Social Cultural Anthropology

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 15	16 - 33	34 - 42	43 - 50	51 - 61	62 - 70	71 - 100

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 12	13 - 26	27 - 37	38 - 49	50 - 58	59 - 70	71 - 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

Somewhat less than half of reports moderated presented appropriate and well-focused topics, a reversal of the improvement seen in the last two May examination sessions. As always, centres varied widely as to the success of their candidates in this regard.

Issue-based topics were again more popular than context-based topics. Centres also varied significantly in the popularity of these two approaches. Some centres, for example, apparently encourage candidates to carry out research within the school setting; a few centres organize field trips to particular sites, such as a camp, a particular town or village, or a cemetery. Once

again, as was the case in the May 2015 session, many more context-based than issue-based reports were successful.

The most successful issue-based report applied Marxist and globalization theory to a study of the impact of industrialization and capitalist market participation on artisanal production. Another report, only slightly less successful, applied concepts of structure and agency to understanding choices made by IB candidates in meeting university admission requirements.

Context-based reports, as is usually the case, tended to focus on sites well known to candidates, such as their own school. Successful reports included an application of concepts and theories of Barth and Bateson to an understanding of the impact of school policies concerning the ethnic identification of students in a bi-ethnic school environment in a region of past ethnic conflict; a study of the extent to which a "patriarchal system" limits women's agency in a public market; a study of the symbolism seen in a ritual periodically performed in a municipal cemetery.

It should be remembered that both issue-based and context based reports have 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 often tended to be overly descriptive, often with unneeded detail. Both approaches are equally likely to lack conceptual and/or 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

While a somewhat smaller proportion of candidates presented appropriate and well-focused research questions this session, it was gratifying to see that only a very small number presented inappropriate questions.

Criterion B

Performance against this criterion was less successful generally than in the May 2015 examination session, with slightly more than one-quarter of candidates clearly justifying and describing their research techniques (corresponding to a mark of at least 3 or 4). Once again, very few candidates presented inappropriate research techniques. As usual, centres varied widely in candidate success with respect to this criterion. Some centres clearly trained candidates in describing and evaluating research techniques, while in other centres, no particular direction seemed evident. Lack of detail supplied in describing and justifying research techniques is a very common shortcoming in this component. More specifically, candidates commonly neglected describing the research context, that is, candidates partially or completely ignored 1) how informants were selected; 2) what the independent or "background" variables differentiating informants might have been; 3) the number of informants involved, and 4) the circumstances under which research instruments were administered.

Criterion C

Performance against this criterion was at almost the same level as in the May 2015 session, with slightly over one-third of candidates presenting data appropriately and in satisfactory detail (thus receiving at least 3 or 4 marks). More candidates than in the past several examination sessions inappropriately presented required data in appendices.

Criterion D

This criterion continues to be the least well served of the assessment criteria. However, performance this session was a marked improvement over that of the May 2015 session, returning to the level of the May 2014 session, with almost two-thirds of candidates presenting a least a rudimentary analytical framework. However, sound application of concepts and theory is often hampered by candidates neglecting to define key concepts, such as "rites of passage", "globalization", "commodification", "ethnicity", "identity", "emic and etic", etc. Many candidates, while aware that they are expected to apply anthropological concepts and theory, introduce concepts or theory they have not fully understood, with the result that they produce distorted and/or superficial analyses. Very few candidates received full marks against this criterion.

Criterion E

A slight majority of candidates offered at least some substantial discussion of ethical issues arising in the course of field research. This was about the same level of performance as seen in the May 2015 session. As in the case of most IA assessment criteria, performance varied markedly among centres. Most candidates showed a concern for respecting informant privacy, but once again, the majority of candidates did not deal with the broader but less obvious issues of ethical practice in field research, such as issues of representation of individual subjects and groups, positionality and reflexivity. These issues have been of increasing concern to ethnographers and anthropological theorists over at least the past 40 years. Hence, it is reasonable to expect higher level candidates to show some degree of familiarity with them.

Criterion F

Slightly less than half the candidates received at least two out of a possible three marks against this criterion, a performance slightly less successful than seen in the May 2015 session. To do well against this criterion, candidates must have presented anthropologically valid and well-focused issues, and must show some awareness of what constitutes an 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 in consideration of full marks against this criterion.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

- Selecting and focusing the research question: There has been little improvement in candidates' framing and focusing research questions in recent sessions, and the wide variation in performance in this respect between various centres shows there is considerable

room for improvement. Teachers will find suggestions for working with candidates through the stages involved in refining a broad topic into a well-focused research question in the guidelines for the higher level internal assessment (HL IA) component in the Teacher Support Material (TSM), accessible through the subject home page on the Online Curriculum Centre (OCC). Teachers have often inquired on the OCC forum about the advisability of allowing candidates to carry out IA research on the same topic as their Extended Essay. Since there can be many different approaches to a broad topic, it is possible for students to choose the same topic for both components, with the likelihood arising that there may be some overlap in data gathered for each project. However, research questions must be clearly set apart, and analyses of data with respect to each research question must be independent. Clearly, it must be the teacher's responsibility to insure that the candidate is not addressing the same question in both reports.

- Data presentation: It continues to be the case that less than half the candidates present data clearly and in sufficient detail. This component clearly has a methodological focus, but this should not be taken to mean that data presentation should be slighted in favour of methodological issues and theory. Both teachers and candidates should study not only the IA guidelines and assessment criteria found in the current subject guide (pages 44–48), but should also consider the marked and annotated sample reports in the TSM. Teachers should also plan to devote some class time to preparing candidates for the IA component, and should allocate sufficient time for individual conferences with candidates as their projects take shape. Regarding field research techniques, there are many published guides to student field research, a number of which will be found annotated on the Teacher Resource Exchange pages of the OCC. Once again, a few candidates presented necessary data in appendices. Teachers should take care to ensure that candidates understand that appendices should be used only for ancillary material, and not for the presentation of essential data. Appendices are not included in the 2000-word limit, so presenting data in appendices would bypass the word limit on the report.

