

SOCIAL & CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 11	12 - 25	26 - 35	36 - 46	47 - 59	60 - 70	71 - 100

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 12	13 - 23	24 - 35	36 - 48	49 - 59	60 - 72	73 - 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

There were as many inappropriate topics proposed as there were appropriate and well-focused topics. Issue-based research issues outnumbered context-based issues. Once again, both issue- and context-based reports almost always concerned research sites well-known to the candidates. Some examples of issue-based topics are: a report comparing “endo-” and “exo-group” definitions of ethnic identity with reference to a particular ethnic group; gender differences in attitudes toward sex and romantic love; the acculturation process of one ethnic in-migrating group in Paraguay; social pressure to participate in social networking among students. Examples of context-based approaches include: a study of a school playground as a place for socialization in gender roles; a study of social roles in a martial arts academy; a comparative study of behaviour of older and younger students during recreation periods; a study of a Zionist youth organization. As has often been the case, context-based reports tended to be less focused than issue-based reports, and were also more likely to be overly descriptive.

While the HL internal assessment (IA) criteria for the first examinations in 2010 introduced clearer expectations concerning the interpretation and analysis of data, this continues to be the weakest aspect overall in these reports, and often reflects an apparent misunderstanding of the corresponding criterion.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A: Identification of an issue or question

Only a minority of candidates presented appropriate and well-focused research questions. As has usually been the case, candidate performance varied markedly between centres.

Criterion B: Research techniques

A large number of candidates could not both clearly describe and justify their chosen research techniques. Some candidates could neither adequately describe nor justify research techniques. Again, the more successful IAs tended to employ more than one research technique.

Criterion C: Presentation of data

Detail in data presentation and clarity in organization was both lacking to some extent in many of the reports, and the presentation was deemed inappropriate in some reports. The weaker IAs often presented data in a poorly organized manner, interspersing data and analysis, thus making it difficult for the reader to follow either data presentation or analysis. This is more likely to be the case in the presentation of observational data.

Criterion D: Interpretation and analysis of data

Overall this criterion showed the greatest discrepancy between teachers' and moderators' marks. Most candidates did not describe and apply an analytic framework as called for in the criterion. The explicit requirement for an analytic framework, all too often seems to prompt candidates to add theory into the analysis without much thought, resulting in a superficial statement of theory that added little to the analysis of data. For example, several IAs sought to apply Malinowskian functionalism in a superficial manner, with little or no explanation.

Criterion E: Ethical Issues

Only a minority of candidates did more than merely mention ethical issues, and a small number made no mention of ethical issues at all. Treatment of ethical issues rarely extended beyond discussion of gaining permission for the research, obtaining consent from respondents and ensuring anonymity. The broader ethical concerns which loom large in contemporary ethnography such as representation, positionality, and reflexivity were rarely addressed.

Criterion F: Anthropological insight and imagination

Performance under this criterion was very similar to that seen in the November 2010 session, with most candidates achieving less than two marks. This is likely to be as a result of poorly focused research questions, a largely descriptive approach, and where no analytical approach is applied to the data. Some indication of reflexive and critical thinking about the process of data gathering should be expected for the awarding of full marks under this criterion.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

- *Choosing topics and research questions.* Guiding candidates toward worthwhile and achievable research goals remains the most important and possibly the most difficult task a teacher faces with regard to the HL IA fieldwork project. If the topic is not worthwhile and well-focused, data presentation is likely to lack detail and appear

superficial; interpretation and analysis of data is likely to lack clarity of focus and also appear superficial.

- *Interpretation of assessment criteria.* Centres continue to show a wide variation of understanding of the assessment criteria. In some centres it was evident that assessment descriptors were misapplied, in particular criteria B, C, and D. The assessment criteria should be read carefully (see pp. 47-48 in the *Social and cultural anthropology subject guide*, for first examinations 2010). Teachers should also use the marked IA samples in the *Teacher Support Materials (TSM)* publication, which may be accessed from the general documents list on the subject home page of the Online Curriculum Centre (OCC) website.
- *Application of anthropological concepts and theory.* Criterion D makes explicit the expectation that data generated should be interpreted with the aid of anthropological theory. This criterion requires that the candidates apply an “analytical framework” in analysing data. It may be helpful for teachers to consult the marked IA samples with examiners’ comments in the *TSM* publication. The OCC subject forum has frequently seen exchanges between teachers on questions of teaching theory, and the OCC Teacher Resource Exchange lists many likely sources in the literature and also emerging from teachers’ own study and practice. **Please refer to the November 2010 subject report for further guidance to addressing this criterion.**
- *Sensitivity to ethical issues.* Criterion E makes it clear that candidates must address ethical issues. The criterion mentions only ethical issues, and not other difficulties faced in carrying out research. To improve in this criterion teachers should convey the concerns which have become increasingly prominent in published ethnography over the past 40 years, namely the increasingly serious attention paid to issues of representation, positionality, and reflexivity. These issues should be part of the common discourse as teachers present ethnography to their classes.
- *Teachers’ comments on candidate reports.* While teachers are not required to submit comments with their marks for individual candidates, the practice is strongly recommended, and is very useful to examiners in the moderation process. These comments allow examiners to better follow the marking process, and guide examiners in focusing on areas most needing attention in writing reports, in particular in supplying feedback to individual centres. Presently, most teachers do not submit any comments, either on the text itself or in summary form.
- *Description of group work undertaken.* Teachers are reminded that they should carefully describe the circumstances of group work undertaken by their students on a separate sheet and attach this to the 3/CS form (for guidelines on group work, refer to the *Social and cultural anthropology subject guide*, p. 39). Candidates should present their own research questions, even if data is pooled, and carry out their own analysis and interpretation of data.

