

## SOCIAL & CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

### Overall grade boundaries

#### Higher Level

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 14	15 - 32	33 - 41	42 - 53	54 - 65	66 - 76	77 - 100

#### Standard Level

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 13	14 - 26	27 - 37	38 - 48	49 - 59	60 - 70	71 - 100

### Higher level internal assessment

#### Component grade boundaries

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

This year's report for this component is largely similar to that of November 2012 and November 2013.

#### The range and suitability of the work submitted

Slightly less than half of the reports moderated featured appropriate and well-focused topics, a result similar to that found in past examination sessions. A slightly higher proportion of candidates presented inappropriate topics than in the November 2013 session.

In marked contrast to recent examination sessions, context-based research projects slightly outnumbered issue-based projects in this session. This seems to be a result of candidates in several centres electing to carry out research in their own schools. However, the two most successful reports moderated were both issue-based. One investigated the "stigma toward feminism in middle-class teenagers" in a large city, the other focused on theory, asking how Pierre Bourdieu's concepts of cultural capital, habitus and "field" might help analyse power

relations. Only slightly less successful were two context-based reports, one employing concepts of space and place to analyse how candidates organize themselves in a morning school assembly; the second candidate applied concepts relating to power and territoriality in examining how candidates of a given class level appropriate particular space in a school commons area.

## Candidate performance against each criterion

### **Criterion A: Identification of an issue or question**

As mentioned above, slightly less than half the candidates moderated presented appropriate and well-focused research questions, a proportion similar to recent examination sessions. As in recent sessions, results varied markedly between centres.

### **Criterion B: Research techniques**

As in the November 2013 session, the vast majority of candidates achieved at least two marks for this criterion, reflecting at least a basic understanding of the role of research techniques in anthropological research. What is usually missing is the description and justification of the research context, that is, the selection criteria for choosing informants, the number of informants, and the circumstances under which research instruments were administered.

### **Criterion C: Presentation of data**

Most candidates achieved at least 2 marks for this criterion. However, very few received more than 2 marks. Lack of detail in presenting data was easily the most common shortcoming. Many candidates seem to struggle in finding the right balance between data presentation and the treatment of methodological and theoretical issues, referring to the demands of criteria B, C, and D. Often, some of the most theoretically sophisticated reports appear “top-heavy,” slighting data presentation in favour of a more detailed set of methodological and theoretical considerations. Also several candidates mistakenly presented essential data in appendices this session, which are not included within the word limit. For obvious reasons, this is inadmissible.

### **Criterion D: Interpretation and analysis of data**

As in past sessions, this criterion is the one candidates have the most difficulty fulfilling. This session’s performance was unfortunately less successful than recent ones, with most candidates failing to present appropriate analytical frameworks. Candidates often demonstrate a concern that ethnographic results need to be framed by theory, but too often they lack an understanding of just how theory contributes to analysis. As a result, while most candidates introduce anthropological concepts and/or theory, it is often too superficially described and applied to advance the analysis of data.

**Criterion E: Ethical issues**

Few candidates provided substantial discussions of ethical issues arising in field research and in reporting this session. As is usual, centres varied widely in candidate performance. In order to receive full marks candidates need to go beyond describing issues of informant privacy to discuss, for example, issues of representation of subjects and groups, positionality, and to demonstrate reflexivity.

**Criterion F: Anthropological insight and imagination**

The majority of candidates received 2 marks or less for this criterion. If research questions are not closely defined and largely descriptive approaches are taken with missing or superficially applied analytical frameworks, candidates will not do well under this criterion.

**Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates**

- **Choosing topics and defining research questions:** The most difficult and important task teachers face in guiding candidates in regard to this component lies in dialoguing with them, determining why they are interested in particular topics, and helping them phrase research questions and delimit them sufficiently. Once again, a majority of candidates did not sufficiently focus their research questions this session. The Teacher Support Material (TSM) publication (accessible through the Online Curriculum Centre (OCC)) may help teachers to assist candidates in focusing their research question. The TSM gives ideas on how to go about progressively delimiting research interests.
- **Data presentation and analysis:** Only a minority of candidates presented detailed and well-organized presentations of data, and centres were frequently overly generous in assessing data presentation. Given the constraints of the word limit, it is very important that teachers and candidates work carefully with the marked and annotated sample reports presented in the TSM. As the candidates' research and writing progress, teachers should devote regular class time to preparing candidates for this component, as well as scheduling individual conferences. Guides to field research are available to acquaint candidates with the full range of research techniques, and a number of these are annotated on the Teacher Resource Exchange on the OCC site.
- **Application of concepts and theory:** The TSM publication is also useful in helping teachers and candidates appreciate how theory can be made relevant to data analysis, even in a brief research report. Teachers should be regularly making use of a brief but well-written introduction to anthropological theory, of which there are several available, and annotated on the Teacher Resource Exchange on the OCC site.
- **Treatment of ethical issues:** Only a minority of candidates presented substantial discussions of ethical issues. Teachers should discuss with candidates the various points concerning ethical practice covered in the subject guide and in the TSM. Also, time should be devoted to those areas of ethical concern which have become increasingly important to anthropology over the past 40 years, namely issues dealing with positionality, reflexivity and representation of individual informants and groups. It

is moreover impossible to critically read contemporary ethnography without taking these issues into account.