- Defining the analytical framework: Keeping in mind what was reported under candidate performance for Criterion D, there remains a disappointing gap between candidates' results and the expectations under the criterion. A considerable number of candidates stated in their introductions they would apply some particular anthropological theory, and then never actually described it or provided sources, leaving its supposed relevance to be implicitly discovered in their analyses. To produce an adequate analytical framework it is not necessary to lay out an entire theoretical approach in detail; in fact, there is no room for this in a short report. For example, a frequently applied concept in analysing data often used in IAs is the familiar one of "rites of passage". Candidates in past sessions have often applied this concept to the analysis of data on relations between younger and older students in schools, or to graduation ceremonies, to religious initiations, etc. Defining the concept, providing sources for it, and systematically applying it in analysing data is not an overwhelming task, and has resulted in many successful IA reports. A careful study of marked and annotated IA samples in the TSM as well as thorough discussion of the assessment criteria is essential in introducing candidates to the notion of an analytical framework. Unfortunately, teachers' marks in a few centres still indicate that not all understand what is required under Criterion D.

- Ethical issues: It might be observed that ethical issues of research practice should not be approached as an isolated topic. Almost every modern ethnography that candidates are likely to read presents readers with serious ethical issues the ethnographer had to face. In fact, resolving such problems are often close to the central theme of the ethnography. Engaging candidates in ethical problems faced by professional ethnographers is the most effective way to help them see relationships to their own field research.

- Organization and format of reports: While there is no uniform format for the HL IA report, it is advisable for teachers to offer candidates a suggested general format for their reports. This can be designed so as to raise candidates' awareness of the requirements presented in the assessment criteria, and to encourage clarity of organization. Teachers may find that if they do not provide some sort of format thoughtful students are likely to ask for one. Use of a table of contents, subheadings and bibliography deserve attention. On the other hand, candidates should be discouraged from slavishly following the outline of assessment criteria. This session, a few candidates from several centres used all or most of the criteria titles as section headings. This is not a problem with headings such as "Research techniques" or "Presentation of data," but it makes no sense to have a concluding section headed "Anthropological insight and imagination" (Criterion F), for which this criterion is meant to assess qualities of the report as a whole.

- Group work for the HL IA: Teachers are reminded that they should clearly describe the circumstances under which group work is undertaken. For guidelines on group work for the HL IA refer to the subject guide. It is the teacher's responsibility to ensure that the data presentation, interpretation and analyses in each candidate's report are the candidate's own work.

International Baccalaureate®
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

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

As was the case in the May 2015 examination session, most students understood the purpose and goals of the component and some produced excellent, reasoned and thoughtful work. The usual range from excellent to weak was found across standard level internal assessment (SL IA) as a whole. Almost all candidates clearly attempted to meet the four assessment criteria; however there were a few instances where students had not submitted a critique or where the critique was of little substance. Differences in the quality of the SL IA could in some cases could be attributed to lack of clear instruction on the nature of the exercise and the specific requirements of each criterion. See recommendations below. Most student work was within the required word limit.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A

The majority selected appropriate sites at which to conduct their observations. As always, there were some that were inappropriate, especially places too familiar to the observer. Some candidates observed an event in which they participated and a few wrote about events from memory. Neither is acceptable. When participating, candidates had to negotiate an unaccustomed role to set themselves apart from acquaintances acting as usual. When writing from memory, the fieldwork experience was lost.

Most candidates chose public venues where they could observe more or less incognito as fledgling anthropologists and most seemed to enjoy the process. Candidates who sought patterns of behaviour gleaned more useful data that could later be critiqued. Analysis is implicit in thoughtful categorization and this approach made it easier for these candidates to complete Criterion B on description and analysis.

It is intriguing that cellular devices are increasingly a central focus of SL IA observations. They were often mentioned as part of the common knowledge of how people act in relation to devices and how they have the effect of both creating social interaction and isolating individuals.

Criterion B

There have been considerable improvements in candidate performance on Criterion B the past several examination sessions and May 2016 was no exception. Yet it is still the criterion which

International Baccalaureate
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

is most frequently misunderstood or not fully addressed. More candidates are using the words description and analysis in their critiques but not connecting them to the phenomena observed; they were often mentioned in a vacuum. More candidates than usual could make a reasoned discussion on the significance of differences between description and analysis and consider them as two ways to depict an ethnographic reality. But only the exceptional candidates were able to master all aspects of the requirements.

Criterion C

Many candidates were quite exhaustive when recognizing their biases and some also capable of distinguishing between personal and social biases. The higher achieving candidates discussed their position as observers, the effects of prior knowledge of the setting, their role in the setting, and identified examples of assumptions. In some cases, students were aware of subjective and ideological bias, and that these may be social or personal in nature. Lower achieving responses often missed opportunities that were evident in the observation that – perhaps with some guidance – could have been used to show insight into how we all make assumptions and conclusions based on prior knowledge and experiences. Some candidates were not aware of the concept of the position of the observer and that it does not refer to a physical location at the time of the observation but rather their socioeconomic, age, ethnic or gender background. This is a recurring issue. Another recurring problematic issue is the notion that any bias shown is a mistake.

