subheadings, and bibliography specifically deserve attention, and should be part of classroom preparation for the assignment. As mentioned in criterion C regarding the presentation of data, teachers should take care that candidates understand that appendices are to be used for ancillary material only, and not for the presentation of basic data.
- **Group work for the HL IA:** Teachers are reminded that they should clearly describe the circumstances under which group work, if any, was undertaken. This should be done in a statement accompanying the 3/CS form. For guidelines on group work for the IA, refer to the subject guide, page 39. It is the teacher's responsibility to ensure that the data presentation, interpretation and analyses in each individual report are the candidate's own work.

Standard level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 9	10 - 11	12 - 13	14 - 15	16 - 20

The range and suitability of the work submitted

Most standard level internal assessment (SL IA) work showed that candidates considered the observation and report writing to be a valid and valuable exercise in their anthropological studies, and most candidates worked to produce critiques that attempted to meet all the assessment criteria. Inevitably, the range in quality of the reports and critiques was significant. This was most revealing in a lack of understanding of the criteria, notably criterion B (which requires a discussion of the interplay between description and analysis) and a tendency in some critiques to either further analyse the data collected rather than the observation experience itself, or to use the critique to list perceived mistakes made during the observation. These approaches are off focus and detracted from the success of work submitted.

Most candidates met the word limit requirements, which has not always been the case in past sessions, and most kept to the time limit for the observation.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A

As in previous years, the report was the most successfully completed area of the assessment. The main organizing principal was usually time, a one hour observation recorded in a fair amount of detail. Candidates chose almost exclusively to observe a particular public context rather than to seek a theme. This is acceptable but also limiting. Observations that combined theme with context worked best and gave decidedly more material to work within the critiques.

Some reports were written in such a perfunctory style that there was little to critique. A simple chronological list of events (for example, who walked in and out of Starbucks) does not constitute a well-organized report.

Some candidates noted that they were advised to be as objective as possible and while that is good anthropological practice it often makes for clinical or sterile SL IA reports. Furthermore, the sharp focus on objectivity made it difficult to critique the reports allowing only for a dull list of perceived mistakes rather than an exploration into the personal experience of data collection.

Only a few candidates participated or conducted interviews when collecting data for the report, a marked improvement over previous years. This is a good trend since the criteria are specifically designed for observation only.

Criterion B

Criterion B remains the most challenging of all criteria and only the higher achieving candidates were able to distinguish between description and analysis, many making no reference or very minimal reference to the terms, and even fewer presenting a valid discussion. Despite this, many teachers awarded generous internal marks for this criterion (more marks than warranted), suggesting that this is an issue for at least some teachers as well as candidates.

The difference between description and analysis is not understood by many candidates. Phrases such as “I did not have enough inference” indicate that not only have some candidates misunderstood the word in its context here but that they have also misunderstood the purpose of the discussion. Candidates do not always recognize perceptions or assumptions that were inferred with the descriptions or attempts at analysis in their reports. Some unfortunately see these as mistakes rather than a reflection of attitudes, personal and social, which is the main goal of the SL IA. Candidates do not always recognize that descriptive inference and analysis is linked to social categories, such as race or ethnicity. These are often taken at face value. Some casually cited the terms descriptive inference and solid analysis but gave no examples or discussion, which is inadequate to complete this criterion.

However, there has been a notable improvement from some centres. More candidates understand that they can use the critique to evaluate how they have described or analysed the social exchanges they witnessed. In some cases candidates found it interesting to notice that even choice of wording can colour the impression the reader has about the people observed. Some were also skilled at recognizing inferences built into their descriptions as well as the degree to which their analysis was solid. The best critiques also gave apt examples from their reports.

Criterion C

Most candidates were able to identify at least some biases and assumptions, usually personal and social. As is often the case, this criterion displayed relatively strong performances. After the observation report, this is the most successfully completed criterion.

Some candidates were quite proficient at recognizing that what they noticed in their observations was directly related to their personal opinions. Some recognized that the choice of the setting was dependent on their interests. For example, one candidate explained how they were fashion-conscious and therefore wanted to watch shoppers; another stated that they were critical of the local transportation system and went to observe the morning rush at a train station. These choices were discussed convincingly in the critique. Others mentioned that their gender, social status, and nationality influenced the focus of fieldwork. This gave an interesting dimension to

criterion C that overlapped well with the requirements of criterion D, critical evaluation of the report.

Candidates had been directed to use the report to attempt to understand their biases, although some mistakenly thought that the critique should be used to search for flaws of bias in the report.

Criterion D

Most critiques demonstrated good attempts at reflecting upon the broader implications of assumptions in terms of how biases might have shaped their understanding of what was observed as required in criterion C. A number of critiques went on to try to conceptualize their reflections within a larger context of anthropology, including methodological issues and social categories as required in criterion D.

Some candidates recognized the need to discuss the way they categorized people by “race” in their reports. This is a positive development. Many candidates living in counties where race is an issue and a part of public discourse have previously ignored this descriptive factor when observing the multiethnicity of public places. Some candidates did understand that what they chose to observe and record can be enhanced by public debate and wider social issues.

General discussions of the nature of fieldwork were sparse, however. Methodological issues were not taken up convincingly. Some candidates used examples from ethnographic work covered in class. This is acceptable but in many cases it overshadowed the critique of the report itself.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

- Candidates should be instructed that, in principle, there are no “mistakes” in the observation. There can be superficial analysis, subjective attitudes, prejudice, and misunderstandings. These are not mistakes as such, but rather the way we often interpret when we are unaware of our own perceptions or larger social issues. Future candidates should not use the critique to correct perceived mistakes from the observation but rather note what they have understood about anthropological method in relation to their observations. That is, we tend to be subjective and we need to develop an awareness of these tendencies when we collect data. Teachers might refer to what candidates have learned in theory of knowledge (TOK) on perception and awareness of self and society to help guide this process.
- Teachers should look more carefully at the criteria, especially criterion B, and develop ways in which they can convey the intent behind the requirements. Class discussion on what constitutes analysis as opposed to description can be useful, and examples of how inference can give unintended meaning can be pursued. Candidates should be encouraged to search for inferences and analytical expressions in their reports and should be encouraged to identify social as well as personal biases. Candidates should also be made aware of the reflective aspects of the SL IA. It can be instructive

to apply the criteria to ethnographic material covered in class or to essays written by candidates in order to work concretely with the criteria as a preparation to doing the critique.

Higher and standard level paper one

Higher level component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 2	3 - 5	6 - 7	8 - 9	10 - 11	12 - 13	14 - 20

Standard level component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 2	3 - 5	6 - 7	8 - 9	10 - 11	12 - 13	14 - 20

Higher level paper one

The areas of the programme and examination that appeared difficult for the candidates

There were no specific areas which appeared particularly difficult for candidates. Almost all candidates were able to provide responses to all three questions, and demonstrate a level of understanding of anthropology.

Areas of the programme and examination in which the candidates appeared well prepared

Generally this paper was handled well by candidates. Almost all candidates had relevant comparative ethnographic material to use, although some were better at establishing this material's relevance and using it to construct a sustained response.

Most candidates demonstrated knowledge of theoretical perspectives, and were able to identify possible viewpoints of the anthropologists.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

Question 1

Several candidates struggled to introduce generalizations, and relied heavily on the text to construct their responses. However, the majority were able to identify important, relevant points and therefore achieved a reasonable mark.

Question 2

As stated, most candidates were able to identify a relevant viewpoint of the anthropologists and show knowledge of theory. Lower achieving responses simply wrote all they could about these but did not clearly focus on answering the question in the examination paper.

Question 3

This question was generally answered well. Most candidates gave full identification of their comparative material and relatively few simply repeated their knowledge of this without working it into a full response.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Most centres are using recent ethnographic material and this is to be encouraged.
- Some centres seem to be using non-ethnographic documentary material, and while it is possible to use this material in an anthropological manner (*i.e.* critically, and with an understanding of the context of how the material was produced, *etc.*) the evidence indicates that most candidates simply take this material at face value.
- Criticality is to be encouraged, but this is not the same as criticising the stimulus text and the research behind it. Up-to-date, high quality peer-reviewed articles as the basis for the stimuli and candidates should not make assumptions about the anthropologists' research or methodology, and any such claims should be supported by evidence from the text. One or two candidates made claims that the article's authors were somewhat mercenary and did not particularly care about the environmental issues discussed, whereas one of the authors was actually from the community in question.

Standard level paper one

The areas of the programme and examination that appeared difficult for the candidates

Most candidates were able to demonstrate a general understanding of the text – in this case an extract which examined the relationship between knowledge and power; specifically an ethnographic description of how the construction of knowledge on the environment and risk perceptions are embedded in social structures and cultural dynamics. However, many answers remained on a descriptive level. In a significant number of cases candidates were quite dependent on the text and appeared unaware that they should be using their own words, incorporating anthropological concepts and providing discussion and analysis. In the main difficulty was the depth of answers; candidates had some difficulty analysing in sufficient detail.

Generalizations and conceptual knowledge were two of the least satisfactory areas which are evidently a challenge for some candidates. Some did not recognize or were not familiar with core terms and concepts like knowledge, power, power reproduction or power relations. Too often, candidates try to define core terms and concepts using their general understanding. Hence, it was sometimes difficult to determine whether or not the understanding of these terms was only based on common sense or whether it could demonstrate anthropological knowledge.

Most candidates were able to attempt all questions. In a small number of cases candidates were not able to complete all three questions. Question 3 in particular was sometimes left unfinished, or was too brief and lacked detailed comparisons.

Areas of the programme and examination in which the candidates appeared well prepared

As has been the case consistently in past sessions, the range of achievement was wide, with the critical difference being the ability to write conceptually and analyse rather than describe. Some candidates demonstrated good comprehension and analytical skills, critical thinking, and the ability to interweave ethnographic materials and anthropological concepts to make well-developed arguments. Some candidates showed an ability to bring in relevant anthropological concepts, as well as to produce convincing discussions and comparisons supported by relevant, fully contextualized ethnographies. Many candidates could present quite detailed comparative ethnographies that were generally relevant and identified properly. Some were able to make sound statements about the viewpoint of the anthropologist. The comparative question produced a good range of well structured answers drawing on several different ethnographies across the cohort of candidates.

The highest achieving scripts showed evidence of anthropological understanding and insight. Candidates tended to use relevant concepts and discussed power, agency, processes of socialization, culture, political organization, identity, authority and ideology. Some candidates incorporated some of Bourdieu's conceptualization such as symbolic violence, cultural capital,

or habitus. Others discussed the concept of hegemony as opposed to coercive power. Some responses discussed the Foucaultian diad 'power/knowledge' and proved effective. Many candidates identified and defined key terms such as capitalism, modernity and globalization as general contexts to situate their discussions.

Candidates in general made relevant ethnographic choices that were mostly linked to the comparing and contrasting of power relations in society. It was encouraging to see that the ability to fully identify ethnographic material is improving.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

Question 1

Responses generally identified and explained the relevant points required, but many did not demonstrate sufficient anthropological understanding for high marks.

Most candidates were able to describe and seemed capable of identifying relevant points/examples but generalizations were limited. The more successful responses presented relevant generalizations and examples, but others were rather dependent on the text itself. Lower achieving responses relied heavily upon the text and quoted answers rather than summarizing in the candidates' own words. A small number of answers were composed almost entirely of quotations from the set text. In some cases, the different views were just described and cited. There were some candidates who defined concepts like ideology, power, and cognitive systems and could make generalizations. Few responses could account for the contradictions between objective conditions and the subjective experiences of the residents.

Question 2

This question aimed at the discussion of how knowledge, as a way of organizing and comprehending social and natural environments, is context dependent.

In general the answers were quite descriptive. Stronger answers provided detailed analysis, and discussed the relationship between knowledge and power, understanding it in context. Many candidates successfully depicted how knowledge might be socially produced. The highest achieving responses were able to bring into the explanation relevant concepts. Some candidates referred to terms drawing from Marx and his view of thought as political product, discussing false consciousness. Others drew on Bourdieu's concepts of symbolic power, symbolic violence or habitus to interpret how these schemes of perception or dispositions framed Flammable residents' knowledge. Also relevant was the use of the concept of symbolic capital in the discussion of state officials and doctors' knowledge as a manifestation of power. Some candidates introduced the concept of socialization and discussed how knowledge is perpetuated through social reproduction and naturalized. Some responses discussed the inability of the agency to contest power structures.

Many candidates were able to recognize the viewpoint of the anthropologists and most who did referred to the distinction between “insider” and “outsider” perspectives (generally using the terms *emic/etic*). Some good responses analysed the authors’ emphasis on the local categories in their relation to the social structure or pointed out that the use of quotations gives evidence of the authors’ intention to make sense of the situation according to the agents’ point of view.

Some responses were only descriptive, and many did not identify relevant anthropological concepts. Some candidates continue to fail to make any reference to the viewpoint of the anthropologist and so are failing to gain more than four out of six marks for this question.

Question 3

This question required candidates to demonstrate an understanding of power relations as inherent to any society (or groups, institutions or sectors within it) or between societies. While in the Flammable situation, power and knowledge were intimately associated, other manifestations of power relations could be analysed and the answer structured in other terms.

In the majority of cases, this question was well answered. The highest achieving answers were those that made good ethnographic choices where comparative points were clearly linked to the issues raised in the text and fully contextualized in terms of author, place and ethnographic context. Most candidates successfully identified and presented a relevant ethnography in the comparison, though the lowest achieving responses did not always fully develop both similarities and differences.

Briefer, more simplistic answers produced responses that made reference to which group had power and which did not, lacking further anthropological analysis. Some high achieving responses made reference to structure-agency tensions and worked on forms of resistance. Some answers were more narrative than comparative in nature and structure. In these cases, candidates extensively developed a description of the chosen ethnography disregarding the basic requirement that is to establish a comparison, based on similarities and differences.

Many ethnographies were drawn upon producing successful answers. Some of them include Bourgois’ *In Search of Respect*, June Nash’s *We Eat the Mines and the Mines Eat Us* or Leo Chaves’ *Shadowed Lives* focusing on class and ethnic relations; Reena Patel’s *Working the night shift* about India call centers and Brennan’s ethnographic work on Dominican sex workers, both addressing gender power dynamics in the context of globalization. Other popular choices included Lee’s materials on the Ju/’hoansi, Chagnon’s work on the Yanomamö, Weiner’s Trobrianders and Kraybill’s materials on the Amish.

Full identification of comparative materials continues to be a problem for some candidates, though this aspect seems to be improving. Some candidates would only make a very generic reference to a group of people, without any identification in terms of place, author or historical context. A publication date for ethnography is not

necessarily what is meant by ethnographic contextualization, but the description of the historical context of the ethnographic account.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- In terms of examination skills, candidates should be reminded to read the questions carefully and structure their answers accordingly. Practice with previous paper 1 examination papers and markschemes is critical to developing this skill. Candidates should be encouraged to be explicit in demonstrating their understanding of concepts by, for example, defining the terms used. Candidates should make sure they are actually answering the questions, and be aware that question 1 is usually descriptive but question 2 is more analytical.
- Teachers need to help candidates clarify key question terms, to make sure that answers are relevant and closely focused; again, practice with previous texts should be helpful with this issue and candidates should be aware of the assessment criteria for this paper. Candidates need to make sure that they support any claim with anthropological evidence. This can best be achieved by ensuring that anthropology teachers are also teaching writing methods and argumentation styles within our discipline.
- In question 1, candidates need to use their own words rather than rely too heavily on quotations from the text. Candidates are expected to go beyond simple description and develop some generalizations that are relevant to the terms of the question and can be linked to relevant points and examples given in the text.
- In question 2, in order to gain full marks, the answer must identify the viewpoint of the anthropologist. Also, candidates should be encouraged to work on developing their analytical skills so that they can move beyond merely offering descriptive responses.
- In question 3, candidates should learn to present a comparative ethnography in terms of author, place, and historical context. Identification in terms of historical context requires at least approximate fieldwork dates. Many candidates missed out on receiving more than 4 marks for this question because they seemed unaware of the need to present the ethnography in full detail to receive higher marks.
- In terms of ethnographic materials, it is important that teachers try to ensure that candidates are familiar with some contemporary materials.

Higher level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 6	7 - 13	14 - 15	16 - 20	21 - 26	27 - 31	32 - 44

The areas of the programme and examination that appeared difficult for the candidates

Often candidates produced a ‘theory or theoretical perspective’ paragraph or two in their essay and then ignored this for the remainder of the essay while they discussed, almost entirely descriptively, the ethnographies they had studied. Too often the two parts of the essay, theory and ethnography, are not sufficiently integrated so that the anthropological concepts, *etc.* are not applied to the descriptive ethnographic material in the scripts. Some candidates did not refer to any theory and in a few cases no anthropological concepts were used. Candidates regularly produced essays that lacked balance. That is that not all parts of the question were answered or comparisons consisted, for example, of a great deal of information about one society and no more than a passing comment or two about another. In some cases key terms in questions were not understood or were used in inappropriate ways. For example, candidates did not always write about social movements in question 7 and, in some cases, simply discussed migration instead. Question 9 was not, on the whole, well answered and appeared to be the question candidates who were struggling to find a second question to answer opted for. As in previous sessions too many candidates did not demonstrate a detailed knowledge of three or more societies and in a very small number of cases only one society was covered on the examination. While it is good to note that some candidates are now clearly distinguishing between ethnographies and texts produced by journalists or others, some candidates used memoirs (for example, on fishing used in question 4 on the environment) and autobiographies (for example, on the Hmong in the USA) and even novels (on the Tokal in Kazakhstan for example) without making clear that this material was not written by anthropologists. In most cases when such material was used it was not evaluated in anthropological terms and candidates were not able to discuss this material in relation to relevant concepts or theories. Very few candidates were able critically to evaluate and/or compare the ethnographic material they wrote about using appropriate anthropological conceptual and theoretical terms and knowledge.