- **Organization and format of the report:** While there is no specific format for the HL IA report, it is advisable for teachers to produce a suggested format for candidates in order to raise awareness of the requirements reflected in the assessment criteria, and to encourage clarity of organization. Use of a table of contents, subheadings (often neglected), and a bibliography (often omitted) should form part of classroom preparation for this component. Also, teachers should take care that candidates understand that appendices are for the presentation of ancillary material only, and should not be used for the presentation of essential data. This session several candidates used titles of the various criteria as subheadings. This is not advisable. The assessment criteria measure performance which is not necessarily confined to any delimited section of the report (most obvious, of course, with regard to Criterion F), and this form of organization if strictly followed is likely to lead to repetitiveness, as well as not serving the reader well in clearly showing how the report was put together.
- **Presentation of group work:** While group work was not an issue this session, teachers should ensure they clearly describe the circumstances under which group work was undertaken. This should be done in a statement accompanying the 3/CS form. For guidelines on group work for the HL IA, please refer to the subject guide, page 39. It is the teacher's responsibility to ensure that candidates in a group frame different research questions, and that data interpretation and analysis are each candidate's own work.

## Standard level internal assessment

### Component grade boundaries

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

### The range and suitability of the work submitted

As in previous years, the range and quality of work seen varied widely in terms of both overall presentation and the extent of anthropological knowledge and understanding demonstrated. Requirements for this component seem to be generally understood, however the nature and purpose of the critique continues to be problematic for some centres, where it is sometimes used to provide further analysis of the observation rather than a critical discussion of the written report, which is what is intended. The need to meet the word count also continues to be disregarded in some individual cases, often to the disadvantage of the candidate as words over the limit are not included in assigning marks. However, it seems that candidates are usually able to identify sites that are appropriate for observation if not always to identify an issue to guide it, and most written reports are quite successful in terms of both organization and detail. Similarly, most candidates were usually able to use the critique to think more critically about their report in terms of recognizing examples of bias and assumptions. However, the distinction between description and analysis (Criterion B) is often not explicitly addressed and remains problematic for almost all candidates.

### Candidate performance against each criterion

As in previous examination sessions, most candidates were more successful on criterion A (the detail and organization of the written report) and on criterion C (focus, assumptions and bias) and continue to have problems with criterion B (the distinction between descriptive inference and analysis). With respect to A, while many reports are quite well detailed, what constitutes “organization” in this context continues to be misunderstood: a simple chronological format (for example, using 5 minute intervals) is not sufficient as in terms of organization it does not go beyond the presentation of raw data.

With respect to criterion B, in many critiques there was little if any reference to the distinction between description and analysis and little identification of their own descriptive inferences, which were more often discussed only in terms of bias or assumptions. At best, some candidates were able to comment quite thoughtfully on the relation between evidence and conclusions which is moving in the right direction.

With respect to criterion C, many candidates were more successful in recognizing some of the ways in which bias and/or assumptions sometimes linked to their position as observers of their own social and cultural context, for example in terms of class, gender or ethnicity, had shaped their reports, and some provided quite thoughtful commentary on specific examples as

required. However, many continue to understand these in personal rather than in social and cultural terms and do not consider how these might reflect larger sociological and/or ideological perspectives.

Finally, as in previous sessions with respect to criterion D, performance was much more variable: most candidates were able to show some evidence of an anthropological understanding of their written report (for example as presenting an emic perspective or in relation to the ethical issues raised by covert observation) but only a few were effective in linking this more critically to their materials or to more specific anthropological concepts and arguments.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

These remain very similar to previous examination sessions and need to be closely linked to ongoing classroom work with, and discussion of, the nature of ethnographic materials:

- It is essential that candidates understand why simple chronological notation – presenting their observations in more or less “raw” list form – does not constitute organization in this context. They should be helped to identify alternative, more effective, organizational strategies for their written report.
- The distinction between ethnographic description and analysis needs to be constantly examined and discussed in the classroom if it is to be successfully identified and discussed in the critique, in relation to the written report.
- Although some candidates recognize that their biases and assumptions often have a social and cultural component and are not just personal, this too needs to be an area of discussion both in relation to class ethnographies as well as their own written reports.
- It is essential that candidates are made familiar with both guidelines and assessment criteria. They should be made aware of the word limits and the consequences of exceeding these.