Criterion D

There was a tendency to look for ways the observation could have been improved rather than using the critique as an opportunity for self-reflection. Noting perceived mistakes in the observation detracted from methodological issues to be considered in the critique. Nonetheless, some methodological issues were discussed convincingly. Candidates displayed an ability to creatively and dynamically incorporate anthropological terms and concepts into their analysis of their original observation. Candidates made relevant methodological critiques of their initial work, providing adequate suggestions and commentaries. Many also used anthropological terminology. The difference between emic and etic remained a favourite quandary.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

- Many students continue to enter into a discussion of what they perceive as mistakes made during their observation exercise rather than critique the experience. Further guidance might be useful for students to understand that mistakes in terms of objectivity are not the central aspect to this exercise. Rather, it is what types of knowledge we can gain by observing the world. If students are able to understand that subjectivity can offer sound analysis by way of reflexivity, then they might also be able to answer in full Criterion B on the difference between description and analysis.

- Criterion B remains the most substantial challenge in the SL IA. To improve their performance, students should define the terms descriptive inference and sound analysis, and then systematically provide examples of each from the original observation. Too often, it seems that these two terms are foreign to candidates, although it is clearly expressed in the evaluation criteria that they need to discuss each of them. Teachers could show concrete

International Baccalaureate®
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

examples of description and analysis and discuss the significance of distinguishing between the two. This could be discussed further by linking analysis to anthropological concepts.

• Teachers should make it clear to candidates that the position of the observer does not refer to their physical location at the time of the observation, but to their ethnic and socioeconomic background, their gender, and their societal background. The use of race as an organizing or central descriptive factor in observations should be discussed in the critique rather than taken as a given. For schools in places where race is a central social issue and common in public discussion this is often the case and treated uncritically. Candidates should be discouraged from conducting observations at places where they know everyone, at their own workplaces, or at functions of groups of which they are members. Unless the student is judged to be capable of producing a convincing discussion on Fieldwork in Familiar Places in the critique, teachers should advise that these venues should be avoided. Candidates who present observations in chronological order might be advised to use another organizing principle (e.g. thematic, by actions, or groups of people) as this gives more substance to the report and potentially to the critique.

• Candidates could be made more aware of the specific evaluation criteria. In some instances intelligent, well-spoken and academically prepared candidates do not seem to have been adequately familiarized with the IA requirements, and thus do not address them in a satisfactory manner, causing them to receive lower marks.

Higher level paper one

Component grade boundaries

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

General comments

Generally the standard of responses was good. Teachers should be commended for their work in teaching Social and Cultural Anthropology and for ensuring that their candidates are well-prepared for their examinations.

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

There were no areas which appeared particularly difficult for candidates this session, although many struggled to achieve more than 4 marks in question 1. To reach the higher mark band candidates needed to use a generalization to help contextualize and interpret the text provided, but few explicitly did this.

In question 2 many candidates did not explicitly mention and discuss the viewpoint of the anthropologist.

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

Almost all had a good comparative ethnography to use for question 3 and were able to identify this fully. On the whole there was a good rationale offered for the comparative ethnography, rather than it being contrived.

Similarly, in question 2 almost all candidates had more than one theoretical perspective that they could discuss and apply. The higher achieving responses did this as part of a sustained argument, rather than isolated mentions and 'name checking' of theoretical perspectives.

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

Question 1

All candidates were able to make the distinction between 'play' and 'game' and most expressed this in their own words rather than repeating the stimulus text. Lower achieving responses

treated the question as one would an English language comprehension paper; i.e. they did not show evidence of the study of anthropology through the use of, say, subject-specific terminology from outside of the examination paper. Higher achieving responses were able to do this, as well as offer generalizations such as how globalization impacts indigenous communities.

Question 2

As mentioned above, the stronger responses proposed a viewpoint of the anthropologist and gave justification for it. They also attempted to apply theoretical perspectives in order to offer an explanation of the text. Some responses offered many theoretical perspectives, with just a brief sentence attempting to justify each one, seemingly in the hope that something would 'stick'. There are more marks available by offering sustained, reasoned explanation and analysis of one or two perspectives rather than in a 'scattergun' approach.

Question 3

Most performed quite well in this question. Lower achieving responses failed to give full identification of the comparative ethnography, or had learned one ethnography and then contrived, awkwardly, to fit it to the question. Some did not focus the comparison on social change and simply compared whatever they wanted to; i.e. they did not really answer the question. The stronger responses offered clear similarities and differences, and did so on a conceptual rather than superficial level.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Candidates should be encouraged to engage with subject-specific terminology, as the correct use of terminology is one of the clearest ways to provide evidence of studying Social and Cultural Anthropology.

Many centres do this already, but spending some time critically analysing the ethnographies used in class (for example in terms of the era in which the research was carried out and the associated presuppositions relating to that era) would help with questions 2 and 3. This is particularly true for centres with limited resources that might be relying on older ethnographies.

As ever, make sure that candidates are actually answering the question (particularly in question 3).

International Baccalaureate
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

Standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

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

General comments

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

Most candidates were able to demonstrate a general understanding of the text. Lower achieving responses remained on a more descriptive level, and as in previous sessions, a number of 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. Thus, the range of success lied mainly in the depth of answers.

Some responses demonstrated little familiarity or knowledge of core terms and concepts related to themes of political organization; individuals, groups and societies; and societies and cultures in contact, from which they could have drawn to produce more successful responses. Too often, candidates tried to define core terms and concepts using their general understanding rather than showing evidence of anthropological knowledge. 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 question 3 in particular was left unfinished, or was too brief and lacking detailed comparisons.

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

The range of achievement was wide, with a number of very successful, insightful and critical responses. The ability to write conceptually and analyse ethnographic material, rather than simply describe it, remains the crucial difference in terms of achievement. It is encouraging to read responses demonstrating good comprehension and analytical skills, critical thinking and the ability to interweave ethnographic materials and anthropological concepts to make well-developed arguments, as well as producing convincing discussions and comparisons supported by relevant, fully contextualized ethnographies.