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

Requirements for this component seemed to be generally understood, although the critique continued to present difficulties for at least one centre. Samples seen suggest that candidates have been able to identify appropriate sites/events for observation and written accounts were usually completed quite effectively. However a very small number of candidates appeared to have undertaken a preliminary observation. The critique too was usually appropriately focused on the written report rather than elaborating further on the event/site observed and addressed most if not all of the relevant assessment criteria more or less effectively.

Candidate performance against each criterion

As is usually the case, performance on criterion A was strongest overall: many reports were quite well detailed and organized although only a few were marked at the highest level. As noted last year, simple chronological notation every five minutes is not sufficient to establish a report as "well-organized"; more often than not this strategy results in little more than a listing of more or less "raw" data. Less successful reports tended to include previous knowledge or self-reflection rather than specific observation, providing less detail overall. As was also the case last year, the other area of fairly strong performance was on criterion C; many candidates were able to identify some ways in which their own assumptions, social position and/or relation to the event/site observed influenced their report, sometimes with relevant examples. However these were more often seen as personal rather than social or cultural, with little reference to ways in which these might reflect race, class, gender or ethnicity. However, the critical distinction between description and analysis measured by criterion B remains very problematic for many, with some samples making minimal or no reference to these terms; clearly this continues to need close attention in the classroom in relation to all ethnographic materials. Finally, performance on criterion D was sometimes quite disappointing, either because relevant anthropological discussion was not connected to the data collected/presented or because it was almost entirely missing.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

- Candidates should be advised NOT to use chronological notation, presented in five minute blocks, to organize their written reports as this often results in little more than the listing of more or less raw data.
- The distinction between description and analysis should be at the centre of all classroom teaching, not only in relation to internal assessment but also in relation to all ethnographic materials studied.
- Candidates need to be guided in discussion of, and reflection on, the nature and source of assumptions and bias, to recognize where these may be social and cultural

as well as personal, and to examine ways in which race, class, ethnicity and gender may be significant.

- All candidates should be familiar with the details of assessment criteria and reminded of the word limits for each section.

Further comments

It may be worth noting that there is an overall pattern of teacher evaluation that is frequently higher than the moderated mark, and that this is particularly the case with criterion B where candidates are consistently least successful.

Higher level paper one

Component grade boundaries

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

Many of the comments from the standard level paper one report is equally valid for higher level paper one (see pages 15 to 18)

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

Situating the text used in the examination paper within the broader discipline of anthropology (i.e. kinship) seemed a problem for many candidates. Those that were able to make the connection could then draw on additional material to make their responses more substantial.

The levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

Almost all candidates appeared to have engaged with ethnographic literature and were able to present and discuss material with relevance to the examination paper.

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

Question 1

Most candidates struggled to achieve high marks for this question because they failed to make generalizations. Most repeated what was in the text instead of using their own words. Being able to place the text in its broader context and in anthropological terms was duly rewarded.

Question 2

Again, many candidates gave a descriptive response which drew heavily from the extract itself. This did not demonstrate an understanding of the anthropological concepts involved.

Question 3

Most candidates were able to produce a good response to this question, but there appeared to be evidence of candidates memorizing a specific ethnography (e.g. Bourgois) and then making the question fit around what they had learned with little attempt to establish grounds for comparison. Some did this better than others. Those who had broader reading did much better, in some cases exceptionally well. Some candidates used unsuitable material (e.g. from film, from journalism (National Geographic), from missionary literature) and material which is quite dated (e.g. Fernea).

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Candidates could look at past examination paper 1s and then try to identify the theoretical approach / sub-discipline of anthropology that the extracts belong to.

Candidates should analyse exam questions (particularly question 2 in paper 1s), identify key terms and then spend a sentence or two defining them. This helps to demonstrate their understanding of the concepts / theories involved, and may further help them to recollect other works they have studied in order to write a more substantial response.