## Higher level paper one

### Component grade boundaries

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

**PLEASE NOTE: That some of the comments from the standard level paper one report pages 17–20 are equally applicable here.**

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

There were no specific areas of the examination which candidates appeared to find difficult. The vast majority of candidates were able to tackle the paper and offered good responses.

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

Almost all candidates were able to offer a valid theoretical perspective through which to approach question 2, and most could offer at least one appropriate viewpoint of the anthropologists who authored the text. Almost all candidates were able to draw on a comparative ethnography.

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

#### Question 1

This question was mostly well-answered but the better responses took a conceptual approach rather than relying solely on description. Candidates appeared to struggle to incorporate generalizations into their response and some simply used the catch-all concept of “globalization”. While this was acceptable, more development and justification was needed to achieve more than 3 or 4 marks.

#### Question 2

This question was well-answered and there appeared to be an improvement in comparison with previous examination sessions. As stated above, valid theoretical perspectives were put forward, but in some cases the justification for these was a little contrived (in the sense that the data were made to fit the theoretical perspective). Candidates were particularly good at offering valid viewpoints of the anthropologists.

### Question 3

Almost all candidates had a comparative ethnography to draw upon, although in some cases the rationale for its choice for addressing this question was a little unclear. The majority of candidates accurately identified these ethnographies, and most constructed their responses as a comparison. A few simply compared them at face value ("these people hunt; those people farm") rather than in response to the question asked.

### Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Candidates are encouraged to study a range of recent ethnographies in order to have the best possible one to draw upon for question 3. Candidates should be directed to answer the question and not just write everything that they know about the comparative ethnography. Where possible, comparisons should be on a more conceptual level rather than superficial.

### Further comments

It is pleasing to see an improvement in candidate preparation for higher level paper 1 this examination session.



## Higher level paper two

### Component grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 7	8 - 15	16 - 19	20 - 24	25 - 28	29 - 33	34 - 44

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

Several topics seemed to be less familiar to many candidates, including development, health and illness, myth and art, refugees, religious and social movements and nation building. However, the difficulty seems to lie as much within different centres as in areas of the programme. As noted in past sessions, discussion of theory was again quite limited, with forms of functionalism dominating and attempts to use older theoretical approaches to analyse more contemporary social and cultural phenomena. Some candidates confused structure-centred approaches with structuralism.

Some candidates were limited by their texts and/or ethnographies, including the use of a good deal of secondary materials/analysis – as in Harris' *Cows, Pigs, Wars, and Witches* or the use of short articles in *National Geographic* which were not by anthropologists. Ethnographic materials, although generally relevant, were not very well detailed. Although theory is more often than not now a part of many responses, including relevant theoretical perspectives, these rarely are used effectively in terms of answering the question and sometimes seem to distract from it. There is some sense that too many candidates are answering somewhat mechanically, following some kind of template that does not often serve them well. In these responses the first paragraphs of each essay is taken up with a pro-forma description of a particular theoretical approach or school including its advantages and disadvantages and this is then ignored for the remainder of the essay which is typically a purely descriptive one that may or may not have any connection to the theory outlined at the start of the essay.

Some candidates produced only very short essays and a few only answered one question. While most now make some reference to process of transformation and change and do include material on three or more societies this is still not the case for all candidates.

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

Several responses were excellent, with strong answers to question 4 (globalization and media/communication), question 5 (identity and migration) and question 6 (ideology and ethnic groups). More popular questions were those about gender and power (question 3) and the social uses of ritual (question 2) although quality varied. In terms of theory, it was encouraging to see more use of political economy theory, which seemed to be generally understood though rather often reduced to economic factors only. In the highest achieving responses, symbolic theory was also well used as were approaches to postmodernism. Some candidates were able

to produce very detailed ethnographic accounts which they were also able to analyse and evaluate conceptually and theoretically.

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

### Question 1

The key problem with several responses to this question was the lack of clear understanding and definition of development programmes. Candidates who had not studied development invariably produced answers that were based on limited knowledge and commonsense assumptions. In some cases any form of economic initiative was counted as a development programme and the example of the Kuna was sometimes used as the ethnographic case to support such responses. Higher achieving answers focused on how government or NGO funded programmes changed local patterns of subsistence, introduced formal education, *etc* and in this way altered how people interacted with their environment or changed the work that they did and so altered labour relations. The example of the Inuit was used well in some answers. Changed understandings of health and illness in connection with development programmes was the least popular option for this question and often rather poorly answered with some candidates choosing to write on the Hmong in America as their case study.