This session it was positive to see that teachers are introducing new, varied and contemporary ethnographies in their courses, generally allowing candidates to produce relevant comparisons. 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 although this remains a difficult task for many.

Candidates could draw from many themes of the programme in order to develop their answers. The most successful responses discussed relevant concepts such as power and authority, introduced Anderson's concept of imagined community and Bourdieu's of habitus. Some candidates critically discussed cultural contact referring to concepts such as hybridization or assimilation. Some high achieving responses were based on concepts from ritual analysis, while others used the concept of enculturation or socialization appropriately. Some candidates incorporated capitalism, state hegemony and post colonialism in order to contextualize their responses. Most candidates were able to choose relevant ethnographic material for their comparisons based on processes of cultural and social change.

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

Question 1

The majority of candidates could identify the meanings of 'game' and 'play' and articulate an organized response. Although most responses generally identified and described the relevant points required, many did not demonstrate sufficient anthropological understanding for higher marks.

The more successful responses could describe how soccer as 'play' was related to an egalitarian society while soccer as 'game' to a more hierarchical, state society – the latter being foreign to the Urarina – or present other relevant generalizations supported by key examples.

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 text provided.

Question 2

The higher achieving responses could explain the ideological uses of this cultural practice in the legitimation of the nation state, opposing local kinship structures. Many candidates were able to account for the main elements cited in the text regarding the construction of national identity through the sport tournament and the incorporation of the Urarina as state citizens. The highest achieving responses recognized the viewpoint of the anthropologist as critical, in his contrasting of warfare to sport, or anarchic egalitarianism to state control and power. The highest achieving responses were able to bring into their analyses relevant concepts – such as those mentioned above – define them and use them effectively.

While stronger answers provided detailed analysis, and explained the process of change being brought about by the implementation of soccer tournaments, many answers were quite descriptive. Many candidates were aware of the need to recognize the viewpoint of the anthropologist, and referred to insider/outsider perspectives in their attempts to do so, with varied levels of success. The lowest achieving responses were only descriptive, failing to identify relevant anthropological concepts and issues.

International Baccalaureate®
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

Question 3

In the majority of cases, this was a well answered question, and many candidates could discuss how in this ethnographic extract, sports articulated social and ideological dynamics, and compare it to other processes of social or cultural change.

The highest achieving responses 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 could successfully identify and present a relevant ethnography in the comparison, though the lowest achieving responses did not always fully develop both differences and similarities from a conceptual approach.

Some responses made reference to sport instead of focusing on a process of social or cultural change. Lower achieving responses were more narrative than comparative in nature and structure, extensively developing a description of the chosen ethnography and disregarding the basic requirement that was to establish a comparison, based on similarities and differences.

Many candidates have studied more contemporary ethnographic materials and produced interesting and relevant responses. Some of these materials include: Mary Beth Mills' Thai women in the global labour force: Consuming desires, contested selves, Jane Parish's From the body to the wallet: Conceptualizing Akan witchcraft at home and abroad, Grinker's Unstrange minds: Remapping the world of autism, Ghodsee's Lost in transition: Ethnographies of everyday life after communism; Khosravi's Young and defiant in Tehran, Holmes' Fresh fruit, broken bodies: Migrant farm workers in the United States. Other popular choices included Bourgois' In Search of Respect, June Nash's We eat the mines and the mines eat us, Leo Chaves' Shadowed lives, Reena Patel's Working the night shift, Brennan's ethnographic work on Dominican sex workers, Lee's materials on the Ju'Hoansi, Chagnon's work on the Yanomamo, 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 is clearly improving. Some candidates would only mention 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

It is encouraging to see teachers incorporating new ethnographic material that enable candidates to produce a varied array of comparative discussions.

In terms of examination skills, candidates should be reminded to read the questions carefully and structure their answers accordingly. Practice with previous paper 1 texts and markschemes is critical to this goal. 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 here and candidates should be aware of the specific 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. 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. Analytical skills are demonstrated through the appropriate use of relevant concepts, in order to interpret and explain the ethnographic material given.

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.

Higher level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 7	8 - 15	16 - 17	18 - 21	22 - 25	26 - 29	30 - 44

General comments

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

Producing answers that covered all parts of the question, included relevant ethnographic material, anthropological concepts, core terms or theory and comparative points was not something all candidates were able to achieve. Many were able to incorporate some of these into their answers but not all, and not all equally well.

While most candidates included some ethnography and were able to identify this in their answers not all showed detailed knowledge of three societies across the paper and not all presented sufficient descriptive ethnographic material to produce fully developed answers.

As has been the case in previous examination sessions, not all candidates in this session understood what was meant by "social movement" but more were correctly identifying indigenous societies. A proportion of candidates who chose to answer using structuralism did not fully understand this and often confused structuralism with structure-centred perspectives. Some schools appear not to be teaching candidates any theories developed after structural-functionalism which means that candidates are limited when applying theory to interpret ethnographic material and particularly so when writing on, for example, globalization. In some cases, candidates do not integrate concepts and ethnography, choosing rather to write a paragraph on theory followed by one of descriptive ethnography in the hope that the examiner will make the connections between the two.

A number of candidates were able to answer one question on the paper reasonably well but then struggled to find a second question that they could answer to the same standard. A very small number of candidates did not complete both essays and ran out of time part way through the second essay.

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

Candidates seem to be able to integrate theory and ethnography more effectively when citing ethnographies that already do this. In such cases, they are able to recognize and describe the theoretical perspectives of the ethnographers and interpret the ethnographic data using the

same lens as the ethnographer. In the higher achieving responses, candidates also demonstrate the ability to present a critical view of the ethnographers' perspectives and to evaluate these. The topics of gender and globalization were popular and appear to be ones that are taught widely and well through ethnographies and theories such as feminism for gender. It was also good to note that more candidates are able to cite relevant theoretical work by non-anthropologists such as Judith Butler and Michel Foucault and to link this appropriately to work by anthropologists.