Candidates should be aware of the ethnographic present of the comparative material they use in question 3, and if they are using dated material they need to use it critically and discuss / establish its relevance to the response. However, it is far better if they have some more recent, relevant ethnographic work to draw upon. In addition to this the use of documentary film or journalistic material alone is strongly discouraged.

Further comments

Most candidates attempted all the questions and should be commended for their competent use of English in their responses.

Higher level paper two**Component grade boundaries**

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 6	7 - 13	14 - 16	17 - 21	22 - 26	27 - 31	32 - 44

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

The key area of the programme which proved difficult for candidates continues to be answering all parts of the question. Many candidates provide only partial responses developing only one part of the question and either mentioning very briefly or completely ignoring other parts of the question.

Some candidates failed to read the questions carefully to understand what was being asked of them or chose to re-write the question as in question 10 where “social relations” was transformed into “ethnic relations” by one candidate.

Some candidates did not answer the examination paper using detailed ethnographic material on at least 3 societies. A few attempted to increase the number of societies they cited by including vague references to their own society or to “western” or “civilised” society. Here it was evident that no ethnographic material had been studied and the information provided by the candidates in such answers was superficial.

While many candidates did gain marks on criteria D and E, too many candidates failed to gain marks on these criteria or failed to gain as many marks as were available.

While most candidates were aware of the need to cite theoretical material or to refer to relevant core terms and perspectives in their essays some chose to do this at the start of their essays and then to ignore theory and concepts when they began to discuss ethnographic material. This produced essays that were in two often non-related halves. Such essays often seemed to be composed of memorized paragraphs on theory which were slotted into each essay regardless of relevance followed by ethnographic material relating in some way to the question. Good essays, by contrast, interweave the conceptual/theoretical knowledge with the ethnographic detail in order to produce focused and relevant answers to questions.

Defining terms

The central concepts appearing in questions were often undefined, poorly defined or only partially defined. These terms, such as “development”, “political organization”, “globalization” and “gender” were often not clearly defined or incorrectly defined (“gender” in purely biological terms for example, “globalization” as synonymous with colonialism and “development” as a way of gauging progress from savagery and barbarism to civilization) and this left candidates struggling to make their answers relevant to the question.

Application of theory

Centres varied widely in the ability shown by their candidates to carry out theoretically informed discussions. Some candidates appeared to be limited in their choices of possible theoretical perspectives and no matter what the question, some centres appeared to have taught only psychological functionalism, cultural ecology and perhaps one other theoretical perspective all of which are unlikely to be ones contemporary anthropologists would consider using in their work. Such now perhaps “historical” perspectives are ones that candidates should learn as a part of how anthropologists in the past made sense of the ethnographic contexts in which they worked but all candidates should also be taught using more recent ethnographies, some of the more contemporary perspectives and theoretical concepts used by today’s social and cultural anthropologists.

Use of ethnographic materials

While most candidates did cite appropriate ethnographies some cited work by non-anthropologists. This may be acceptable as long as the material cited is evaluated using anthropological approaches, concepts and theories. However, candidates do need to be clear about the distinction between ethnographies produced by anthropologists who have lived and worked with one group (or several) over an extended period of time and who have taken the time (when needed) to learn local languages etc. and the work of journalists who may produce interesting material with social content but who are not trained as anthropologists and who do not spend significant periods of time with any one group of people.

In some cases, also, candidates appeared not to have read any ethnographic material less than 50 years old. In the last half century a great deal of very good material has been published by anthropologists and it is a pity that candidates are not always given the opportunity to read some of this more recent work in addition to classic older material.

A small proportion of candidates referred to past paper 1 material, often without naming the ethnographer or accurately locating the people referred to, as an ethnographic case study. While material from past paper 1s is clearly helpful in the preparation of candidates for the examinations this material should not be the only material some candidates appear to be able to remember as their ethnographic material in their answers to questions on paper 2.

Ability to answer all parts of a question

Too often candidates ignored key words in a question or focused on one part of the question to the detriment of the rest. For example, in question 2, a large proportion of candidates appeared to ignore “political organization” altogether when answering the question. Again, in question 4 while candidates wrote about “economics” very few focused on “economic change” as the question required.

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

As noted in previous reports, centres varied widely in the ability of their candidates to present and relevantly apply theoretical perspectives. Some candidates produced excellent detailed scripts demonstrating sophisticated levels of knowledge and skill in answering the questions. These candidates had a sound range and knowledge of anthropological theory, the ability to select and use relevant concepts and detailed knowledge of several ethnographies which they were able to draw on to produce detailed, reasoned, sound and considered essays. At the other extreme, however, some candidates were only able to show very elementary, and occasionally no, knowledge of anthropological theory and sometimes there was little evidence of having studied the requisite number of ethnographies in sufficient detail to do well on the paper.

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

Question 1

This question was one that was both very well answered and also sometimes rather poorly answered. The better answers often chose to show how one social group produced a collective social identity in contrast to another group they lived in close contact with, for example, the traveller-Gypsies and the Gorgios (Okely) or Puerto Ricans in New York (Bourgeois). By choosing to compare two distinct groups in relation to each other candidates were able to demonstrate the varied processes involved in the formation and shaping of social identity.

Weaker answers tended to ignore the term “social” in the question and wrote about individual identity. Other weaker responses failed to consider the “processes” involved in the shaping of social identity and wrote as if “social identity” were fixed and unchanging. Some candidates did not appear to be clear about how to define and understand identity in social anthropological terms.

Concepts such as resistance, exploitation, power relations, marginalization and post-colonialism etc. were often used in answering this question and some candidates were also able to discuss the place of the ethnographer and the role of both gender and the political position of the fieldworker in their answers.

In general this question was well answered at the level of ethnographic material but rather less so from a theoretical/conceptual perspective.

Question 2

This question was attempted by a significant number of candidates and here the most popular options were globalization followed by migration. The development option was the least popular choice and also the one that was least well answered overall.

The main problem with answers to this question was the lack of focus many candidates had on “political organization”. While they were able to write reasonably on globalization or migration the link between these topics and political organization were not always well understood or well developed in discussion of ethnographic materials. A few candidates, particularly those writing on globalization, seemed to forget the question on the examination paper and produced essays about globalization in general.

Some candidates wrote on more than one group even though the question specified reference to only one group. Those who wrote on development and political organization did not have suitable ethnographic material or a clear understanding of development issues and so mostly produced relatively weak answers.

Ethnographic material for this question was extremely varied and covered everything from recent ethnographies on organ trafficking to Malinowski’s Trobriand ethnography (which was not always convincingly used as an example for this question).

Question 3

This was a popular question where candidates almost all defined kinship, well in some cases and rather less well in others. The Trobriand material by Weiner was very popular as a choice for kinship relations and exchange (by far the most popular of the three options). For those who used the Trobriander ethnography from the 1970s the Trobriand funeral ritual with the exchange of banana leaf bundles from owners to workers was mostly used well to exemplify kinship relations and the production and maintenance of such relations in a matrilineal kinship system. Those who wrote on kula, however, tended to show that they understood exchange but did not link this to kinship relations.

Some candidates managed to confuse themselves over owners, workers, principles of descent in matrilineal systems, direction of the circulation of armshells and necklaces etc., but did show that they had learnt the Trobriand ethnographic material even if keeping all the elements straight was a little challenging.

Question 4

Many candidates wrote on economic change and the division of labour among the Ju’hoansi describing how this particular group, who were hunter-gatherers in the 1960s when studied by Lee, were no longer solely hunter-gatherers when Lee returned for another period of fieldwork in the 1990s. These essays tended to be reasonably successful in terms of demonstrating knowledge of economic systems (hxaro) that have clear non-economic functions as well as how they are subject to change as a consequence of – in this case – external events over which the people themselves have no control and which alter the division of labour in the society.

Other candidates focused on Trobriand forms of production and exchange although in these cases there was often no discussion of “change” and candidates produced detailed but very descriptive essays outlining forms of economic exchange. Some candidates attempted comparisons of the Ju’hoansi and Trobriand societies.

Candidates who wrote on economic change and relationships with the environment produced, on the whole, rather less successful essays. These essays again tended to describe how groups interacted with the environment in economic ways but did not always discuss “change” – for example, when describing intensive agricultural practices in rural Greece. Some candidates wrote on the changes to the lives of Canadian or Australian indigenous peoples often describing their sedentarization and access to western commodities (the economic change) as clear improvements on their less “civilized” past ways of living. The exceptions to this, however, were the candidates who wrote on economic change and exchange in Papua New Guinea using materials such as Strathern’s *The Rope of Moka* where the essays often demonstrated a more nuanced understanding of both what has been lost as well as what has been gained by economic changes that have taken place over the last several decades.

Question 5

Candidates who chose to answer this question mostly produced quite strong and mostly very detailed answers often focusing on Geertz’s *Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight* or Okely’s *The Traveller-Gypsies* for the illustrative ethnographic materials. These essays typically defined symbols well and were able to discuss the social uses to which symbols are put. The comparison and contrast were either with the same symbol understood in different ways by differently located social groups or with different symbols used in the same and different ways by different social groups studied by different ethnographers.

Question 6

Relatively few candidates answered this question. Those who did, however, were often able to define ritual in more or less reasonable terms but then often struggled to be able to discuss knowledge systems in relation to ritual. Some candidates focused on rites of passage as their chosen ritual and then attempted to show how rites of passage related to wider understandings of the place of human beings in the religious and/or social worlds of the people who performed particular rites of passage.