### Question 2

Lower achieving answers simply described myths or ritual (no candidate approached the topic of the social uses of art) and left any social use of such myths or ritual to be inferred or implied from their answers. Others described rites of passage but many of these answers did not have the language to show how such rites of passage are transition rituals as described by Van Gennep and later developed by Turner. Some candidates used the non-anthropologist Fadiman's work on the Hmong and were able to describe rituals in some detail but usually lacked conceptual and theoretical means to evaluate and develop the descriptive parts of their essays. Some of the higher achieving responses used Kuper's work on the Swazi and in some cases this was compared with rituals among the Trobrianders.

### Question 3

This was a very popular question and many candidates produced solid and in some instances excellent answers to this question. Higher achieving answers were those where power was well defined – usually in Weberian terms but occasionally a Foucauldian approach was taken – and then applied to ethnographic data to develop a reasoned and relevant discussion. While most candidates were also able to define gender or to use this term appropriately, too many still equate biological sex with gender and many simply considered the term as one that required no discussion at all. Bourgois's *In Search of Respect* and Weiner's Trobriand materials were popular choices in answering this question. In some instances candidates compared rather

than contrasted the ethnographic examples they presented. Lower achieving responses simply produced descriptive answers outlining a division of labour that did not directly answer the question. Some candidates assumed that in matrilineal societies women had more power than men and that the opposite would be the case in patrilineal societies. These candidates did not have a clear understanding of the differences between descent systems and social or other forms of gendered power.

#### Question 4

This was another very popular question with exchange systems the most popular option followed by commodification and with relatively few candidates choosing media and communication. One issue that arose in a number of responses was that candidates only partially answered the question – either they wrote on globalization and did not develop the topic of commodification, exchange systems, *etc* in relation to this or they wrote on exchange systems or commodification, *etc* but did not write about globalization. Some candidates wrote on colonialism as though this were a synonym for globalization. In general also, candidates who had studied commodification or media and communication usually produced sound and sometimes excellent papers but those who had not formally studied these topics were limited to commonplace and commonsense statements that did not demonstrate anthropological knowledge and understanding. Candidates who wrote on media and communication used Abu-Lughod's ethnographic work on cassettes and television well and some wrote on the commodification of gendered labour in the form of transnational domestic service. Some candidates were able to apply Appadurai's work on scapes and to cite authors writing on deterritorialisation, for example, when writing on the impacts and consequences of globalization.

#### Question 5

Candidates who were able to define identity, either as individual or group identity, tended to produce more focused and higher achieving answers to this question. Migration and indigenous peoples were the more popular choices for answering the question and the Hmong and Penan were frequently chosen to answer with. Higher achieving essays were able to convey the complexity of identity formation and construction in altered social contexts and used relevant conceptual and theoretical models to do so. Many responses, however, simply described in general terms migrants in their new homes and wrote of how aspects of culture were maintained or adapted to the new social environment with little or no theoretical analysis.

#### Question 6

Candidates who answered this question fell into two broad groups, those who were clear what ideology meant and were able to cite and apply ideas from Gramsci and others to their work and those who ignored the term ideology and simply described an ethnic group they had studied. For those who wrote on ethnic groups and ideology Scheper-Hughes's work on Ireland was a popular choice as were both the Penan and work on the deaf in Japan by Nakamura. Some good and even excellent detailed answers dealt with ideology and music in Singapore.

### Question 7

This was another relatively popular question with most candidates choosing the first option, kinship, on which to answer. Many answers were limited to a description of the division of labour with some reference to kinship and only a few managed to develop their responses to include sound theoretical discussion. Candidates who wrote on social movements did not tend to do well as on the whole the examples they chose to write on were not social movements and so the material was not relevant to answering the question. The Trobrianders, the Puerto Ricans in New York and the Kuna of Panama were the most popular groups used for the answers to this question.

### Question 8

Most candidates were able to define tourism even though some definitions were problematic. However, beyond this relatively few candidates had a strong grasp of tourism from an anthropological perspective and focused most of their answers on either inequality or the environment with little direct reference to tourism. The Kuna were a particularly popular choice for answering the question with the Trobrianders also quite popular. Those candidates who chose inequality tended to fare better than those who chose the environment as many candidates lacked the conceptual knowledge to do more than describe changes to environments pre and post the arrival of tourists.

### Question 9

Some answers to this question were excellent with reasoned and detailed conceptual understandings of symbolism applied to relevant ethnographic materials. Both Swazi materials by Kuper and work on the symbolic significance of nation building songs in Singapore were used to good effect.