Given the number of responses discussing gender and power, and those discussing globalization, it seems that gender and globalization are issues that are dealt with persistently across schools. Candidates who defined how they understood key terms tended to produce more focused and conceptually developed answers. This was particularly so in cases where it is possible to understand and apply a term very differently depending on how it is conceptualized i.e. "power" as used by Weber or Foucault.

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

Question 1

This was a popular question and was frequently answered using Bourgois' In Search of Respect for both 'ethnic relations' and 'inequality'. For those focused on inequality, female migrant workers in ethnographies such as Pun Ngai's Made in China: Women factory workers in a global workplace was a popular choice as was Constable's Made to Order in Hong Kong: stories of migrant workers. Stephen's Transborder lives: indigenous Oaxacans in Mexico was also used by some candidates, as was Tsuda's 2003 Strangers in the Ethnic Homeland: Japanese Brazilian return migration in transnational perspective. A few candidates were unable adequately to define migration or chose ethnographies that did not relate to migration. More candidates were able to write well on structural violence and social marginalization to help make sense of the ethnographic materials they described.

Question 2

The most frequent issue with this question was the failure adequately to define 'power' and to connect this with a relevant theoretical perspective and/or theory. Candidates who were able to discuss power within a Foucauldian, Weberian or Marxist framework typically produced stronger and more focused answers. While most responses chose gender as the lens through which to consider power, some strong answers drew on Allison's Nightwork: sexuality, pleasure and corporate masculinity in a Tokyo hostess club to develop nuanced and sophisticated analyses of sexuality and the performance of masculinity. Others writing on gender chose to use Ghannam's Live and Die like a man: gender dynamics in urban Egypt as well as a range of other ethnographies. Many candidates were able to cite relevant concepts such as 'hegemonic masculinity' or to use Butler's work on the performance of gender with higher achieving responses demonstrating an understanding of the terms that went beyond citation. Suffering was the least popular option and when candidates were able to define suffering in appropriate anthropological terms the answers were sound. The work of Veena Das, Clara Han and others who have worked on suffering in recent years was occasionally cited. A very small

number of candidates used Farmer's medical anthropology work and ideas of structural violence in response to this option.

Question 3

This was another popular question with arts and expression as the least popular option and political and economic systems as the most popular choices. More successful answers managed to keep both parts of the question in focus which meant that globalization was not simply mentioned in the opening and closing sentences but otherwise ignored. A weakness in some responses was to outline globalization in abstract terms citing relevant concepts and theorists, often in some detail and very well, but then not using any of this knowledge when outlining and evaluating the ethnographic material that had been selected to answer the question. For the arts and expression option Khosravi's Young and Defiant in Tehran was used as ethnographic material. For economic systems Ong's work on Malaysian factory women was a popular choice.

Question 4

Relatively few candidates answered this question and those who produced stronger essays were able to define a clear framework within which the terms 'environment' and 'conflict' were relevant and integrated. While most answers understood 'environment' as aspects of the natural world, such as the rainforest for the Kayapo or the Kalahari Desert for indigenous groups, some made a case for urban environments which produced competition and conflict for different social groups. Some candidates wrote about issues including misuse of the environment leading to pollution of the natural world, unjust control of resources by powerful companies and corrupt authorities, and competition for the same resources (as in tourism versus conservation). Global warming also made an appearance in a few scripts.

Question 5

This question produced some very good answers using material on the Arab Spring and on the Occupy Movement where new social media technologies were described and understood and were central to the organization of these social movements. The highest achieving responses were also able to incorporate possible limitations in the use of new technologies to bring about political and social change. With indigenous movements the Kayapo were a popular choice and Turner's work on Kayapo use of video technology and film was used well. One weakness in some responses was the failure to recognize what an indigenous movement is and so in a few cases the ethnographic material chosen to answer this question was not relevant. Very few candidates chose to write on revitalization movements.

Question 6

This was a relatively popular question and candidates who answered it had sound knowledge and understanding of different forms of leadership across a range of societies. Many candidates were able to describe acephalous egalitarian systems of leadership as well as those of big men and chiefs. Some described state systems and many were able to link leadership to issues such as power, authority, gender, conflict, etc. The higher achieving responses both compared and contrasted leadership while lower achieving responses tended to focus on either

comparison or contrast but not produce a balanced answer dealing with both. Popular ethnographies used to answer this question included Lee's work on the !Kung San, Kuper's work with the Swazi, Wiener and Malinowski on the Trobrianders and Sahlins on big men.

Question 7

This was not a popular question and was not often well answered. Candidates too often assumed that what constituted religious belief was self-evident and so required no discussion or definition. Ideology was also too often simply assumed to be an unproblematic term rather than defined and located within a clear conceptual or theoretical framework. Issues of morality and ethics that related to ideas of good and evil were not, on the whole, sufficiently well discussed and again were often assumed to be clear and unchanging. Some candidates chose to use Douglas's work Purity and Danger in order to explain how categories of clean and unclean might be generated and the consequences of this.

Question 8

Social class was the more popular of the options for this question and where class was well conceptualized the essays were often sound. Examples of class-based resistance ranged from the Puerto Ricans in El Barrio to the miners in Nash's We Eat the Mines and the Mines Eat Us. Resistance, however, was not always well conceptualized despite references to the 'weapons of the weak' and agency-centred perspectives. Too many candidates assumed that any act against an assumed norm or status quo must always constitute resistance while action in support of the prevailing social order was always considered to be a de facto act of conformity. In terms of family and resistance essays there tended to be a focus on those who had chosen to construct alternatives to the heteronormative family and Weston's Families we Choose was a popular text for these responses. Some candidates produced essays that had an opening section outlining a conceptual and theoretical understanding of class which was then ignored for the remainder of the response as the ethnographic material was described.