Question 7

On this question most candidates were able to define division of labour in sensible terms (by gender, age, class etc.) and most were also able to make a good attempt at the definition of moral systems. However, the links between moral systems and the division of labour were harder for candidates to discuss and to sustain for the length of their essays. Those who did manage this often did it well and some were able to write in considered terms, for example, about child labour and human rights and were able to discuss the complexities of denying children the right to work on the reasonable grounds that no child should have to work and endure exploitation in the 21st century and yet also showing how such a position might well harm the immediate best interests of particular children at the present time.

Weaker answers tended to fall back on arguments based on dubious biological reasoning about the inherent weaknesses of women and how moral systems reflect this and so “protect” women from work that they are supposedly incapable of.

Question 8

Many of the candidates who answered this question began with sound definitions of agency and then chose suitable ethnographic materials to demonstrate their understanding of agency and the limitations of agency in particular social contexts. Particularly popular was Bourgois’ *In Search of Respect* as an ethnography where the limits of individual agency are clearly juxtaposed with the constraints imposed by structure.

Better answers tended to show a clear understanding of how agency is shaped, constrained and enabled in different contexts and how different individuals can make choices which all, however, have consequences. Concepts such as “gender”, “ethnicity” or “social capital” were often used to discuss the limits of agency for some individuals.

Less strong scripts tended not to consider agency at the level of the individual at all and wrote in very general terms about groups wielding power or lacking power.

Question 9

While strong answers considered how anthropologists studied one of the topics listed in the question as well as providing evidence of detailed knowledge of the chosen topic many others simply wrote whatever they knew about tourism (the most popular choice) or indigenous movements or nation building without considering the distinctive contributions that anthropology can make to the understanding of the chosen topic.

On tourism the Maasai proved to be a popular ethnographic choice though not one that was always well used. For indigenous movements the problem for candidates was often the failure to identify what was meant by “movement” in this context (and moving from one place to another on a seasonal basis was not an appropriate understanding of movement for this question). Few candidates were clear about what a social movement is, what a social movement by indigenous peoples might be or how such movements have been studied by anthropologists.

Very few candidates wrote on nation building and those who did mostly wrote in very general and rather vague terms.

Question 10

This question was a fairly popular one but not always well answered. Most candidates managed reasonable definitions of gender although some continue to consider that gender is a biologically based and fixed state. Comparisons were often about the place of women in society many comparing women in a relatively “free” social context (Trobriand women or women in some western context) with women in a Muslim (usually limited to ethnographies in very conservative places written a long time ago) context where sex segregation is a feature of the social order. Here, partly because of the ethnographic material chosen, very stereotypical portrayals and overly stark comparisons tended to dominate the essays with relatively little sense of the enormous variations possible in the lives of women in both western and non-western, Muslim and non-Muslim societies.

Some stronger essays considered not only how gender shaped social relations but how this can be varied depending on a range of other factors such as age (older women having more social freedoms than younger women), class (richer women with more options than those who are poorer though sometimes also with more constraints because of their relative wealth) etc.

While some candidates were able to bring in theoretical concepts and perspectives from feminist anthropology relatively few candidates did this even when their ethnographic material lent itself to the use of such perspectives. This was a pity as the descriptive material was sometimes sound and a good essay could have been turned into a very good one with some stronger theoretical / conceptual knowledge. No candidates considered some of the more recent ethnographic materials on masculinities or on sexuality in different social and cultural contexts and this was a pity as this material is both contemporary and of interest to many candidates as was shown in the May examinations where several centres had taught such ethnographic material.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Candidates need to be introduced to a broad range of anthropological theories and concepts as well as to ethnographies serving to link with or exemplify the theories candidates are taught. In particular, centres should ensure that candidates are given sufficient time during their studies to become familiar with some more contemporary ethnographies and some of the more recent theoretical developments in the discipline. Too many candidates continue to be held back by an apparent lack of any knowledge of theories or perspectives from the last 60 years.
- Candidates should be reminded that key terms used in questions must be defined, and applied to the ethnographies discussed in the essay. Key terms need to be referred to and focused on throughout the essays, not simply defined at the start of an answer and then ignored.
- Teachers need to help candidates achieve a balance between ethnographic description and theoretical discussion and analysis. Candidates who simply describe ethnographic material cannot achieve very good marks on the assessment criteria (particularly A and C). However, candidates who have memorized set “theoretical” paragraphs to begin their essays with will not score highly on criterion A as the “theory” paragraphs are then rarely explicitly linked to other materials in the essays. Candidates who understand the theoretical perspectives and are able to select relevant concepts / core terms or ideas from these and to interweave them in relevant ways into their essays are those who tend to do well on criteria A and C.
- Candidates should be strongly encouraged to answer all parts of a question and to relate the different parts of the question together to produce a coherent integrated essay. Candidates should also read the questions very carefully to ensure that if they are asked to write about one group they do not produce material on more than one group in their essay. Candidates should also be strongly discouraged from simply reproducing class essays in the examination. The precise wording of the examination question may require a rethinking and reordering of materials produced in class.