### Question 10

Relatively few candidates answered this question and while some were able to discuss consumption in general terms none dealt particularly well with production. Candidates did not appear to have the theoretical or ethnographic materials with which to answer this question well.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- At higher level, candidates need to have extensive and in-depth ethnographic knowledge of a range of particular cases which was quite often missing this examination session. Teachers need to be encouraged to review their course materials with this in mind. As noted last year, while secondary ethnographic sources such as Harris' *Cows, Pigs, Wars, and Witches* or those discussed in a general text, may be useful in some contexts, they do not provide the depth and detail needed.
- While it is encouraging to see more candidates trying to incorporate theory and perspectives into their responses, quite often this reads as rather mechanical and it is

not always made relevant to the question, perhaps in part because only a few candidates seem to have more current theory to work with. Functionalism alone is not enough and does candidates a disservice.

- Work by non-anthropologists should be used, if at all, only very moderately and most of the work candidates read should be by anthropologists.
- Candidates should be discouraged from writing on topics they have not studied in depth and on areas they are not familiar with.
- Candidates should be warned not to reproduce a class essay that may not fully answer a question on the examination paper.
- Candidates should also be encouraged to answer all parts of a question.
- Teachers needs to find ways to make sure that ethnography is always examined in relation to theoretical perspectives and relevant theory: where these are taught in relative isolation, making connections between them – as required in the examination – is made much more difficult.

## Higher level paper three

### Component grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 2	3 - 5	6 - 7	8 - 10	11 - 13	14 - 16	17 - 20

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

As has been the case in previous sessions, an ability to develop relevant connections and comparisons between theoretical perspectives, schools of thought and ethnography continues to be a challenge for many candidates; while most candidates seem to have some knowledge and understanding of these three key components, rather often this appears to be limited to “learned” materials and candidates have trouble in applying this beyond the context in which it has been taught. Consequently more often than not relevance to the question is only weakly established, limiting achievement on criteria D and E in particular. And in many cases, it seems that this knowledge and understanding is in itself quite limited to just one or two schools of thought, applied to specific ethnographic cases or contexts which also limits candidates' ability to think and write effectively with and about these components in response to new questions in terms of a genuine inquiry. Again, this means that the specific requirements of the question are often not addressed. For example in many cases, candidates ignored the requirement to choose one of several options: most often it simply seemed either that their knowledge of any specific school of thought was insufficient for more developed discussion (as in many responses to question 2 and question 3) or that they were repeating “learned” materials in a mechanical fashion without close reference to the question itself.

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

It was very encouraging to see some excellent thinking and writing this session: on four of the five questions a small but increasing number of candidates performed at the highest possible level. More generally, despite the limitations noted above, it was also clear that many candidates had quite detailed knowledge and some understanding of specific schools of thought (for example structural functionalism, political economy and historical particularism were most frequently referenced) and related perspectives, were able to describe these more or less effectively and apply them to relevant materials, if not always precisely focused in terms of the question chosen. In terms of perspectives, candidates were most effective in demonstrating some knowledge and understanding of diachronic and synchronic perspectives (questions 1 and 3), and structure- and agency-centred perspectives (question 2). Ethnographic materials that were most consistently used well included *In Search of Respect* (Bourgois), *Penan Histories* (Bending), *The Ju'Hoansi* (Lee), *The Swazi* (Kuper), as well as Fadiman's journalistic account of the Hmong in California, although this was usually wrongly identified as an ethnography.

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

### Question 1

This was a popular question and answers were either successful or more limited in equal part. The most effective were those that compared Kuper's account of The Swazi and Bourgois' *In Search of Respect*, which supported a sound discussion of contrasting schools (Structural Functionalism and Political Economy) and examples of ways in which these shaped the accounts. Other discussions focused, mostly effectively, on one ethnography (Swazi, *In Search of Respect*, Ju'hoansi, Penan Histories); less successful were discussions of The Inuit, Kuna, and Yanomamo.

### Question 2

This was a popular question, focused on structural functionalism or political economy. Responses ranged from top, to middle and lower end marks: at the lower end candidates often lost focus, suggesting that relevant knowledge was more limited. Most successful were discussions of structural functionalism which seemed quite well understood, recognizing that the emphasis is on structure and that agency is largely missing. Discussion of political economy as a school of thought was more problematic; several candidates focused narrowly on the economic with power and politics missing, and discussion of the relation between structure and agency derived from the ethnographic reference rather than theory.

### Question 3

This was the most popular question: the majority focused on a diachronic perspective, with others split between idealist and materialist perspectives. There were some sound answers on a diachronic perspective, however the narrow requirements (one school of thought, one theoretical perspective) challenged the limited descriptive knowledge of most candidates whether in terms of Historical Particularism or Political Economy, and quite often responses introduced materials that were tangential to the question. Those who focused on an idealist perspective and symbolic theory were much more successful, producing several informed discussions that were closely focused and detailed. A materialist perspective was usually linked, appropriately, to cultural ecology or cultural materialism but rather narrowly understood, and ethnographic materials were more limited, oversimplified, or lacking in detail.

### Question 4

The responses were more often than not problematic: rather than answer the question, many simply described the differences between particularistic and universalistic perspectives, often in general terms without any attempt to explore the reasons for these differences or to relate this to the development of anthropological theory. However this was not always the case; several candidates developed informed and thoughtful arguments, linked for example to historical shifts from scientific to more

humanistic approaches or from a search for human commonalities to a focus on cultural differences as ethnographic accounts proliferated.

### Question 5

There were very few responses to this question: some were excellent, with clear understanding of cohesion- and conflict-centred perspectives and working with “structuralist theory” via Durkheim and Bourdieu and symbolic theory (Geertz and Turner) respectively, and some were very limited in terms of knowledge and application.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- The challenge of this paper is for candidates to be secure enough in their knowledge and understanding of theoretical perspectives, schools of thought and ethnography, to be able to think and write with and about these components in response to a specific unseen question to demonstrate an understanding of some of the ways in which perspectives and schools of thought shape ethnographic accounts. As noted above, for many candidates, where knowledge of these different components is limited in range and/or to “learned” materials taught only in relation to a particular context, this presents a difficult task.
- While it is encouraging to see that most candidates are able to present some kind of descriptive knowledge of perspectives and one or two schools of thought, in many cases this still appears to be learned or memorized rather than well understood, which makes application to new questions and even familiar ethnography difficult, often limiting relevance overall. The challenge then for the teacher is to find ways to help candidates develop confidence in their knowledge and understanding of both perspectives and schools of thought through application, discussion and writing in the classroom.
- Teachers need to make sure that candidates have some familiarity with current schools of thought as well as recent ethnography: this has improved over the past few examination sessions but still needs attention in some centres.



## Standard level paper one

### Component grade boundaries

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

### General comments

Overall, the majority of candidates was able to demonstrate a general understanding of the text, and in some cases were able to produce insightful and well informed responses which showed good anthropological knowledge.

This examination session, the chosen extract presented an account on the consequences of the increasing use of technology on social relations and culture in a society, exemplified by how the use of GPS units and other technologies (snowmobiles in particular) have changed the way in which Igloodik Inuit orient themselves on land and at sea. The extract discussed the complex ways in which modernity and tradition co-exist.

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

Though many candidates were able to evidence a general understanding of the extract, some answers remained on a descriptive level or were quite dependent on the text. Some candidates appeared unaware that they should be using their own words and incorporating anthropological concepts to demonstrate their understanding.

Not all candidates attempted to define or discuss key concepts (*eg* modernity, tradition, culture) relevant to the questions. Thus some answers were more descriptive than analytical, leading to limited arguments and rather superficial comparisons.

Some candidates did not fully contextualize their comparative 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. Though there has been some progress in this aspect, it continues to be a point to consider.

A small number of candidates were unable to complete all the questions on the paper. In particular, question 3 was sometimes left unfinished, or so brief as to be too short to gain a good mark.

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

In terms of areas of the programme, a great number of candidates appeared to be familiar with anthropological concepts and issues related to the extract. The dynamics of modernity and tradition, processes of globalization and social change, culture and socialization seem to be topics that most schools are working on in class as evidenced by the candidates' knowledge and understanding.

Thus, the range of achievement was generally related to the ability to discuss and apply specifically, anthropological concepts and approaches and to develop answers that were analytical and anthropologically informed.

It is pleasing to see that many candidates were able to make informed statements about the viewpoint of the anthropologist, giving evidence of teachers preparing candidates in this aspect.

The performance of some new centres was quite encouraging, suggesting that good teaching programmes are in place. It is encouraging to read a good range of well-structured answers drawing on several updated contemporary ethnographies across the candidate cohort.

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

### Question 1

Most candidates seemed capable of giving an account of how the use of GPS units and other technologies have changed the way in which Igloodik Inuit orient themselves on land and at sea. Most did so by identifying relevant points/examples, but generalizations were limited and in some cases rather dependent on the text itself.

The more successful responses presented relevant generalizations. Better answers included generalizations about the fact that the introduction of new technologies has had both positive and negative consequences, which have been unevenly distributed across members of a society and increased differences between people, demonstrating good anthropological understanding.