Question 9

This was a reasonably popular question with comparisons between Trobriander kula and the !Kung San forms of sharing often featuring in the answers. Candidates were able to incorporate not on Mauss's work The Gift to understand exchange but also to write on reciprocity citing Sahlins. In a few instances candidates developed comparisons between capitalist and traditional non-capitalist forms of exchange.

Question 10

This question was not often answered well as candidates did not always appear to have studied human rights from a social and cultural anthropology perspective and so answers were on the whole no more than generalized common-sense and rarely demonstrated any sound knowledge and understanding of the topic or issues. There were some exceptions to this and answers on female genital operations, for example, when supported by sound ethnographic material and historically informed knowledge of development of human rights as in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and informed by the work of NGOs, etc. produced subtle and nuanced answers to the question.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Key terms used in questions should be defined, where applicable citing the relevant theoretician, and applied to the ethnographies discussed in the essay.
- When a question has options to choose from, candidates should make it very clear which option has been chosen.
- The highest achieving responses include relevant and detailed ethnographic description which is closely linked to key terms from the question, relevant core terms and/or theory and make some comparative points. This is a lot to do for each question and so candidates should be given plenty of opportunity to practice writing essays using the assessment criteria to guide them as to what the examiners are looking for.
- Candidates should not answer a question on a topic that they have not studied.
- Teachers should ensure that candidates become familiar with contemporary ethnographies and some of the more recent theoretical developments in the discipline.
- Candidates should be encouraged to answer all parts of a question and not to only write on the one part that they know more about.

Standard level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 5	6 - 11	12 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 25	26 - 31	32 - 44

General comments

There continues to be some excellent analytical work at the very top and evidence of detailed ethnographic knowledge and understanding, with some solid comparative skills in the next band. However it is disappointing to continue to see too many candidates who seem to be unfamiliar with the language and materials of anthropology, in the sense that concepts are used in terms of common sense understandings, without discussion or anthropological definition and using non-ethnographic materials in non-anthropological ways. As in past sessions, the key distinction between higher and lower achieving responses continues to be the explicit knowledge and application of anthropological concepts to well detailed ethnographic materials that are made relevant to the question. Without this, responses are descriptive rather than analytical, and sometimes not anthropological at all.

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

As already noted, a lack of conceptual knowledge and understanding was a general problem for many, but several concepts seemed to present particular problems: ideology (question 7), globalization and systems (question 3), movements (question 5 – whether social, indigenous or revitalization) and human rights and cultural rights (question 10), all appeared to be poorly understood, and ethnic relations (question 1) was quite often misunderstood.

Linked to this problem of conceptualization, and perhaps more troubling, is that many candidates seem not to understand the difference between ethnographic and non-ethnographic materials (for example, ethnographies were quite frequently referenced as novels), or how to use non-ethnographic materials appropriately. In terms of the examination, it also seems that some candidates did not understand the prompt structure of some of the questions: when given a choice of specific focus they either covered everything or did not choose a focus at all. Similarly, many do not seem to understand the different command terms that introduce each question and do not differentiate between discuss, examine, evaluate and compare. And although most candidates were able to make comparisons, few seemed able to discuss them.

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

Despite the concerns and difficulties noted above, for almost every question there were some responses that were excellent, linking the core terms and concepts with well detailed and relevant ethnographic materials, and discussing and analysing them critically and sometimes reflectively. In terms of the programme, if choice of question is any indication, many candidates felt well prepared to answer questions on migration, power and gender, and globalization and to a lesser extent, on leadership and exchange, and there were some strong and informed responses to all of these questions, however there was not always a correlation with frequency of choice and quality of answer. More clearly, more candidates this session seemed able to draw on a wider range of materials and to demonstrate detailed knowledge and some comparative understanding of them. Identification of materials also seems to have improved.

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

Question 1

This was a popular question, most often identifying the focus as inequality, however many wrote about the experience of migration more generally without any anthropological definition or discussion of key terms, and ethnic relations when chosen, was treated only in terms of kinship. This lack of clear focus was particularly the case when using Chavez' ethnography, Shadowed Lives, which was a frequent choice. Other common choices used somewhat more effectively included Fadiman's journalistic account of the Hmong in Calfornia, Bourgois' In Search of Respect, and Seth Holmes Fresh Fruit: Broken Bodies. A few responses stood out both for the ethnographic materials used and the quality of anthropologically informed thinking and writing they demonstrated: these include Katy Gardner's article, Desh Bidesh, Mary Beth Mills' article on women in rural Thailand and Abdullah's Black Mecca: African Muslims of Harlem. Much less effectively used were a number of non-ethnographic sources, including films such as Last Train Home and Stateless, along with texts such as Boom Town Girl, and The House on Mango Street.

Question 2

This was the most popular question, with most responses focused on gender, however more often than not responses reflected common sense generalizations, stereotypes and value judgments as much as anthropological knowledge and understanding, which was disappointing. However there were some anthropologically informed and thoughtful answers that drew variously on the distinction between public and private spheres, Ortner's nature:culture contrast, access to different forms of capital and/or ideas about structure and agency to examine power in relation to gender. It seemed that most candidates were able to draw on a range of detailed ethnographic materials to develop relevant comparisons. Materials frequently used included Patel's Working the Night Shift, Bourgois' In Search of Respect, Kraybill's Lives of the Amish, Fernea's Guests of the Sheik, Weiner's Trobrianders of Papua New Guinea, Lee's Dobe Ju'Hoansi and Chagnon's Yanomamo. Less frequent texts included Pascoe's Dude you're a Fag, Stack's All Our Kin, Anderson's Code of the Street and Brennan's

Selling Sex for Visas. Responses examining power with reference to sexuality or suffering were few and far between: there was some confusion about gender and sexuality along with some rather uncritical use of non-ethnographic materials (i.e. films like Virgin Daughters and The Hunting Ground in particular), but some interesting efforts at examining suffering in relation to capitalism, as well as a way to gain power, through rites of intensification.