The areas of the programme and examination in which candidates appeared well prepared

Many candidates demonstrated detailed knowledge of relevant, and often contemporary, ethnographies and were able to use this effectively to produce reasoned and comparative answers which sometimes also compared theories and evaluated different concepts in relation to ethnographic material. There were some excellent responses demonstrating high levels of knowledge and understanding across the paper and the very highest achieving

responses showed that candidates had the ability critically to evaluate and discuss in a sophisticated and nuanced manner, the ethnographies, theories and concepts they used to answer the questions on the examination paper.

It was encouraging to see more candidates incorporating discourse analysis and more recent theories on gender as well as some using Foucault to analyse and discuss ethnography. Some candidates were able to work with different strands of post-modernism and to distinguish between these.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

Question 1

This was a popular question, which was answered most often in terms of gender relations, with kinship the second most popular, and class the least popular option. The higher achieving responses were those where a clear focus on how the economy was organized and how this had changed was demonstrated, and where this was then used to develop a discussion of changes to kinship, gender or class relations as a consequence. Many candidates chose to write on cases where globalization has altered social relations in some form and used ethnographic material on factory labour in China for example, or African societies such as the Maasai in their answers. Some candidates discussed the Mosuo / Na of China in relation to both the kinship and gender options. Other candidates discussed the impact of colonialism on economic organization and the effects of this on kinship, gender and class. Popular ethnographies for this included Nash's *We Eat the Mines and the Mines Eat Us* and Bourgois' *In Search of Respect*.

Question 2

Lower achieving responses to this question were those where one term, either identity or religion, was ignored. Candidates wrote about either identity or about religion but not enough were able to discuss both in relation to each other. A lack of clarity in defining and conceptualizing identity and religion sometimes accounted for over-general and superficial scripts. Higher achieving responses used clearly relevant ethnographic material such as Brown's *Mama Lola*. Other high achieving responses used work by Danforth's *Firewalking and Religious Healing* and Herzfeld's *The Poetics of Manhood*.

Question 3

This was a particularly popular question and many candidates chose globalization and exchange on which to answer with regard to social relations. The main weakness in some responses was the failure to address 'transformations in social relations' with candidates writing on ethnographic contexts where no transformation appeared to have taken place. The globalization option produced many essays on sedentarization, population movements from rural to urban situations, increased access to formal education, the proletarianization of formerly family-based workers

and the rise of transnational forms of labour associated with remittance economies and the separation of nuclear families. The responses which focused on exchange often used the same ethnographies as those writing on globalization. However, these latter responses selected different examples from the ethnographies or discussed them using different concepts and theories in order to make their discussion relevant to exchange. Ethnographies used to answer this question included: Allen's *The Hold that Life Has: coca and cultural identity in an Andean community*; Constable's *Maid to Order in Hong Kong: Stories of Migrant Workers*; and Lee's *The Dobe Ju'hoansi: Case Studies in Cultural Anthropology*.

Question 4

This question produced some sound but more often rather low achieving responses. Some of the higher achieving responses were those where 'environment' was clearly defined, often but not always in terms of natural environment and where both natural and human social interventions had resulted in some significant change to the environment with consequences for social groups. The groups described included the Skolt Lapps and the social and environmental changes that followed the introduction of new technologies. Other candidates wrote on the Inuit (Stern's *Daily Life of the Inuit*) or on the Kayapo (Posey's *Kayapo Ethnoecology and Culture*). The quality of answers often depended on the strength of the connections candidates were able to make between environmental factors and social factors and the conceptual links that were used to connect the two.

Question 5

Candidates who chose Bourgois' *In Search of Respect* and who focused on post-colonial migration and conflict in receiving states produced sound and sometimes strong essays which demonstrated understanding of historical causes for migration and how racism, lack of educational opportunities, *etc.* may result in social, economic and ethnic marginalization leading to conflicts of various sorts. Other candidates chose to write on small scale and interpersonal conflicts which may arise when families are separated by migration as a consequence of war or economic necessity. Some candidates wrote on the Hmong in the USA and the intercultural misunderstandings that have arisen between Hmong and Americans. When these latter responses were able to go beyond the descriptive and commonsense they were sound. Some candidates used Besteman's *Unraveling Somalia: Race, Class and the Legacy of Slavery* (ethnography of political violence) as the ethnographic study to answer this question.

Question 6

Candidates who were able to define what they meant by 'new technologies' tended to be those who produced the more focused and better-reasoned answers to this question. A fairly popular choice for ethnography was the work of Abu-Lughod on the Bedouin and in this case both televisions and cassette recorders were used as new technologies in relation to issues of gender, sedentarization, globalization and protests by youth against the impositions of the older generations. Interesting uses of

new technologies in some responses included literacy as a technology which served to empower women and where access to education for girls was one means that could be used to prevent early marriage and economic dependence. Some candidates also included ethnographic material on music and globalization using, in some cases Condry's work on hip hop in Japan. The lower achieving responses were usually those that failed to cover all parts of the question and this meant that if societies were compared then they were not also adequately contrasted in relation to the social significance of the technologies discussed in the response. In a small number of cases two societies were not discussed even if the technologies were both compared and contrasted.

Question 7

This question was well answered when candidates had studied power and/or resistance to power and were able to conceptualise these in relation to ethnographic material. Many candidates were able to cite the work of Weber or Foucault on power and use this to examine one of the question options in relation to ethnography. Very few candidates wrote on social movements and those who did were not always able to select a relevant example of a social movement. Most answers were on political systems and for this power and globalization proved a relatively popular combination.

Question 8

This was perhaps the most popular question on the paper and often produced sound and sometimes excellent responses. Higher achieving responses had a clear understanding of what inequality meant and this did not just mean 'difference' as appeared to be the case for some candidates who assumed any difference between men and women in any society constituted inequality and who further assumed that any such difference also meant that men were by default in the superior social position. Candidates discussed a range of inequalities, gendered, class-based, ethnic inequalities (Stewart's *The Time of the Gypsies*) and even health inequalities (Farmer's *Infections and Inequalities: The Modern Plagues*). Often, higher achieving responses linked ideologies, power relations and access to material resources with specific forms of inequality and some were able to show how colonial forms of power had resulted in contemporary inequalities. Some interesting responses considered egalitarian societies to evaluate practices that produce gender inequality such as that studied from a feminist perspective by Shanshan Du's *Chopsticks Only Work in Pairs: Gender Unity and Gender Equality Among the Lahu of Southwest China*.

Question 9

This question was not often answered, and was even less often answered well. Responses on both good and evil and those on suffering rarely went beyond commonsense understandings of the terms and for the most part appeared to be answered by candidates who were struggling to find a second question to respond to. The higher achieving responses dealt with ethics and where candidates had a sound working definition of this they were sometimes able to consider ethics in relation to fieldwork, for example, and in a small minority of cases also how understandings of

ethics in fieldwork has changed over time. Some candidates chose to write on the Mead-Freeman materials and while this is an interesting topic these responses were rarely able to evaluate Freeman's claims critically.

Question 10

A popular answer to this question was to link the Puerto Ricans of El Barrio (Bourgeois' *In Search of Respect*), with resistance or modernity. In general, and particularly when resistance was theorized, this produced higher achieving responses than when candidates answered in relation to modernity as this latter term was not usually well understood or examined. Other candidates wrote on the Mbuti and the work of Turnbull in relation to ritual but this tended to produce descriptive lists of Mbuti ritual practice without sufficient links to ethnicity.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Candidates should not answer questions if they are not sure that they have studied and understood key terms in the question. This session candidates who wrote on social movements, for example, when they had clearly not studied any social movements produced responses that had irrelevant ethnographic material.
- Candidates should aim to integrate theory, concepts and ethnography in every essay. Mentioning theory in the opening paragraph of an essay and then ignoring this for the remainder of the response is not sufficient.
- Candidates should make sure that they read each question carefully and then answer all parts of the question.
- Candidates should ensure that a sufficient number of societies has been covered across the two responses in the examination.
- Candidates should aim to demonstrate some knowledge of processes of change and transformation within and across cultures and societies and this should be more than a pro forma mention in a clause in the conclusion of the essay.
- Candidates should have covered enough anthropology during their program of study for them not to have to struggle to find a second essay to answer on the paper.
- The skills of comparison, analysis and evaluation should be explicitly taught. These are complex skills and so sufficient time needs to be devoted to understanding, practicing and applying such skills in relation to ethnography and anthropology.
- In centres where work by novelists, journalists, wives of anthropologists and autobiographies are used in place of ethnographies candidates need to be taught to apply relevant anthropological theories and concepts to these texts in order to study them through an anthropological lens and to evaluate them in anthropological terms.

Higher level paper three

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 2	3 - 4	5 - 6	7 - 8	9 - 11	12 - 13	14 - 20

The areas of the programme and examination that appeared difficult for the candidates

A small minority of candidates produced very short or incomplete responses, with a very small number no longer than a few sentences. Lower achieving responses failed to meet all the assessment criteria – often omitting any reference to either theory or theoretical perspectives and in some cases not referring to any ethnographic material. Some candidates did not answer all parts of the question they chose or failed to make clear which option in a question was being answered.

Lower achieving responses sometimes misrepresented or misunderstood either theoretical perspectives or theory. Candidates who did attempt to include theoretical perspectives, theory and ethnography in their answers sometimes included a range of material but did not always make explicit how these materials served to answer the question in a coherent and focused manner. At times the connections between theoretical perspectives, theory and ethnography were not clear. Typically, in these latter cases, a candidate would outline a theory and then describe an ethnography but not link the two together to make any connections between them explicit.

In a small number of cases a broad range of theories or theoretical perspectives were listed in the same answer but it was not always clear that these were understood and their relevance to the question was often also unclear. Such papers sometimes included references to a mixture of theories including functionalist, post-modern, Marxist all in the same paper without any clear logic or design.

In some cases concepts such as ‘power’ were understood in only very basic and commonsense terms and were not related to any theorists of power. This limited the scope of candidate answers and failed to demonstrate any clear conceptual or theoretical knowledge and understanding.

The areas of the programme and examination in which candidates appeared well prepared

Some candidates produced extremely good work, demonstrating detailed levels of knowledge about theoretical perspectives and theory and demonstrating sophisticated understandings of how to apply this knowledge to evaluate ethnographies. The highest achieving responses were detailed and nuanced discussions of theory, clearly aware of the limitations of any given theoretical perspective, and able to evaluate ethnographic literature showing advanced levels

of critical thinking. The highest achieving work in this cohort matched and in some cases was better than much undergraduate level work on anthropological theory. Such work demonstrated detailed understanding of structuralism, interpretive anthropology including in some cases nuanced discussions and critiques of post-modernism, and in an increasing number of responses there was also some understanding of discourse theory which, although not always very well articulated, is encouraging in terms of a general move towards more contemporary approaches to ethnographic data. A very broad range of ethnographic material was used to answer the questions including Bourgois, Weiner, Nash, Scheper-Hughes, Ortner and Chagnon, Allen's *The Hold Life Has; Coca and Cultural Identity in an Andean Community* and Besteman's *Unraveling Somalia: Race, Class and the Legacy of Slavery*.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

Question 1

Candidates often chose functionalist ethnographies to exemplify cohesion-centred perspectives and when this was done well the responses were sound. For idealist perspectives a range of theories were used including symbolic, which tended to work best, and for structure-centred perspectives candidates often chose either Marxist or functional-structuralist theories and ethnographies which utilized these approaches. As with most of the questions on this paper Bourgois' *In Search of Respect* was a very popular choice of ethnography and was used, in different ways, to answer all three options. Lower achieving responses sometimes mistook structure-centred for structuralist and this resulted in some less than satisfactory answers. Other candidates compared and contrasted two anthropologists but strayed from focusing the comparison and contrast on the theoretical perspective in the question. Some of these latter papers occasionally read as though they were class essays on similar but not quite the same topics reproduced in the examination without sufficient adaptation so that they fully answered the question in the examination paper.

Question 2

Candidates who were able to define and apply 'agency-centred' well were most likely to be those who produced sound responses. Candidates who were able to focus on agency but also make comparative reference to structure also produced good responses. Answers which described agency well, but then did not link this to a discussion of the relations between individuals (agents) and society, did not fully answer the question. In a few cases agency was equated to the actions of the powerful in society and this was not a helpful understanding of the term. Some candidates also seemed to consider that choosing to follow social expectations was tantamount to a lack of agency (in the case of Iraqi women for example) and for these candidates agency seemed to mean willful defiance of social norms and values. This understanding of agency was also problematic. In at least one case a candidate misunderstood agency and took it to mean 'institution' or 'government organization'. Some interesting responses used Nash's *We Eat the Mines and the Mines Eat Us*, to

discuss the limits of agency and a small number of candidates introduced Foucault to begin to theorise agency but, unfortunately, this was not often done particularly well.

Question 3

All three options were answered with materialist and conflict-centred the most popular options. While most candidates who answered on materialist perspectives were able to outline and correctly describe infrastructure, superstructure, *etc.* as well as discuss notions of power in relation to means of production a few understood materialist in very basic terms which was not usually very helpful. For these latter candidates any object constituted the material and so discussions focused on how many material possessions people had and what was important about these. Such responses rarely did more than describe and lacked any sound conceptual or theoretical means to evaluate ethnographic data. Material on former hunter-gatherers was sometimes used to produce inventories of material possessions. Those writing on particularistic perspectives were often able to articulate the need for detailed individual studies, usually linked to synchronic perspectives but some failed to go beyond stating the significance of the perspective. While most candidates were able to link the chosen perspective to a relevant contemporary issue – such as migration, marginalization or violence – a number of candidates simply described the perspective with no reference to any contemporary issue.

Question 4

Many candidates were able to define and make clear the distinction between synchronic and diachronic perspectives and were able to link these to relevant theories such as functionalism for synchronic perspectives. Some candidates compared work in the same society at two points in time to highlight synchronic and diachronic perspectives, while others chose a centre of thought and evaluated it in terms of synchronic and diachronic perspectives to show how a centre of thought may work better with one rather than another perspective and how this both informs and limits how one evaluates any given centre of thought. Several candidates chose to write on Margaret Mead and to link her approach to anthropology with that of her supervisor Boas and then to critique Mead in the light of Freeman's work. While this provided the basis for an interesting discussion the material was sometimes treated in a rather reductive manner and the limitations of Freeman's work was not usually considered. In these responses the assumption that more recently published work was inevitably an improvement on earlier research was sometimes explicitly stated, not questioned and problematic.

Question 5

This question was the least successfully answered on the paper. Too few candidates were able to select a suitable universalistic perspective, such as structuralism, and too many responses consisted of inappropriate and short discussions on why anthropology matters and/or has universal significance. Those few candidates who did demonstrate detailed knowledge of structuralism, for example, and were able to

apply this to ethnography relating to how it is possible (or not) to understand the social and cultural world did well.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Theoretical perspectives and theories used in questions must be defined, discussed and applied to the ethnographic material used in the response. Ideally, candidates should be taught not only how to define a concept/theory but how to apply and evaluate it in relation to specific ethnography.
- When a question has options to choose the candidate must make clear which option has been chosen. The candidate must then stick to this option and not be tempted also to write on the other options.
- Candidates should be strongly encouraged to answer all parts of a question and not to only write on the one part that they know more about.
- Candidates should be discouraged from writing on theoretical perspectives or theory that they are not entirely familiar with and confident in discussing.
- Candidates should not produce paper 2 type essays with a heavy reliance on ethnographic detail. On paper 3 the balance of the answer should be towards theoretical perspectives and theory with ethnographic material used to support and demonstrate understanding of theory and theoretical perspectives.
- Candidates who use non-anthropological texts for their answers need to be able to evaluate and discuss these texts using clearly anthropological theories and concepts.

Standard level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 15	16 - 21	22 - 26	27 - 32	33 - 44

General Comments

This session saw a small but continued growth in the number of candidates, which is always encouraging, and overall achievement was very slightly stronger. While it was good to see an increase of candidates at the high end, it was of some concern to see more at the very low end of the range: thus the quality of anthropological knowledge, understanding and skills demonstrated varied widely, from excellent to extremely limited. As noted last year, there are still too many candidates who seem to be writing quite often from a common sense rather than from an anthropological understanding, even when there is evidence of some ethnographic knowledge. Ethnographic knowledge continues to be the strength of many papers and it was encouraging to see some more current or updated materials in use this session; it was also good to see some candidates recognizing when their descriptive materials were not strictly “ethnographic” and commenting on this in appropriate ways. However, some candidates continued referring to ethnographies as “novels”, which was problematic. There is also some evidence that some centres are using more documentaries, films and television programmes than ethnographic texts, which places these candidates at a disadvantage. As in past sessions, the key distinction between higher and lower achieving responses continues to be the explicit knowledge and application of anthropological concepts; without this, many responses continue to be more descriptive than analytical. This session it was also noted that explicit comparisons seemed less evident than in past sessions.

The areas of the programme and examination which appeared difficult for the candidates

As in past sessions, it was noted that explicit knowledge of anthropological concepts or terms was more often than not missing, that terms were often only used descriptively, with little definition or discussion. Even where used appropriately in relation to other materials, which was generally the case, candidates rarely made explicit links or connections between concepts and ethnographic materials. As noted in past sessions, terms were presented as if self-evident suggesting little understanding of ways in which anthropological approaches are different from common sense ones. There were some candidates who in questions 1, 2 and 3 used only general knowledge information spread by the media and public opinion. Linked to this, it also seemed that many candidates misunderstood key terms used in the questions: for example class relations were quite often misinterpreted, ethnicity and race were very often conflated, and “environmental conditions” were treated as synonymous with social conditions. A second area that seemed difficult, again because so often missing, was systematic and explicit comparisons between different societies or different groups within a society: instead

different groups/societies were simply described side-by-side leaving comparison implicit at best. These two limitations, taken together, meant that many responses were more descriptive than analytical, although there were some notable exceptions. In terms of ethnography, it seems that some candidates believe that a succession of brief examples constitutes a sound response giving little time or space for comparison or analysis, and still too often ethnographic materials are not carefully or completely identified or given any substantial context. In other cases it was apparent that candidates were basing their answers almost exclusively on short summaries or films, which should not be the case: exposure to and some familiarity with ethnography is essential to the course. In terms of the programme it was noted that most candidates were not distinguishing effectively between different processes of change and transformation: thus terms like globalization, modernity and modernization were used interchangeably and with little specificity. Thus some ethnographic choices did not apply well to the chosen question: for example, ethnographies from the 1950s or 1960s may not be appropriate to address a question on globalization. Additionally, knowledge of political and legal systems, as well as of economic organization, was very limited and discussions of anthropological approaches to good and evil or to suffering were at best presented in common sense terms and sometimes quite personal terms. Finally, many candidates did not seem to be aware of the assessment criterion D (knowledge of processes of change and transformation, which accounts for 4 marks out of 44) and criterion E (breadth of knowledge of societies, which accounts for 2 marks out of 44) that are measured across both essays, which limited their overall achievement.

The areas of the programme and examination in which candidates appeared well prepared

Given the limitations detailed above, it is good to note that most (but not all) candidates were able to demonstrate some quite detailed knowledge of relevant ethnographies, a good number of which are quite contemporary which is encouraging, and were able to use this more or less effectively to construct a sound – if not very analytical – response. It was also good to see that more candidates recognized when an account was not ethnographic, and sometimes provided some appropriate commentary on this. Additionally of course, there were some excellent responses that were able to demonstrate critical kinds of knowledge, skills and understanding across all three assessment criteria (concepts and analysis, ethnographic knowledge and comparison), clarifying the kinds of work that can be achieved at this level. In terms of the programme it was also encouraging to see quite good work done around the concepts of inequality, ideology and identity, as well as the relationship between economic organization and gender relations. More generally, although this is not consistent across all candidates, many were able to demonstrate some understanding of processes of social transformation at least descriptively and were able to integrate some sense of this into their response, particularly in relation to gender relations where candidates quite often demonstrated quite extensive knowledge.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

Question 1

This was a popular question, most often describing how “economic organization” (treated very generally in most cases) altered gender relations or sometimes kinship relations, and missing or ignoring two parts of the question – “To what extent...” which was the command term, and “changes in economic organization” which was the wording of the question. However, there were also some high achieving answers to this question, conceptually informed and often using well detailed materials from Patel’s *Working the Night Shift*, Chang’s journalistic account *Factory Girls*, Brennan’s account of sex workers in the Dominican Republic, Lee’s *The Dobe Ju’hoansi* or Bourgois’ *In Search of Respect* among others. However, in too many other cases, “altered gender relations” or “kinship relations” were reduced to women’s work and families.

Question 2

This relatively popular question produced a disconcerting number of responses that were only personal in nature or based on common knowledge which, however well written, is clearly inappropriate in this context. Additionally, in some cases, where limited ethnographic knowledge was presented, there were some inappropriate value judgments made which were out of place. Other responses were a little more successful in at least describing ethnographic materials that were relevant in terms of religious practices, most often Kraybill’s sociological account, *The Riddle of Amish Culture* or Fernea’s personal account *Guests of the Sheik*, although concepts were rarely defined or discussed. However there were also some more thoughtful and informed responses that distinguished between individual and collective identity, explored ways in which religious belief and practice were made visible through symbols and rituals, and/or ways in which religion – as a community of practioners – may function as a mechanism of social control. It was good to see some new, contemporary ethnography here such as Magliocco’s account of Neo-Paganism in San Francisco.

Question 3

This was a popular question, usually focused on how globalization “has led to transformations in social relations”. However, far too often, globalization was taken to refer to any kind of externally induced change, rarely identified and generally “bad”, and “transformations in social relations” were more often asserted than described in any kind of detail. The most successful responses were those that were able to discuss globalization as a specific contemporary process, and explicitly connect this to relevant ethnographic materials, for example to the emergence of call centres in India (Patel’s *Working the Night Shift*), to economic restructuring/outsourcing (Bourgois’ *In Search of Respect*) and Hull’s *From Field to Factory and Beyond*, or the impact of government development policies and tourism in Ladakh (Norberg-Hodge’s

Ancient Futures). Many fewer candidates chose to focus on ways in which exchange “transformed social relations”, and in this case too, those who were able to establish a relevant conceptual framework were much more successful, often providing quite detailed analysis using materials such as Lee’s *The Dobe Ju/’hoansi*, Weiner’s *Trobrianders* and Holmes-Eber’s *Daughters of Tunis* among others.

Question 4

This question was not often chosen, and as noted above, rather often “environmental conditions” were treated as if synonymous with social relations or the social environment, without any attempt to justify this. Others wrote from personal opinion or general knowledge, with no anthropological or ethnographic reference. However there were a few responses that were more effective, using Lee’s and Marshall’s accounts of the Dobe Ju/’hoansi or Kung.

Question 5

This was quite a popular question and produced a range of responses using a variety of ethnographic cases that included materials about group migration, including accounts by Bourgois, Lee, Chavez and Fadiman, as well as Chagnon’s account of macro- and micro-population movements among the Yanomamö. Many responses remained descriptive and sometimes comparative, usually confirming a relationship between population movement and conflict in terms of cause and effect, and based on general assumptions about the difficulty for any minority to adapt to new circumstances. More effective responses were more nuanced and informed, recognizing conflict as cause and effect, and often linked to different forms of power, using detailed materials from Bourgois’ *In Search of Respect* and Fadiman’s journalistic account of the Hmong. For those who used Kraybill’s account of the Amish, the issue of historical context was problematic, and needed much more careful framing, to justify a link between population movement more than two centuries ago and conflicts in the present.