### Question 2

Higher achieving answers provided detailed analysis incorporating concepts and knowledge from social and cultural anthropology that were relevant to the analysis and interpretation of the passage.

The relationship between technological changes on the one hand and, on the other, social relations and culture was explained in various ways. Some good responses approached this question from general anthropological concepts and terms related to different themes: individuals, groups and society; societies and cultures in contact; economic organization and the environment and systems of knowledge. The higher achieving responses realized that these changes are occurring in the context of

changing relationships to learning and to forms of activities such as work and leisure, also noticing that not all Inuit are of the same mind, with some embracing the GPS as amplification of human ability, while others are seeing it as a catalyst for a rift between generations.

However, some responses were only descriptive, and demonstrated limited understanding of relevant anthropological issues and concepts. In some cases, responses merely paraphrased the extract and tended to be repetitive.

There was a more comprehensive attempt to include the viewpoint of the anthropologist in response to this question.

### Question 3

Many candidates were able to produce good responses to this question which required a demonstration of an understanding that modernity and tradition are always intertwined in any society. As the relationship between modernity and tradition may take many forms, this question allowed candidates to make comparisons of different kinds and draw from a wide range of ethnographic materials.

The majority of candidates structured their answers as a comparison and at least attempted to introduce a comparative ethnography. Candidates who did particularly well on this question often did so because they were focused and chose well contextualized and relevant comparative ethnographies.

It was encouraging to see that many centres are incorporating more contemporary materials into their readings which provided opportunities for relevant discussions.

Popular ethnographies chosen were Bourgois' *In Search of Respect*, Okely's *The Traveller-Gypsies*, Lee's *The Dobe Ju/'hoansi*, Weiner's *The Trobrianders of Papua New Guinea*, Nakamura's *Deaf in Japan: Signing and the Politics of Identity*, Piot's *Remotely Global* and Bending's work with the Penan in Malaysia. All of the above provided relevant materials for comparison.

## 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 1s 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 be aware that question 1 is descriptive and question 2 analytical. Teachers need to help candidates clarify key question terms, to make sure that answers are relevant and closely focused.
- In question 1, candidates need to use their own words rather than rely 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 candidates should be encouraged to work on developing their analytical skills so that they can move beyond merely offering descriptive responses. Also, candidates are expected to show explicit recognition of the viewpoint of the anthropologist.
- In question 3, candidates should learn to present a comparative ethnography in terms of author, place, and historical context. Some candidates were unable to achieve more than four marks for this question because they seemed unaware of the need to present the ethnography in full detail.
- Overall, candidates should be able to discuss and develop a conceptual understanding of the ethnographic materials they read. It is this conceptual framework that will enable them to discuss the ethnographic materials more effectively and critically.
- Finally, in terms of ethnographic materials, it is important that teachers try to ensure that candidates are familiar with some contemporary ethnographic works. The opportunity to read more recent ethnographies in addition to classic older material will enable candidates to cover many areas of the programme more thoroughly.

## Standard level paper two

### Component grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 6	7 - 12	13 - 17	18 - 21	22 - 26	27 - 30	31 - 44

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

In terms of the syllabus, it seems that many candidates were not familiar with tourism, the shift from production to consumption, the concept of development programmes or ideology as related to religious movements or ethnic groups, as these questions received very few and usually quite limited responses, perhaps also reflecting a lack of relevant ethnographic knowledge in these areas. With one notable exception, this was also the case with responses to the importance of economic organization in relation to social movements (usually not understood), as well as to kinship which is more surprising. And although more candidates chose to write about globalization, most often in relation to exchange systems, more often than not they had difficulty in establishing the relevance of their materials. In terms of the examination, as has been the case in past examination sessions, while many candidates were able to use key concepts in the context of ethnographic materials, analysis remained limited by lack of explicit definition and/or discussion of key terms (criterion A). Similarly, comparisons remained often implicit and not well detailed (criterion C). And although the presentation of ethnographic knowledge was usually more successful, many candidates did not provide complete identification and were not always effective in establishing the relevance of their materials. Finally, for the paper as a whole, many candidates did not demonstrate much knowledge and understanding of processes of change and transformation (criterion D) or knowledge of more than two societies (criterion E).

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

Areas of the programme where candidates were more successful included symbolism, gender and power, the social use of ritual or myth, and identity in relation to migration or indigenous peoples. Although many of the responses to these questions were more descriptive than analytical, most candidates were able to demonstrate some anthropological knowledge and understanding of key terms and the relevance of quite well detailed ethnographic data that was clearly focused if not always complete. There were also some candidates who were able to go well beyond this, providing informed and thoughtful definition and/or discussion of key terms, which was applied to detailed ethnographic materials of at least three societies overall, using analytical and comparative skills to develop an argument that took account of relevant processes of change and transformation.