Question 3

This was also a very popular question, perhaps because many candidates were familiar with possibly relevant ethnographic materials, however conceptualization of globalization itself as well as what might constitute an economic system was very limited. Consequently in too many cases responses were largely descriptive accounts of social change of one kind or another, with only occasional focus on anything economic – such as 'work', 'division of labour', 'subsistence' or 'consumption'. Some ethnographic materials used more effectively than others in terms of addressing the transformation of economic systems, included those on Ladakh and the Dobe Ju'Hoansi. The other three options – legal systems, political systems and arts and expression were rarely chosen.

Question 4

This was not often chosen, but when candidates took the time to clearly conceptualize 'environment' and make explicit their approach, there were informed and thoughtful responses, using Turner's materials on the Kayapo, Chagnon's Yanomamo, Safa's The Urban Poor of Puerto Rico and Brisebarre's article, The sacrifice of Id al-kabir, among others. Other less successful responses struggled to conceptualize both 'environment' and 'conflict'.

Question 5

The key here was an understanding of the term 'movements': when understood – perhaps by 50% of those choosing the question – most were able to present relevant materials and to develop a focused discussion using materials such as Turner's work with the Kayapo. However candidates who misinterpreted or ignored the term 'movements', or read it as migration or mobility, too often related new technologies, which were generally quite well understood, to social relations or social change of some kind, thus not really answering the question. This is not the first time that candidates have had a problem with this term, so it is hoped that highlighting it will remind teachers that this needs to be clarified for their candidates.

Question 6

This was quite often chosen and produced a range of responses from those that were closely focused, detailed and comparative to those that were descriptive and very general, with little conceptualization, organization or comparison. It is interesting to note that some of the stronger answers used earlier and more traditional ethnographic sources quite effectively, including Weiner's Trobrianders, Lee's Ju'Hoansi, Fernea's Guests of the Sheik, Kraybill's Amish and Chagnon's Yanomamo.

Question 7

There was not much evidence of informed evaluation here, but rather more moralistic value judgments, which was disappointing: few seemed to understand ideology and evil was often taken as synonymous with bad. Nonetheless there were some relevant descriptions and comparisons, but it often seemed that knowledge of religious beliefs in themselves for any particular group was too limited to develop any larger argument. There were a few notable exceptions, where candidates were able to develop genuine arguments on the basis of their knowledge of materials from Sarajevo (Sarajevo under Siege, Ivana Macek), Tehran (Young and Defiant in Tehran, Shahram Khosravi), and the Azande (Evans-Pritchard) and Bolivian miners studied by June Nash, all of which were very good to see.

Question 8

There was a strong tendency among responses to resort to popular uses of resistance rather than to conceptualize resistance as resistance to power; nonetheless there were some informed and focused responses based on detailed knowledge of relevant ethnography. Resistance to family was the more popular choice, with some candidates thinking and writing effectively based on their knowledge of Kate Weston's Families we Choose and Bourgois' In Search of Respect. With respect to class, although conceptualization in many cases was fuzzy, there were some strong responses, based on Mary Beth Mills work on rural women in Thailand and Bourgois' In Search of Respect, as well as some potentially interesting responses using Privilege: The Making of an Adolescent Elite at St. Paul's School by sociologist Shamus Rahmen Khan. Less effective responses used Amish Rumspringa, Fadiman's journalistic account of the Hmong in California, and Anderson's Code of the Street.

Question 9

Mauss and his fundamental text "The Gift" seemed to be almost entirely missing from these responses. While there was some relevant conceptualization in terms of different forms of reciprocity, the focus was on exchange rather than exchange systems and tended to comparative description rather than analysis although this was quite often quite well done. As noted for question 6, more traditional ethnographic sources quite often held their own in this context. Some of the effective comparisons were the Yanomamo and the Flats (Carol Stack, All our Kin), the Yanomamo (Chagnon) and the Trobrianders (Weiner), the Bangladeshi and rural women in Thailand (Gardner and Mills), the Trobrianders and Tiv (one of the few references to Mauss), and the Ju'Hoansi and the Trobrianders.

Question 10

This was not often chosen and produced a range of responses, some quite well versed in the key terms and others that came to it from a more ethnocentric position: rather few made explicit their clear understanding of the terms and left the reader to figure out what was assumed: in some cases the examples and related discussion clarified what was understood, in other cases it seemed clear that the question represented a place to go when all else failed. However, despite having trouble clearly and explicitly conceptualizing terms here, a good number of candidates seemed to understand the distinction and the conflict that it can generate.

International Baccalaureate®
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

In keeping with the concerns raised in the general comments, and the frequent reference to the lack of conceptualization in specific questions, the importance of helping candidates understand that anthropology uses a specialized language to think and write about the social and cultural worlds and processes they study, and produces a particular kind of text based on the research experience, cannot be overemphasized. Any study of anthropology must begin with this language, to recognize the distinctions its makes and learn to use it precisely in relation to ethnographic materials, where links need to be made explicit (i.e. explained) and not just assumed. As recommended last year, this needs to be a central component of every anthropology class and made much more evident in every examination response.