Question 6

This was quite a popular question but often not very well done as often as not because the “social significance of new technologies” was not sufficiently examined or compared, as required by the question. While candidates were quite often able to describe the introduction of a “new technology” (the motorboat in terms of the Trobriand kula ring; the snowmobile for the Skolt Lapps, or the steel axe for the Yir Yiront were common examples), as with social relations in question 3, their social significance was simply asserted and rarely described or compared. More effective comparisons made good use of the appropriation of video cameras among the Kayapo (Turner), television and cassette recorders among the Awlad ‘Ali Bedouin (Abu-Lughod), and sometimes, the complex the relationship between the Amish and technology (Kraybill).

Question 7

This was least chosen and rarely well done question as most candidates treated the terms of the question in very general and often vague terms and with little evidence of anthropological knowledge and understanding. A few responses were more successful, focusing on either missionaries or the state as representing “new forms or uses of power” that changed either legal and/or political systems for groups such as the Tiwi, the Ju/'hoansi or the Yanomamö.

Question 8

This was the most popular question and produced a huge range of responses from excellent to poor, including several that presented only personal or political opinions, as well as just about everything in between. The highest achieving responses presented informed discussions of different forms of power, both ideological and material, identified and defined relevant terms such as gender, race, ethnicity, class and sometimes caste and linked these effectively to detailed ethnography using materials such as Patel's *Working the Night Shift*, Foley's *Learning Capitalist Culture*, Bourgois' *In Search of Respect*, Gutierrez de Pineda on Santander in Colombia (used by many writing in Spanish), materials about Northern Ireland and the Maasai (Spencer and Hodgson), to explain how specific forms of inequality are produced and maintained. However in the majority of responses several key elements were missing: candidates addressed only the production or maintenance of inequality rather than both, used relevant terms only descriptively and sometimes incorrectly, described differences rather than inequalities, and/or quite often presented very problematic accounts of gender inequality using materials such as Fernea's personal account, *Guests of the Sheik* and Chagnon's *Yanomamö*. Other materials that were sometimes used quite well here included Fadiman's journalistic account of the Hmong in the US and Chavez's account of Mexican migrants in California.

Question 9

This question was rarely chosen and almost all responses, missing or ignoring the wording of the question, simply presented some ethnographic description of good and evil, ethics or suffering, rather than “how anthropology approaches the study of” any one of these. A few responses, which were more successful, discussed cultural relativism as key to anthropology's approach to these kinds of issues and were usually able to provide some relevant ethnographic support for their claim.

Question 10

This question was quite often chosen with most candidates focusing on ethnicity and either ritual or resistance (modernity was chosen in very few cases). However most responses used ethnicity descriptively, if at all, most often treating it very generally as culture, to argue that either ritual or resistance were ways of establishing and/or reinforcing ‘culture’ in different circumstances. Some of the more effective responses made quite good use of either Turnbull's *The Forest People* or Fadiman's account of

the Hmong to emphasize ethnicity as a sense of cultural identity and difference and the role of ritual or resistance to both express and maintain this in different contexts.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Conceptualization

The standard level course incorporates three fundamental components: anthropological concepts and approaches which provide the tools for argument and analysis, detailed ethnographic knowledge and comparisons, which together provide the materials for supporting, illustrating and evaluating anthropological questions and arguments.

While many candidates are quite well prepared in terms of their ethnographic knowledge and most demonstrate some comparative skills (although these were too often implicit this session), too many continue to demonstrate little knowledge or understanding of anthropological concepts and approaches, yet these need to be at the centre of any and every course, class and examination response. It is this conceptual framework that enables candidates to discuss and analyse the ethnographic materials effectively, to make and support an anthropological argument. Thus anthropological concepts must be explicitly taught, discussed and constantly used in the classroom.

Ethnographic materials

Some candidates seem too dependent on non-ethnographic materials, especially films made for television and quite brief journalistic accounts, and where the particular nature of ethnography – as something more than just information – is not well understood. This not only diminishes the nature and value of ethnography (and thus anthropology itself) but also directly disadvantages candidates. These kinds of materials may be valuable as supplementary materials in support of ethnography but not as a substitute for it, which appeared to be the case too often this session. Many candidates seem unaware of the importance of providing careful and accurate identification (including the ethnographic present) as well as some context for each ethnography: it is important that teachers take this up in the classroom and make it part of good classroom and anthropological practice. The choice of ethnographic texts to represent an appropriate range and balance is also an important responsibility and one that all need to review from time to time. It is crucial to convey to candidates that anthropology is not merely about indigenous peoples, endangered cultures, and migrants, women and other minorities. Anthropology is about human culture, the conditions of its production and reproduction and cultural difference. Therefore the big issues of the human condition, social relations, beliefs, economy and creativity are all at the centre of anthropological endeavour, no matter whether they refer to minorities or majorities. The selection of ethnographies must take into account this pluralistic dimension of modern-day anthropology.

Themes

Processes of change and transformation need more precise understanding and discussion in terms of both context and specifics, to distinguish between modernity, modernization and globalization more effectively, and to be able to explain in what sense a particular phenomenon – for example, education or tourism or migration – may be seen to exemplify one or the other. Regardless of the questions chosen, candidates also need to take into account that criterion D (4 marks out of 44), marked across both essays, rewards responses that demonstrate knowledge and understanding of processes of change and transformation: this session too many candidates did not meet this requirement effectively.

Examination preparation and essay writing skills

It was noted with some concern that many scripts seemed to suggest that not all candidates were familiar with, or aware of, expectations or assessment criteria for the examination (see for example the comment on criterion D above). Many errors, omissions and misspellings with regard to titles, dates and authors were also noted, and more generally there was a lack of essay writing, analytical and comparative skills apparent in a good number of responses. These kinds of issues need to be addressed consistently in the classroom, both in the kind of feedback candidates are given and also in the standards they are held to. Obviously, but worth restating, all candidates should be very familiar with the assessment criteria and it is strongly recommended that teachers, from the beginning, make these part of their own assessment practice.