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

### Question 1

There were very few responses to this question about development programmes, suggesting that the concept was not well understood and/or a lack of knowledge of relevant ethnographic materials. One more successful response examined health centres among the Shuar in Ecuador and how these affected local knowledge of health and illness.

### Question 2

This was a popular question, with most choosing to focus on the social use of ritual. Although more descriptive than analytical, some were able to demonstrate familiarity with the three-stage model of the ritual process and link this to relevant and sometimes quite well detailed ethnography including the healing dance of the Ju'Hoansi (Lee), Trobriand rituals surrounding death (Weiner), and the process of migration from Mexico to the USA in *Shadowed Lives* (Chavez). Materials about the Yanomamo (Chagnon) and Selknam (Chapman) were less successfully developed. In terms of myth, the most effective response linked myth to identity and power in relation to the Penan (Bending) and Hmong (Fadiman).

### Question 3

This was a popular question about the relation between gender and power. Some responses were quite successful in demonstrating some knowledge and understanding of relevant concepts and/or approaches, and with some evidence of analysis rather than just description. Although as concepts gender was less well-addressed than power, most candidates were able to reference other relevant terms such as hierarchy, division of labour, the public/private dichotomy and use these more or less effectively to develop some kind of argument or account. Some candidates described women's role as mediators with "hidden power" among the Travellers (Okely) and Yanomamo (Chagnon), although this was rarely examined further. Other materials included the Trobrianders (Weiner) though often missing women's forms of power, *In Search of Respect* (Bourgois) focused on violence against women but too often without sufficient context, the Ju'Hoansi (Lee) and the Swazi (Kuper).

### Question 4

Responses to this question treated globalization in very general or "common sense" terms and links between globalization and the ethnographic materials (Dinka; Inuit; Yanomamo/Chagnon and Shuar/Harner) were left implicit.

**Question 5**

This question about identity was relatively popular and some responses were anthropologically informed and quite well developed. In relation to indigenous peoples the most successful responses compared identity among the Penan (Bending) and Hmong (Fadiman); in relation to migration more effective responses included some working with *Shadowed Lives* (Chavez), *In Search of Respect* (Bourgois) or compared the Hmong (Fadiman) and ethnic groups in Singapore.

**Question 6**

The very few responses focused on the relation between ideology and ethnic groups, and were most successful when working with the Traveller-Gypsies (Okely), where ideology and beliefs about purity and pollution were clearly articulated as important boundary mechanisms as a minority group.

**Question 7**

Among the few responses to this question about economic organization, one – focused on social movements among the Penan (Bending) and Deaf in Japan (Nakamura) – was excellent, but others were much more limited, lacking clear understanding of key terms as well as knowledge of relevant ethnography.

**Question 8**

There were no answers to this question about tourism.

**Question 9**

The few responses to this question about symbolism produced several very well informed responses, working with the notion of symbols as polyvocal and Penan (Bending) and Hmong (Fadiman) materials.

**Question 10**

There were very few responses to this question about the shift from production to consumption, one of which was excellent, demonstrating detailed knowledge and understanding of relevant concepts and ethnographic/journalistic materials (Penan by Bending and Hmong by Fadiman). Other responses were much more limited in terms of demonstrating specifically anthropological knowledge.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- As stated in past subject reports, the key to effective responses is the candidates' knowledge and understanding of anthropological concepts given in the question that can then be explicitly linked to relevant and well detailed ethnographic materials, to establish a framework for both analysis and comparison. Ethnographic description

alone, however well detailed and essential, is not sufficient. For many candidates informed analysis and systematic comparison continue to be a challenge and need to be something that is constantly discussed and practiced in class. In this context it may be worthwhile exploring strategies that encourage candidates to develop relevant generalizations before introducing ethnography.

- Candidates need to be confident in their knowledge and understanding of their ethnographic materials to illustrate and support larger arguments and claims. They need to learn how to contextualize these, to provide full identification (too often not the case this session), to recognize when case studies are not ethnographic (an example from this year was Fadiman's journalistic account of the Hmong in California), and how to select from all that they know to ensure that that these are directly relevant to the question. Targeted teaching strategies and classroom practice can help to support the development of these skills.
- Candidates also need to learn to develop explicit systematic comparisons for every essay, whether or not the question itself is comparative. Again, targeted strategies and practice can encourage the development of this skill.
- It is essential that candidates are familiar with, and understand, all assessment criteria, including D (4 marks) and E (2 marks) which are assessed across both responses.