Higher level paper three

Component grade boundaries

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

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

The weakness that stood out the most was the disconnection of theoretical schools of thought from ethnography and theoretical perspectives. Most candidates incorporated schools but many struggled to integrate these with the discussion of theoretical perspectives and ethnography, meaning that they were, at best, only partially successful in demonstrating their relevance to the question. Many candidates included a series of seemingly memorized points

about theoretical schools. This created the impression that they had read a short summary of the school of thought from a text, but not actually learned the relevance of that school to anthropology in any depth. In some cases, candidates tended to list and define several theoretical perspectives at the beginning of their essay. These seemed like memorized definitions. The effect of this was often to delay the real content of the essay to the second page.

Some candidates used ethnography quite effectively while others tended to exaggerate the content of ethnography in an attempt to fit their argument. Candidates need to study ethnography with an understanding that they are studying real people and that a responsibility to be accurate comes with representing these people in their essays.

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

Overall, most candidates addressed all the assessment criteria: theoretical schools, ethnography and theoretical perspectives were included in most responses. Most candidates were able to select relevant theoretical perspectives and most defined these correctly. Many candidates successfully linked theoretical perspectives to ethnography and discussed ethnography with an appropriate level of detail.

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

Question 1

This was a very popular question. Most candidates understood, and were able to define, diachronic. Many candidates drew on Lee's ethnographic study of *The Dobe Ju/'Hoansi*. Most did so with reasonable levels of success. However, many overlooked the context of anthropology in explaining reasons for Lee taking initially a synchronic approach and then moving towards a diachronic approach. Candidates would have been more successful if they had been able to link Lee's perspectives to other schools of thought from this period. Also, many candidates presented this ethnography as if Lee studied the Ju in the 1960s, then went into hiding until the 1990s when he was "surprised" to see change in their society. This overlooks the more sustained approach that, in reality, Lee undertook. Bourgois' *In Search of Respect* was used successfully, although few candidates linked his work to political economy, which would have helped them to explain the links between theory, perspectives and ethnography. Many candidates used evolutionism but none were able to link their school to ethnography and few were able to go beyond a mere listing of the characteristics of this school.

Question 2

This was not a very popular question. Those who responded in regards to materialism often made reference to Marxist ideas, or to ethnography that emphasized issues of work or class. Few did this with any depth. There was a notable lack of reference to specific anthropologists and their theories.

Question 3

This question solicited some good responses. Some candidates made relevant links between agency and Burr's work in Vietnam and Bourgois' work in the United States. A few also linked structure to Bourgois. Nevertheless, in these cases, candidates struggled to explain how

these theoretical perspectives were used by ethnographers. Few candidates included theoretical schools in their responses to this question.

Question 4

Most candidates who answered this question chose to focus on conflict-centred perspectives. In terms of theoretical schools, many referred to Marx and some to “the conflict school” but very few linked these to specific anthropologists. For example, Marxist ideas could have been linked to Eric Wolf and political economy; other conflict theorists include anthropologists such as Gluckman or Coser.

Question 5

This was a somewhat popular question. Candidates highlighted some potentially relevant links to ethnography and theory. Unfortunately, many of the candidates who answered this question clearly did not understand the ideas and meaning behind universalistic perspectives.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Learning vs. memorizing

It is clear that some candidates have read textbooks that have helped them become familiar with anthropological theory. Many candidates provided points that appeared to be a list of memorized characteristics of schools of thought. Many candidates found it challenging to go beyond simple description when discussing theory. Theoretical schools also represented the aspect of the Paper 3 responses that was most challenging for candidates to clearly discuss in relevant terms. Candidates need to move beyond description and work towards integrating schools of thought with both ethnography and perspectives within an analytical framework.

In some cases, all or almost all candidates from a centre answered the same question in the same manner. This seems indicative of candidates having memorized responses more than learned materials that they critically, selectively and independently apply to questions in thoughtful ways.

Teachers need to spend time ensuring that candidates have practised applying theory to ethnography (and vice versa) and exploring the relationship of both of these to perspectives. Teaching candidates to develop analytical frameworks that include all three aspects of this component into the response is key.

Relevance

In many cases, candidates selected theoretical schools or ethnography that was relevant to the question posed. In many cases, candidates provided detailed descriptions or lists of seemingly memorized information. However, many candidates did not explain the relevance of these to the question.

Candidates need to be taught to always explicitly explain the relevance of what they present to the question itself.

Selectivity

In certain cases, candidates are providing long lists of all theoretical perspectives at the beginning of the essays. This is unnecessary and simply delays the start of the essay until they focus on what is most relevant to the question. Candidates should be guided towards providing concise and relevant introductions that indicate an understanding of the theoretical

perspectives, schools and ethnography that will be used to respond to the question in a relevant manner.

Standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

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

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

Many candidates were able to demonstrate a general understanding of the text, in this case an extract which examines changes in kinship understandings and practices in a Californian infertility clinic setting. However, many answers remained on a descriptive level or were written in a very generic way rather than focused on the text or the relevant comparative ethnography. In a significant number of cases candidates were quite dependent on the text and appeared unaware that they should be using their own words.

Most candidates were able to attempt all questions. However, relatively few candidates attempted to define or discuss key concepts relevant to the questions, such as kinship, ethnicity, or social and cultural changes, without this it was sometimes difficult to determine whether or not the understanding of these terms was only based on common sense. In some cases, candidates' answers were marred by moral and value judgments and evaluations with reference to the genetic transfers that take place in fertility clinics. Some candidates misunderstood some aspects of the text and their answers to the questions reflected these misunderstandings. In particular, some candidates assumed biological essentialisms when examining kinship.

Some candidates repeated material from question 1 in question 2 which meant that at least one of the questions was not answered appropriately. In a small number of cases candidates were not able to complete all the questions on the paper. Particularly, question 3 was sometimes left unfinished, or so brief as to be too short to gain a good mark.

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

In terms of the areas of the programme, many candidates appeared to be familiar with anthropological concepts and issues on kinship and social and cultural change. As usual, the range of achievement was wide, with the critical difference being the ability to write conceptually and analyse rather than describe. Some were able to make sound statements about the viewpoint of the anthropologist and where the line of thought was well reasoned this was credited. The third, comparative, question produced a good range of well structured answers drawing on several different ethnographies across the candidate cohort.

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.

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

Question 1

Most candidates 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. Weaker scripts 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.

Though many candidates were able to describe the decisions made by Giovanna and Flora – the two women presented in the text – they very often misunderstood concepts such as biology, culture, ethnicity and genetics. These misunderstandings often resulted from the candidate not being able to read Giovanna and Flora's statements critically.

A few candidates introduced a comparative ethnography in this question, which is not required.

Question 2

Stronger answers provided detailed analysis, and discussed the understandings and rationalizations of the women's choices. Most candidates chose to discuss Giovanna's case and her "socializing" of genetics. In Giovanna's case the biological knowledge and cultural understanding presented is one of eliding ethnic and biological categories by suggesting that a woman who has a shared ethnic background and a shared cultural upbringing is sufficiently "genetically" alike to Giovanna to constitute a suitable egg donor. Many candidates failed to understand that it is biologically not possible for a shared culture to be "genetically encoded" in this way. Some of the generalizations offered, veered into the category of sweeping statements, where a candidate would essentialize culture or ethnicity.

Some responses were only descriptive, and many did not identify relevant anthropological concepts. A significant proportion of candidates are still failing to make any reference to the viewpoint of the anthropologist and so are failing to gain more than 4 out of 6 marks for this question. Those candidates who recognized the anthropologist's viewpoint discussed it in terms of emic/etic distinctions.

A few introduced a comparative ethnography in this question, or wrote digressive statements about technological innovations, without reference to the question.

Question 3

Most candidates structured their answers as a comparison and at least attempted to introduce a comparative ethnography. Popular ethnographies chosen were Bourgois' *In Search of Respect*, Chagnon's *Yanomamo*, Clifford's *Identity in Mashpee*, Okely's *The Traveller-Gypsies*, Lee's *The Dobe Ju'hoansi*, Weiner's *The Trobrianders of Papua New Guinea*. All these provided relevant materials for comparison.

Full identification of comparative materials continues to be a problem for a good number of candidates. They are required to fully contextualize their ethnographic materials. Quite often a

candidate 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.

Many answers were more narrative than comparative in nature and structure. A candidate will extensively develop a description of the chosen ethnography disregarding the basic requirement that is to establish a comparison, based on similarities and differences.

Candidates who did particularly well on question 3 often did so because they chose well-contextualized and well-justified comparative ethnographies. Those who did not do so well often appeared to have ignored the focus of the question which was on social and cultural changes.

Finally, some candidates would introduce two different ethnographies even though the question specified that only one such group should be introduced. In a very few cases no ethnography was cited at all.

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 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.
- In question 1, candidates need to use their own words rather than rely heavily on quotations. Candidates are expected to go beyond simple description, to 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. 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.
- Finally, in terms of ethnographic materials, it is important that teachers try to ensure that candidates are familiar with some contemporary materials.

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

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

As was the case last year, many of the questions required candidates to examine or discuss the relation between two different aspects of social and cultural life, each of which needed some kind of definition or clarification, as well as linking. This proved difficult for many in terms of both explicit conceptualization as well as keeping the two parts in balance. For example in question 2 which was a popular question, many wrote sometimes quite well about globalization but barely addressed how this had effected political organization, which was in itself rarely discussed. This meant that many answers were not clearly focused and often quite incomplete. More generally, a good number of answers provided rather little evidence of explicit knowledge of relevant anthropological concepts and approaches, and simply treated key terms such as gender (question 10) or social identity (question 1) as self-evident. Two other areas of the programme that were often problematic was the presentation of ethnographic materials, which were sometimes fragmentary, incomplete and/or outdated, and comparisons which unless explicitly required, as in question 5, were often quite limited. This in turn, also limited achievement in terms of demonstrating detailed knowledge of at least three societies overall (criterion E).

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

As suggested above, a good many candidates were able to write quite effectively about globalization (question 2), about economic change (question 4), and in more limited numbers about social identity (question 1) and symbols (question 5). In most cases this also depended on detailed knowledge of relevant ethnography which often made a large difference in terms of achievement. More generally in terms of skills, where conceptualization and detailed ethnographic knowledge was in place, candidates were able to write closely focused and well supported essays suggesting a good understanding of anthropological approaches and assessment criteria (including comparison), both of which served them well.

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

Question 1

This was not popular but usually quite well done; the key was detailed knowledge of relevant ethnography, allowing candidates to examine different perspectives and factors in terms of processes that shape social identity.

Question 2

This was one of three popular questions but not usually successful: this was largely because many candidates responded only to one part of the question, writing quite well about globalization (most often chosen) but barely addressing its influence on political organization as required. Anthropological conceptualization was sometimes limited in answers to this question. Many candidates ignored the explicit prompt to focus on ONE group.

Question 3

Responses about kinship relations and exchange (the option chosen almost exclusively) were quite limited with respect to anthropological conceptualization and ethnography, and perhaps the least successful question overall. Candidates usually selected relevant ethnography but conceptualization and ethnographic detail was limited and unbalanced, ignoring the prompt to evaluate the relationship.

Question 4

This was a popular question with candidates choosing to discuss the interaction between economic change and either division of labour or relationship with the environment (just 4 chose to look at health and illness). More successful answers focused on division of labour, supported with quite detailed ethnographic materials, although not all provided sufficient context or identification. In other cases answers were rather unbalanced with one part of the question only briefly referenced.

Question 5

This question, requiring candidates to compare the use of symbols in different contexts was not popular, but quite well done by those who chose it. Responses demonstrated relevant conceptual knowledge (e.g. symbols as polyvocal, rites of passage, revitalization, resistance) as well as quite detailed knowledge of ethnography, usually contextualized and identified.

Question 6

This question about ritual and knowledge systems was not popular and most answers were quite limited: there was some general knowledge of ritual in terms of rites of passage but knowledge systems were usually described in very general terms, if at all.

Question 7

This question about moral systems and the division of labour was not chosen.

Question 8

There were only two responses to this question about "what it means for individuals to have agency" but both were quite successful, using quite well-detailed ethnography to clarify and illustrate their claims.

Question 9

This question about anthropological approaches to indigenous movements or tourism (just one response focused on nation-building) was not popular. Those focused on indigenous movements were more successful in identifying relevant anthropological approaches (e.g. traditionalism and revitalization, power and resistance) and presenting quite detailed and relevant ethnography. By contrast tourism was rarely discussed in terms of anthropological approaches and responses were little more than limited descriptions of one case (the study by Turton about the Mursi of Ethiopia), which was itself often misrepresented.

Question 10

This question about how gender shapes social relations was the most popular and produced about as many quite good answers as rather poor ones. More successful answers discussed gender in anthropological terms, as a social construction, and focused on the terms of the question to show how culturally specific ideas about women and men influenced the division of labour, roles and social interaction. Less effective answers treated gender as self-evident and wrote descriptively about women and men in one or two societies with little discussion of social relations.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Teachers need to help candidates read questions more carefully, to make sure that they address the question as asked and completely. This was a clear limitation for many papers this session. To do this effectively, candidates must understand that key concepts need to be discussed in anthropological terms, and that these should then be used as a framework for analysis and comparison. Ethnographic description alone is never sufficient.
- Ethnographic description that is carefully identified, focused, detailed and sustained is essential to clarify, illustrate and support more general arguments or claims. This session it seemed that a good many candidates were drawing on quite limited, outdated and often fragmentary “bits and pieces” of ethnography which was often ungrounded and rarely given any context. One or two clearly focused and well developed cases are much more effective than a little bit of almost everything – which is what sometimes seemed to be the case.
- This recommendation about the use of ethnography is also relevant in terms of meeting assessment criterion E, which requires evidence of detailed knowledge of three or more societies across both essays to earn full marks. This kind of detailed ethnographic knowledge should be within the grasp of all SL candidates, but this was not always evident this session.
- Finally, candidates need to be reminded that they are expected to demonstrate knowledge of processes of change and transformation in at least one if not both essays (criterion D: 4 marks). This too limited achievement for a good many candidates this session.