Directly linked to this, it is critical to insist again on the central importance of using ethnographic texts in teaching this course: without it candidates are placed at a huge disadvantage. Documentaries and film, or nonfiction, newspaper or magazine articles cannot replace this, although they may be used to support or extend ethnography in a variety of ways. As suggested last year, the online curriculum centre (OCC) is a useful place to start as it identifies many ethnographies and ethnographic materials used by IB teachers of social and cultural anthropology.

Teachers also need to give candidates some carefully planned practice using IB examination papers/questions, to develop the skills of close focus and organization in terms of the question, explicit explanation in making links between key terms/concepts and ethnographic materials, along with systematic comparison and analysis.

Higher level paper three

Component grade boundaries

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

General comments

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

Many candidates seem to struggle to distinguish between a theoretical perspective and a theory.

Others appear to have memorized the material in the syllabus but do not know how to apply it.

Many found it very difficult to deal with theory critically, and a surprising number attributed the theory or theoretical perspective to the subjects rather than recognize it as an analytical tool of the researcher.

Many candidates also failed to define key terms and concepts and struggled to pull out the most significant points of a theory/theoretical perspective, tending toward the trivial or exciting sounding elements.

The distinctions and differences between structuralism, structural functionalism and structure centred approach proved to be somewhat confusing for some candidates.

Some candidates misunderstand what constitutes complete identification: the ethnographic present is not the same as the publication date.

Not all candidates answered all parts of a question and not all were able to incorporate theoretical perspectives, theory and ethnography and to make connections between these.

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

Many candidates had an impressive command of theory, ranging from Boas to Foucault and Bourdieu. A good number also had a solid understanding of the nuances of Marxism and/or postmodernism and the arguments voiced by the critics. Many were quite adept at linking theory and ethnography.

Some candidates were clearly well practiced in answering paper 3 questions and had very good understanding of the assessment criteria. These candidates were able to achieve high marks and this included a good number who achieved the maximum marks available.

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

Question 1

This was a particularly popular question and Bourgois' In Search of Respect was often used by candidates to answer all possible variations of the question. Lower achieving responses assumed that 'structure-centred' was a description of how society was organized rather than an approach to understanding society. Some candidates also failed to recognize that structure-centred perspectives and structuralism as a theory are not the same thing. Other scripts failed to recognize that writing only about women was not sufficient to provide evidence of an understanding of 'gender relations'. Candidates who were able to define the key terms of the question successfully and to remain focused on the prompt typically did fairly well. Candidates who answered on both structure-centred and agency-centred perspectives and sometimes also used gender as a form of social marginalization lacked focus on the prompt.

Question 2

Again this was another very popular question on the paper. Where candidates wrote about cohesion-centred perspectives and related this in a relevant fashion to 'cooperation' the answer was usually sound. Violence, hierarchy and even equality were often linked to Marxism and conflict perspectives. One limitation of many scripts was the tendency to describe Marxism in some detail at the start of the response and then to ignore much of this as the ethnographic material was set out. Often concepts and key terms set out at the beginning of the response (such as false consciousness) were never again referred to or linked to the ethnographic materials. Popular choices for ethnographies included Ong's work on Malaysian factory women and Nash's work on Bolivian miners. For equality Lee's work on the !Kung was popular and linked to cohesion-centred perspectives. Some candidates failed to follow the prompt and rather than examine **one** theory or school of thought chose to write on two or more in relation to a particular ethnographic context.

Question 3

There were many possible choices of anthropologist and schools of thought with which to answer this question. Stronger answers were those where the work of the anthropologist or the school of thought could be clearly and sensibly discussed in relation to both universalistic and particularistic perspectives. Both functionalism and post-modernism were popular choices on this question. Candidates who wrote on structuralism, with a few notable exceptions, did not produce strong responses as knowledge of structuralism was either superficial (little more than a mention of 'binaries') or misapplied ('deep structure'). Again there was some confusion between structuralism and structure-centred perspectives.

Question 4

The options on this question were all relatively evenly selected. Candidates were able to outline the chosen theory and related theoretical perspectives linked to the work of an anthropologist. Weaknesses in essay organization were apparent when candidates described a theory and then went on to discuss an anthropologist / ethnography but failed to link the theory explicitly to the anthropologist / ethnography. These essays were written in two halves – first theory and second ethnography and the examiner was left to make the connections between the two parts. With the feminism option some candidates presented a history of first, second and third wave feminism but not always also the relevant theory itself. A history of feminism is not the same as theories of feminism. Equally, simply writing about women is not evidence of a feminist position nor are all female anthropologists feminist. Positively, however, a number of candidates were able to outline the work of Sherry Ortner, Judith Butler, Michelle Rosaldo, etc. and apply this to evaluate the work of the feminist anthropologist selected to answer the question. The general understanding of Marxist theory was also strong in many responses and when used to evaluate and critique ethnographic material answers were often sound. For postmodernism candidates were able to cite the work of Clifford and Marcus (Writing Culture, etc.) and use this to good effect when evaluating a range of ethnographies including Bourgeois' In Search of Respect.

Question 5

Relatively few candidates overall chose this option and it was not always well answered. Candidates who had a strong understanding of either idealist or diachronic perspectives and were able to outline the key features of these, relate them to theory and link these to relevant ethnographies produced sound responses. Some of the higher achieving responses discussed symbolic theories in anthropology and linked these with idealist perspectives. Candidates who wrote on diachrony and considered that a relatively short period of fieldwork (one or two years) was sufficient to establish a diachronic perspective did not produce convincing answers to the question.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Candidates should be taught the difference between theory and theoretical perspective and what a 'critical' treatment of the material entails.

To a certain extent, the responses can only be as good as the ethnographic materials selected to answer the question. Teachers should select ethnographic materials carefully to ensure that they have wide-ranging relevance.

It is in the best interest of a candidate to clearly state which option has been chosen when answering a question that has more than one option.

International Baccalaureate®
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional