

SOCIAL & CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 13	14 - 28	29 - 42	43 - 54	55 - 65	66 - 77	78 - 100

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 12	13 - 26	27 - 39	40 - 52	53 - 66	67 - 79	80 - 100

Higher level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 7	8 - 10	11 - 12	13 - 14	15 - 16	17 - 20

The range and suitability of the work submitted

As was the case in the November '07 session, a great majority of the reports reviewed chose appropriate research topics, again reversing the trend seen in previous examination sessions, and the great majority focused their research questions effectively for short research reports.

Many of the reports presented issue-based research issues or questions. However, where group work was carried out, research questions tended to be context-based, taking a broader ethnographic approach. It was satisfying to see teachers appropriately acknowledging and commenting on group research projects.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A: Identification of an issue or question. As mentioned above, a great majority of candidates presented well-focused research issues or questions. Still, a few schools were markedly less successful in having students choose appropriate topics.

Criterion B: Presentation of data. As has been the case for some years, schools vary widely in the extent to which their candidates present data appropriately. Many candidates presented data appropriately, but it is still evident that in a few schools candidates are not being trained in the methodology of field research, applicable to the HL IA assignment. A common shortcoming was a lack of a balanced presentation in describing and applying research techniques. Another shortcoming was partly an organizational issue, a failure to separate data presentation from data analysis. Clarity in data presentation and detail provided were varied widely, and very few candidates received full marks under this criterion.

Criterion C: Interpretation of Data. Performance in regard to this criterion showed a marked improvement over recent sessions. Most candidates interpreted data so as to provide at least general support for the research questions set forth, although very few candidates received full credit here. It is still the case that few candidates present and utilize explicit analytical frameworks, informed by anthropological theory. Again, in this respect, schools varied widely as to the level of analysis their candidates routinely carried out.

Criterion D: Justification, comparison, and critical evaluation. This complex criterion continues to prove to be the most difficult IA criterion to satisfy, and is still the one in which discrepancies in marking between teachers and moderators are most evident. Yet again, however, the trend of recent sessions was reversed here, as most candidates were able to offer at least some valid comparisons and evaluations of their research techniques. A very few schools continued to do poorly in this regard.

Criterion E: Personal experience and research issues. This continues to be a criterion under which schools vary widely in performance. Once again, however, improvement in performance over recent sessions was marked here. A strong majority of candidates (2/3) received 2 or 3 marks (maximum of 3), showing that candidates are increasingly sensitive to the importance of examining ethical issues in anthropological research.

Criterion F: Anthropological insight and imagination. While it continues to be the case that a minority of reports receive full marks for anthropological insight, performance under this criterion also shows improvement over recent sessions. In marked contrast to the May '07 session, the number receiving full marks (2) was about twice the number receiving none. Yet again, it is still clear that a few schools are apparently failing to guide their candidates in asking valid and significant anthropological questions.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

- From the results reported above, it is gratifying to suggest that schools are making real progress in guiding students in their choice of suitable topics, and in the difficult initial task of narrowly focusing their research questions. As the program in Social and Cultural Anthropology is undergoing revision (the new program will present first examinations in 2010), schools should be sure to examine the new Subject Guide (now available), and the new Teacher Support Materials, which will be available later this year. Regarding the HL IA assignment, important changes in assessment criteria have been made (see Subject Guide) which should make them more student- and teacher-friendly.

- There is certainly considerable room for improvement in applying anthropological theory to the construction of analytical frameworks for interpreting and analyzing data. Consulting the I. B. materials mentioned above would also aid teachers in helping students find appropriate analytical frameworks. Short periodical articles, available in anthologies or readers, may also offer models for designing well-focused research projects. Further the I.B. Online curriculum Center site (the OCC) for the subject offers relevant reference works in the Curriculum Resources list relating to ethnographic methods, and more specifically, to student research projects.
- Teachers are urged to pay close attention to the criteria when critiquing their students' work during the planning and writing stage, and when marking the final research report.

New teachers may find considerable discrepancies between the marks they assign and the moderated marks for this assignment, and may not at first see results comparable to the most successful schools, although most schools continue to show a wide range in marks for the IA assignment. Through patient work guiding candidates and working closely with the criteria, new teachers may expect to see steady progress in results as time passes.

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 - 14	15 - 16	17 - 20

The range and suitability of the work submitted

There has been a positive development in the five years since the observation and critique was introduced in 2002. Students are now almost without exception finding appropriate settings in which they can do non-participation fieldwork, and writing critical reports on their experiences. Again this year many of the Internal Assessments were interesting and insightful.

As in previous years, there were problems with some Criteria. The range of work varied considerably. Differences were, as in all components, evident in relation to ability. But in this component differences are also a result of a lack of understanding of specific Criteria. Unfortunately this applies to teachers as well, which can be seen in marking, especially of the Critiques. Some students are clearly disadvantaged by insufficient guidance in what the requirements entail.

This year's SL IA showed an improvement in the understanding of Criterion B, the nature and focus of the observation. Fewer candidates see this solely as the physical position of the observer, and many now seem to be aware that mental or cultural positions and predilections play a role when we chose to focus on one social phenomenon or a group of people rather

than another. Still, too many students use the Critique to explain exactly where they were seated during the observation, which is of limited importance.

A major challenge for both students and teachers is Criterion C that requires an understanding of description and analysis. Every year there are more students who critique their reports well by including this perspective on the data recorded. This year was no exception. Even though discussion is often shallow or perfunctory, it has increasingly become a focus of the Critiques. This is not the case for all schools and far too many still ignore Criterion C entirely. This lowers marks considerably but more unfortunately can leave SL anthropology students with the mistaken impression that fieldwork is merely a matter of recording what one observes “objectively”.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A As in previous years, the Report was the most successfully completed area of the exercise. The main organizing principal was often time, one hour’s observation recorded in a fair amount of detail. Students chose almost exclusively to observe a particular context rather than to seek a theme. Although there was usually a fair amount of detail, Reports were sometimes written in such a perfunctory style that there was little to critique. Students note that they were advised to be as objective as possible and while that is good anthropological practice it often makes for clinical or sterile Reports. Those few who chose a thematic approach had decidedly more material to work with in the Critiques. Some also added an analytical framework that helped guide their observations.

Happily, there are fewer students each year who participate in the field or add interviews. This is a good trend since the Criteria are specifically designed for observation only.

Criterion B More than the other Criteria, B asks students to specifically reflect on their own position in relation to the observation, including choice of venue or theme as well as personal interest in the people they have observed. This was evident in the choices made when selecting and recording information during the observation but students did not always give specific examples or fully discuss these aspects of the Report in the Critique.

Some students were quite adept at recognising that what they noticed in their observations was directly related to their own interests and opinions. Some even recognised that the choice of the setting was dependent on their interests. For example, one student explained how she is fashion conscious and therefore wanted to watch shoppers; another was worried about violence in sports and therefore went to observe a football match between rival teams. These choices were discussed convincingly in the Critique. Others mentioned that their gender, social status and nationality influenced the focus of fieldwork. This gave an interesting dimension to Criterion B that overlapped well with the requirements of Criterion E, critical evaluation of the Report.

There is now a healthy balance between self reflection and the work of other ethnographers with a strong emphasis on the former. Some Critiques have previously leaned too heavily on descriptions of other fieldworker’s challenges rather than critiquing one’s own.

A recurring problem with many Critiques is that they focus on perceived mistakes or flaws in the Report. It is not a mistake to be who you are and choose certain areas to consider rather than others or to make certain conclusions. The mistake is, if it were, not recognizing and explaining the relationship between the student's personal inclination and fieldwork observation.

As mentioned above, too many students are still reading Criterion B superficially and understanding position narrowly to mean physical position.

Criterion C This remains that most challenging of all criteria and only the better candidates were able to distinguish between description and analysis. Reports were for the most part descriptive but even here there was room for critique since most descriptions included some form of inference. Examples from fast food restaurants: The stressed-out man in a three piece suit scowled at the mother of three who was taking her time ordering their meals. There are many implications of inferences here that could have been taken up in the Critique. Not as mistakes of negative bias but in discussions of subjectivity and how data is recorded. And: There were three Caucasian families, two families of Asian descent and a group of African America boys wearing low slung pants and bling. The categorization here can be seen as an attempt at analysis, and the description, especially of the boys, infers that people are recognisable types. These kinds of assumptions were often ignored in the Critiques.

In some cases students found it interesting to notice that even choice of wording can colour the impression the reader has about the people observed. And some were quite adept and discussing the description and analysis in their Reports with apt examples. But Criterion C continues to present challenges that some students and teachers have not quite grasped.

Criterion D Many critiques are strong in discussion of assumptions, judgement and bias. This was for many students the major focus of the Critique and the discussions were in general quite good. The more successful papers associated these assumptions with conceptual habits and learned behaviour or with wider social issues and systems of classification and connected this discussion to analysis and the position of the observer (B). Here students are asked to recognize assumptions based on experience or hearsay and that in doing fieldwork one must be acutely aware of these judgments so as not to skew data or worse yet, give unfair or unethical portraits of the people we study. This was not done convincingly in most papers.

This year for the first time some students recognized the need to discuss the way they categorized people by "race" in their reports. This is a positive development. Many students living in counties where race is an issue and a part of public discourse have previously ignored this descriptive factor when observing the multi-ethnicity of public places. Some students now seem to understand that what they chose to observe and record can be coloured by public debate.

Criterion E Critical reflection is the area that varied most widely in terms of content and ability. The most adept critical analysis set the observation in relation to anthropological fieldwork, not just by quoting ethnographers as has been the tendency in past years, but by sensing some of the challenges of recording data in the field such as perception and subjectively. Weaker students tended not to evaluate the report at all but rather sum up what

they saw once again. Too many students seem to feel the Critique is a forum to explain their mistakes or to supplement the field report with additional information.

The central element here is that candidates make an attempt to reflect on the fieldwork process and its challenges and to recognize the ways in which they have operated in the field and how the choices they have made are connected to wider anthropological issues. There were quite a few who managed to balance these elements well.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Many of the recommendations mentioned in previous component reports are being followed and the SL IA has become a genuine learning experience for most SL students. Further improvement could be centred on several areas. First, understanding the Criteria more fully, especially Criterion C and the differences in description and analysis. Secondly, giving students the option to write a draft so that they can be guided into following the Criteria would be a useful tool. And lastly, asking students to add a more thematic approach to their observations rather than solely looking at the context.

One way to help students prepare for the Critique could be to refer to the ways of knowing in TOK, especially perception. A good anthropologically related TOK exercise could be to show interestingly ambivalent pictures and ask for interpretations. This can be used as a mini observation where ones experiences and even prejudices are used to interpret what we see. It can be revealing and entertaining. A Greenlandic fisherman can be taken for a Cuban boat refugee, or example. Why a student from Miami has that impression can become a useful educational tool to explain interpretative perception, or asking students to draw a map of the world. Countries where they have lived are depicted with great precision, others largely ignored. And Asian students not surprisingly place the Pacific Ocean in the centre. Students can then be encouraged to see their observation reports in the same light and perhaps be inspired to critique them more fully with greater insight in to how we interpret what we see.

Too many students focus on perceived mistakes in their Reports. Reports need to be evaluated, not corrected. The point of the exercise is to show students that our understanding of the world colours our research. They should, after studying anthropology for 6 months be aware of some of the challenges of data collection. If they have not achieved this in a first draft, they should be guided to do so. This also applies to specific criterion. If there is not recognition of the difference in description and analysis, for example, then students should have a chance to rectify this. One of the reasons IA is now a component in all subjects at all levels is because it gives students the chance to improve their work, something not possible on written exams. They need to be given that chance.

Interesting observations lend themselves well to solid analysis. Students need good material to work with from the Report. As mentioned above, a thematic approach can complement a contextual approach in the observation. Rather than listing who goes in and out of Starbucks, for example, students can try to make sense of what they see, try to draw some conclusions however tentative they may be. This makes the Report more dynamic and can help to give the Critique more depth.

Higher level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 2	3 - 5	6 - 8	9 - 11	12 - 13	14 - 16	17 - 20

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

Weaker scripts tended to be short, very descriptive and either directly quoted from or very closely paraphrased the text. This continues to be a problem and candidates who depend very heavily on quotations (particularly those who do not even acknowledge this by the use of quotation marks) do not do well. Careful reading of the passage is essential as a misunderstanding may lead to irrelevant answers. In this paper a significant proportion of candidates took the claim that the Mursi had begun to use lip-plates to avoid enslavement as the basis for their answers and this was not helpful. In a very small number of cases it was clear that candidates had not finished their answer to question 3 because they had run out of time in the examination. Too many candidates failed to locate the comparative ethnographies they selected for question 3. The very small number of candidates who answered the questions on the paper out of sequence (for example, answering question 2 and 3 before question 1) tended to produce rather weak scripts overall.

The levels of knowledge, understanding and skills demonstrated

These varied from the very good scripts which had well-formulated, focussed and detailed answers to the questions to the very weak which were extremely brief, showed errors of understanding, discussed irrelevant material, were very descriptive and rarely rose above quotation and paraphrases of the text. However, almost all candidates completed the paper and answered all three questions. It is a pity that a very few candidates did not answer one of the questions on the paper as this has a significant impact on the overall mark a candidate can obtain. The best scripts selected relevant two relevant groups within a social context for the comparative question while far too many scripts had no fully identified comparative society. However, even the weakest scripts showed an awareness that comparison was required and did attempt, albeit poorly and often only implicitly, to compare the Mursi and tourists with other groups where unequal power relations strongly coloured the social interactions that were possible.

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

Question 1 The weaker answers to this question simply quoted directly or closely paraphrased sections from the passage. These answers remained purely at the level of description and usually failed to show any real understanding of the passage itself. Some

candidates listed 6 points, presumably one per mark awarded for this question, and did not produce answers which showed the ability not only to select relevant descriptive points from the text with which to answer the question but also to order these in a reasoned and discursive response.

Some candidates mis-read the section in the passage dealing with the belief held by some that Mursi women began to make use of lip-plates in order to avoid becoming enslaved. These candidates reported this claim as fact and so failed to understand that the explanation itself requires explanation in terms of the values and prejudices of those who hold to this explanation. Some of the candidates who misunderstood and mis-read the origin of the lip-plates went on to develop discussions and to reach unconvincing conclusions based on this error.

Better candidates were able to make this point and so showed a close and careful reading of the text as well as their understanding of how prejudices and assumptions may feed into misguided but always understandable rationalisations for cultural practices.

Again, while weaker answers understood that the encounter between Mursi and tourists was uncomfortable they tended to focus on one side of this encounter, most often that of the Mursi, while the stronger answers were able to describe why the encounter was so uncomfortable for all parties involved and also to include the differential power relations in the encounter as part of the reason for this situation.

As ever the strongest answers showed clear understanding of the passage, an ability to select relevant examples from the text which were woven into confident and reasoned answers in the candidate's own words but utilising appropriate concepts drawn from social and cultural anthropology.

Question 2 While question 1 requires candidates to demonstrate their ability to understand the passage at a primarily descriptive level the second question on paper 1 requires candidates to use material from the text but to move towards anthropological generalisations on the basis of this material. The weakest candidates provided purely descriptive answers to this question and the very weakest again depended heavily on direct quotations from the text. Many repeated material from question 1 in question 2. The better answers were able to understand the Mursi lip-plate as a rite of passage for women and as a potent cultural symbol. Some of these better candidates were able to describe how the meaning of the lip-plate was different for both Mursi and tourist and how the encounter with tourists was compelling the Mursi to understand their practice as outsiders did and to re-evaluate themselves through the negative gaze of others. Some good answers described the lip-plates in terms of identity, both for individual women and at a broader cultural level. These candidates were able to draw on relevant concepts and theories on identity and identity construction. Candidates chose different ways of focusing their answers, some at the level of symbol, ritual, identity and gender, and others in terms of power and the interactions between two groups where the inequalities of power structure and limit the possible interactions between them.

Question 3 Unfortunately, many candidates did not read this question as one that simply required two groups who happen to interact in one place and time to be compared with the Mursi and tourist case as all that was required and many described two different case studies

or two ethnographies in their answers. The question only required interactions between two distinct groups such as the Mursi and the tourists, or one powerful group and one less powerful group within one social context. The question was not intended to be a double comparison which would evidently be very challenging given the time constraints of the examination. However, as so many candidates did seem to consider that they were being asked to provide two ethnographic cases to compare to that of the Mursi and tourists, the examiners took the decision not to penalise any candidate who wrote on more than one ethnography. This means that all the material a candidate produced in answer to this question was marked and credit given for the ability of the candidates to produce systematic comparisons with similarities and differences to the Mursi example. Inevitably, however, candidates who wrote about two different ethnographies and described two sets of interactions within these societies and then compared these to the Mursi and the tourists were not often able to provide the level of detail expected of a very strong answer to this question. This matter was also taken into consideration by the examiners when deciding on the grade boundaries for the paper in order to ensure that candidates were not adversely affected by misreading this question in their results.

Popular comparison societies were the Kayapo and the Trobrianders while some candidates also wrote about the Sherpas and their interactions with mountaineers. Some candidates also chose their own societies and their own experiences as tourists or as members of a host society visited by tourists. These latter responses tended to remain at the level of shallow generalisation and lacked anthropological insight. Candidates should be discouraged from writing common sense and journalistic generalisations about their own societies and should not include this material unless they have made a detailed anthropological study of their own society which shows that they have subjected their society to the careful analysis and scrutiny required by anthropologists.

Some candidates described one or two ethnographic examples but then did not explicitly compare these to the Mursi case. Others failed to obtain more than four marks because the comparisons were not sustained or fully developed (mostly showing a few similarities and no differences). The very weakest scripts showed no evidence of having studied a relevant ethnography. Several candidates appeared to run out of time and left the question unfinished.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Question 1: Candidates should not depend on quotations for their answer to this question and neither should they simply produce a list of points which are not integrated into a coherent argument. Although this is a primarily descriptive question candidates should be able to discuss the descriptive material and to draw from this some clear interpretation and conclusion about the issue that the question is dealing with. Careful reading of the text is necessary in order not to mis-read what is being said and so lead to discussions which are not relevant. If candidates are not entirely clear about part of the passage they would be best advised to avoid mentioning it at all in their answer and many candidates did, in fact, produce sound scripts which did not mention slavery and the alleged link between this and the lip-plates.

Question 2: Candidates should avoid repeating material from question 1 in question 2. Further, although some descriptive material from the text is necessary in this question the candidates should be encouraged to move from close reading of the text to generalisations drawing in some of the anthropological concepts and possibly theories that they have studied and which are relevant to the question. In this case candidates who were able to write about identity (and even name theorists), symbols, rites of passage, and/or globalisation all developed acceptable answers to the question by taking the material in the text in different directions. Candidates who were able to view the lip-plate as a symbol of identity from both the Mursi and the tourist perspective, and also show how the meaning of the lip-plate had changed over time produced the strongest and most nuanced answers to this question. Here, candidates need to show that they can develop a coherent and sustained answer to the question that draws on material from the text as supporting evidence for their discussion.

Question 3: this question not only requires a suitable and justified comparative ethnography but needs to have a sustained comparison with similarities, differences and generalisations all woven into the answer. Candidates should be discouraged from comparing the ethnographic case in the examination paper with their own society unless they have specifically studied this in the classroom as one of their ethnographies.

Candidates should be encouraged to stick to the text and the material in the text as the basis for their answers. Those candidates who misread, misinterpreted or substituted material they already knew (or thought they knew) for that contained in the text sometimes produced answers which failed to do well despite their length and general reasoning as they were based on fundamental errors of understanding.

The different skills assessed in each question should be made clear to the candidates so that they are aware of what they are required to do in order to gain the best possible grade on this paper.

Candidates should be strongly advised to answer the questions in the order in which they appear on the paper as this gives them the best possible chance of doing well on the examination overall.

Higher level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 6	7 - 12	13 - 17	18 - 21	22 - 25	26 - 29	30 - 40

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

As ever the same key areas of the programme continue to prove difficult for some candidates and these relate to the definitions of central concepts and terms in questions; the

understanding of basic concepts; the use, or rather more often, lack of anthropological theory; and the interweaving of relevant theory and ethnography. Each of these issues are taken up and discussed below.

Defining terms: The central concepts appearing in questions were often undefined, poorly defined or only partially defined. These terms, such as "social identity", "ethnicity", "reciprocity", "masculinity", "globalization", "social movements", "post-colonialism", and "commodification" are too often not seen as problematic and in need of definition. Often the terms are used in over general and commonsense ways rather than in the more specialized ways in which they are used by anthropologists.

Application of theory: Schools varied widely in the ability shown by their candidates to carry on theoretically informed discussions. Candidates from several schools typically made little or no reference to theory, and regularly applied common-sense wisdom to interpreting and analyzing ethnography.

Injected theory and methodology: Candidates from several schools seem to labour to find and include relevant theory, in the effort sometimes seizing upon inappropriate and not always well represented theory. In some cases it appears that the candidates were limited in the breadth of their knowledge of theory and were compelled to use the same theory no matter what the question. The concern to supply theory sometimes led to gratuitous citation, for example, the injection of "(Malinowski, 192_)" when "fieldwork" or "participant observation" was mentioned. In other cases candidates appeared to have a set statement to make about a particular theory or anthropologist and this was included whether or not it was relevant to the question.

Weak knowledge of particular topical areas: Although there has been some improvement over recent years it is still the case that Section B themes and topics still suffer from neglect by comparison with Section A or more "traditional" themes and topics. "Social movements", "urbanization," "tourism," "post-colonialism", globalization", etc., were on the whole not well handled and some candidates appeared to struggle to find a question in Section B that they could even attempt to answer.

The levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

Schools varied widely in the ability of their candidates to present and properly apply theoretical perspectives. Some candidates produced exemplary work showing high levels of knowledge and skill in answering the questions. These candidates have a broad range and in-depth of knowledge of anthropological theory, the history of the theories, a sound ability to select and use relevant concepts and detailed knowledge of several ethnographies which they are able to draw on to produce detailed, reasoned, analytically sound and thoughtful essays. These exceptionally good candidates are already producing work of degree standard. At the other extreme, however, some candidates were only able to demonstrate very elementary knowledge of anthropological theory and showed little evidence of having studied the requisite number of ethnographies in detail.

The breadth of ethnographic resources used and the depth of analysis practiced varied widely as usual, and the variation shown between schools was clearly more marked than intra-school variation. Candidates in several schools consistently failed to satisfy the requirement of showing detailed knowledge of four societies, and there was also the practice of limiting principal readings to the same world region or even the same nation. In some cases candidates drew on films as their only source of ethnographic information about a given society and in some of these cases it was not clear that the films cited were clearly ethnographic.

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

Question 1 This was a popular question, with very varied approaches evident in the different schools. "Identity" and "social identity" were usually not well defined, and in general were rather narrowly understood, whether explicitly defined or only implicitly through use. An example of this narrow understanding was the tendency to equate "social identity" with group identity, and frequently limiting it to ethnic identity. Relatively few candidates were able to see "social identity" as a broader concept, and to approach it, for example, in terms of ascribed and achieved individual roles, stereotyping, etc. Only some candidates were able to show that "interactions with others" could be both within and between groups. Popular ethnographies used to answer this question included Abu-Lughod and Bourgois. The very weakest candidates used the Mursi material from the paper 1 they had just completed.

Question 2 Relatively few candidates answered this question and those who did mostly chose the health and illness option. Often, however, candidates focused on illness rather than on concepts and understandings of health or the relations between the two. There were relatively few very good answers that showed an ability to link theoretical perspectives to ethnography. Better answers found substantial ethnographic examples, using for instance Lacandon and Huichol material, but few attempts were made to analyze areas such as classification of illnesses, or of disease management and health restoration. One or two poorer essays injected an evolutionary approach, describing a progressive evolution from "traditional" to "scientific" concepts concerning illness.

Question 3 Very few candidates attempted this question and those who did were not often able to answer all parts of the question tending rather to focus on religion and only mention morality in passing. Those candidates who did attempt this question often treated it in broad historical terms, and without employing specific ethnography. Many of these candidates drew on their own knowledge of their own religious traditions and were unable to view these from an anthropological perspective. Those candidates who did use ethnographic material studied in the classroom such as Abu-Lughod's work produced stronger answers to the question. Better answers viewed religion as an ideology supporting concepts of morality, but either symbolic or social-theoretic analyzes of how this operates were almost entirely lacking.

Question 4 A relatively popular question, which yielded some very good answers, employing a range of theoretical approaches, for example, citing Mauss, Lévi-Strauss, Polanyi and Sahlins. Theories and theorists were not, however, always correctly linked and some care should be taken to ensure that candidates are aware of just who did what and wrote what

when in their answers. "Reciprocity" was not always well defined but there were some notable exceptions to this with some excellent essays showing clear and detailed knowledge. Some candidates used appropriate analytical frameworks, such as Polanyi's, but without attribution. Answers tended to not realize the question's potential, for example, there was very little attention to how reciprocity might apply to industrial societies. Ortner's Sherpas, the Dobe, Trobrianders, and Yanomamo were common sources of examples.

Question 5 This was a fairly popular question. Candidates struggled to define "masculinity" and often the meaning of the term as employed by the candidates remained implicit in how the question was answered. Better answers applied theoretical perspectives from functionalist or symbolic anthropology approaches to data. Poorer answers did not represent the problematic nature of the term as pointing to a culturally-constructed variable, for example, sometimes equating it to *machismo*, and seeing it in black-and-white terms as a given. Changing male gender roles as part of a globalizing process among the Kung supplied some of the most apt and well-analyzed examples. Too often masculinity was considered to be synonymous with aggression and violence and the Yanomamo were frequently the ethnographic example chosen to exemplify this position. Some good answers drew on the ethnography by Bourgois and showed how even women could perform 'masculinity' in some contexts.

Question 6 This was a popular question. Economic organization and kinship was by far the most popular pair for comparison, with economic organization and political organization in second place. There were several answers linking political organization and religion, more popular among Spanish-speakers. Although some ambitious answers linked economic organization and kinship to fundamental theoretical issues, especially conflict vs. cohesion and structure vs. agency, the theoretical implications of the questions were rarely well-developed. Ortner's Sherpa, Pun's Shenzhen factory women, Bourgois' Barrio dwellers, and the Dobe were often well employed ethnographic examples.

The economic and political organization option was rather less popular, and did not stimulate much thinking about theoretical approaches. Marxist approaches and political economy perspectives were not explicitly or closely applied to analyzing ethnography. Candidates seemed often to be guided by their ethnographic choices in stressing either economic or political organization, and their answers were often lacking the balanced treatment which an appropriate analytical framework would have provided.

The economic organization and religion option was a rare choice, but yielded one excellent answer to this question elaborating a social action approach using Wong's Chinatown and Ortner's Sherpas as examples.

Religion and political organization was a combination attempted by some candidates but in general the answers to this question were disappointing. There was little application of theory, and the topic tended to provoke sometimes polemical historical summaries of the political power of religious institutions.

Question 7 This was not a popular question and one which did not appear to be well answered. "Social movement" was viewed as an unproblematic term, therefore not one requiring definition. A few candidates cited tourism as a "social movement," and another

produced a logically reasoned argument as to how social movements might spread and become "global" (without defining globalization), but gave no specific examples. No answer examined an actual social movement in the terms required by the question. Candidates appear to be unclear about what a social movement is and so most, quite sensibly if this is the case, chose not to answer the question.

Question 8 This was a relatively popular question in Section B. "Migration" was not always well defined or well understood. For example, at least one candidate interpreted the capitalist invasion of the territory of a traditional rural-based ethnic group as "migration," and then proceeded to focus on resource appropriation and social/cultural change. Bourgois' Barrio dwellers and Pun's Shenzhen were especially well used, and the accompanying theoretical

frameworks were sometimes well interpreted. The stipulation concerning "short-" vs. "long-term" impacts proved to be a stumbling block for some otherwise well-informed candidates, and few candidates convincingly dealt with both.

Question 9 For some candidates this question provided an opportunity to tell what they knew about the broad topics listed, but in most cases the specific contributions made by anthropology were slighted, and ethnography was employed mostly to exemplify the impact of urbanization and post-colonialism, the most popular choices. The best answers were to the urbanization option, which produced some excellent scripts. Bourgois' Barrio ethnography and Pun's Shenzhen study were well-used, although the former's elaborate theoretical frameworks were not well rendered. One candidate chose urbanization, but mainly discussed modernization and a few others defined urbanization as any form of culture contact, in one case using the supply of metal tools to indigenous populations as evidence of urbanization. Post-colonialism, the second most popular choice, was generally not well done. Candidates typically could link colonialism to ethnographic materials, but did not distinguish between colonial and post-colonial horizons. Some explicitly defined post-colonialism as the period after the arrival of the colonists but while the colonists were still in control of a territory.

Question 10 This was a very popular question, which often suggested the relevance of particular theoretical approaches, and which permitted the application of a wide range of ethnographic materials. "Conflict theory" was an obvious choice, but the potential of conflict theory for analysis of materials was not often much realized. Using Bourgois' Barrio study, and Ortner's Sherpas, *Sherpanis*, and *sahibs* led to some successful answers, although the balance between well laid-out theoretical approaches and well-chosen and detailed ethnography was not often realized. Some candidates answered this question well drawing on ethnography about the Bedouin and Northern Ireland. Some candidates successfully used the ideas of Barth, Goffman and Bourdieu to help frame their responses. Others had no theoretical grounding and in fact, often interpreted conflict in the most basic, physical terms. Poorer answers, of which there were many, took various off-question tacks. Several answers launched into laments of colonial exploitation in various parts of the world, usually producing superficial historical summaries.

Question 11 This was also a popular question, and produced several very good responses. The best answers proposed tourism as a globalizing force, and Ortner's Sherpa ethnography was used to especially good effect. Appadurai's "-scapes" provided the bases of good analytical frameworks for several answers. Here again, however, many attempts suffered

from an inability or a lack of concern to define "commodification," and to place it in an appropriate context of social and cultural change. In fact, "commodification" was often poorly understood. For example, some candidates said that *people* were "commodified" when they were influenced to buy something. A number of candidates equated "commodification" with the growth of a cash economy, or simply with commercialization. In turn, the cash economy and commercialization were the targets of simplistic laments over the corrupting effects of modernization in traditional societies. A majority of answers took a descriptive approach, neither defining commodification nor providing theoretical perspectives. A number of better answers, however, did realize that culture itself may be commodified.

Question 12 This was a fairly popular question the answers to which usually suffered from missing, incomplete, or distorted definitions. There were several excellent or very good answers, using appropriate concepts, such as Appadurai's "-scapes," and references to several other theorists of globalization. Too often, however, the question was seen as an opportunity to bewail the homogenizing and culturally destructive effects of modernization. One candidate, for example defined globalization as follows: "Globalization refers to another society or culture inflicting some change onto another and making it more like their own." In other words, the dynamics of globalization and localization were frequently ignored.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Candidates should be reminded that key terms used in questions are almost always problematic, and must be defined, as well, of course, as being understood!
- Teachers need to help candidates achieve a balance between conceptual development and theoretical exposition and analysis. Theory often seemed to be "injected" into an argument for its own sake.
- A significant number of candidates continue to omit all identifying information about the ethnographic materials they discuss. On the other hand, candidates from other schools consistently demonstrated care in the identification of sources. Candidates should not find themselves in a position where they are entirely dependent on film for the answers to their questions. Ethnographic films are useful educational tools and when studied in detail (by which is meant knowledge of how the film was paid for, negotiations about filming made, how editing, soundtrack etc. project a point of view and so forth) may constitute an ethnography but without this close study and analysis a film may well lack the depth to provide enough material for a sufficiently detailed and sustained answer. Films used in conjunction with written ethnographies and articles, however, may provide the best of both worlds, the immediacy of the film medium with the detailed and analytic perspective offered by a text.
- Candidates should be discouraged from attempting to answer a question on a topic that they have not studied. They should be made aware that a term in common usage may have a specific meaning in anthropology and that an everyday understanding of the term is not sufficient to answer a question well.

- Candidates need to be introduced to a broad range of anthropological theories and concepts as well as to ethnographies which serve to link with or exemplify the theories candidates are taught. In particular, schools should endeavor to ensure that candidates are given sufficient time during the course of their studies to become familiar with some more contemporary ethnographies and some of the more recent theoretical developments in the discipline.
- Some schools need to observe more closely that the programme in HL Social and Cultural Anthropology calls for candidates to demonstrate detailed knowledge of four societies, and that under the new programme going in to effect this year (first examinations in 2010), candidates will be penalized under the new examination criteria for failing to show detailed knowledge of three societies.

Higher level paper three

Component grade boundaries

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

General comments

Overall, there seems to be improvement in the theory programs being taught at many schools. Fewer papers were dependent on lists of fundamental theoretical issues or simple regurgitations of memorized points about theoretical schools. A challenge still lies ahead in teaching students how to truly apply theory to ethnography and to draw links between these two areas and theoretical issues. The new 2010 syllabus will require candidates to draw connections between 'perspectives' (formerly 'issues'), 'schools' and ethnography.

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

While candidates often included information from theoretical schools, issues and ethnography, linking these together in an analytic framework was challenging. Some candidates were not able to apply theory to relevant ethnography at all. Ethnographic data was often used to spice up a theoretical position, but only the best candidates could make solid arguments that supported the use of data. Data, usually as an afterthought, was often not situated in terms of ethnographer(s), time and place. Other papers were mostly ethnographic with almost no theory and scant mention of theoretical issues.

The other area that was most challenging was comparison and connections - Criterion D. Candidates struggled to place theory within the history of the discipline of anthropology. Theory needs to be explained in terms of reactions and influences. Candidates should understand how theoretical schools fit with the overall history of the discipline. While this

criterion was difficult, it allowed for a clear distinction to be drawn between the good and excellent papers.

Some candidates seemed challenged by the range of ethnographic sources presented to them during their course of studies. On one hand, candidates had seemingly only studied a very narrow range of ethnographies written in the same time frame (which limited their ability to understand historical trends), On the other hand, some candidates seem to have been exposed to so many sources that they did not understand any in depth.

Finally, many candidates found it difficult to present a logical and sustained analytic framework. Essays often began with a solid description of theory and/or issues, sometimes linked. Candidates would then move to describing ethnographies. However, this limited their ability to draw the connections and comparisons that are needed. Candidates should be trained to develop frameworks that allow them to provide a sustained argument that links issues, schools and ethnography together.

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

There was a wide gap between the very best and very worst papers. The strong essays were highly sophisticated with an historical depth and critical understanding and the weakest candidates lacked analytical and writing skills.

Some schools are clearly teaching an excellent range of theory. More theory from the 1970s through 1990s has crept into some programs. Some schools seem to spend significant time helping candidates to understand the content and theoretical perspectives of ethnographic texts in depth. Other schools seem to survey sources rather superficially, which made it difficult for candidates to integrate ethnography into their responses. All sources, be they ethnographic books, articles, films, are created from the perspective of the ethnographer(s). At the higher level, candidates should spend time discussing and analyzing the perspectives of all sources they study.

Most candidates could provide some knowledge of theoretical schools and issues, making Criteria A and B the most successful. Successful coverage of the ethnography requirement (C) varied as mentioned above. Comparison and connections (D) were in some cases expertly explained and discussed in other cases ignored. This area was sometimes weak even in the better papers, those which showed the candidates knew certain theories well but could or did not discuss them or contextualize them in relation to other theories.

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

Question 1 This was not a popular question and was often poorly answered. Candidates struggled to relate their discussion to theory and theoretical issues. Some mentioned Boas but did not go far beyond this. Making ethnography relevant to this question was equally difficult for candidates. Chagnon's work with the Yanomamo was used by some candidates

but not made relevant. It was also taken uncritically and ethical issues were not discussed in depth.

Question 2 This question was fairly straightforward. However, it was surprisingly difficult for many students. Many correctly identified functionalism as a cohesion-centred school but struggled to explain why this was the case (e.g. influences, reactions) and how this was a strength or weakness. Those who focused on conflict usually identified with Gluckman or Coser but dealt with them superficially. Weaker candidates made a link to Marx but not to specifically anthropological, neo-Marxist schools. Even weaker candidates chose to write about THE conflict or THE cohesion schools – neither of which exist – more specific schools needed to be discussed. Some candidates misinterpreted the fundamental theoretical issues as inherent in cooperative or violent societies – they needed to understand these issues as perspectives of ethnographers and theorists not as characteristics of societies. There were some candidates who successfully contrasted neo-Marxist theories with structural-functionalism and Durkheimian influenced ideas. Bourgois' work was applied effectively in some cases.

Question 3 This was a popular question and even weaker students did fairly well. Arguments were generally clear and theory figured largely in their answers, which was not the case for some of the other questions. Classic criticism of functionalism and its limitations was central and was handled with varying levels of sophistication. Most could identify key links but struggled to explain why this school was synchronic (e.g. reaction to social evolutionism; seen as positivist during the early part of the last century). Marxist and feminist approaches were also convincingly discussed and were often well connected to ethnographic examples. Boas' historical particularism was popular with a few schools but candidates sometimes presented confused or limited discussion and did not analyze ethnographies. Some candidates did not focus on theory but discussed the use of myth and legend as ethnographic evidence, stating that these should be taken into account to understand changes in society. Many mentioned that it was best if the ethnographer returns to review the data, especially in papers that used Chagnon. More interesting and expert analysis was carried out with Weiner's work.

Question 4 This was the second least answered, and the question that showed the greatest variation in skill. There were truly excellent papers that could trace the development of anthropological thought to the post-modern period (and beyond) and discussed interpretation thoroughly. A shift away from functionalist and/or positivist thinking was made clear but these were also used to discuss the limitations of interpretive approaches. Candidates discussed Lila Abu-Lughod in terms of how her personal theoretical development is mirrored in her ethnographic writing. In these cases, candidates clearly benefited from reading more than one source from a single ethnographer. Geertz, Turner and Ortner were also used successfully. Bourgois was used somewhat less successfully. It was disappointing to see that Clifford, Marcus and Fischer were mentioned by remarkably few candidates. The weaker candidates did not understand that an interpretive approach entails specific theory and theorists and instead, wrote about general interpretation of data.

Question 5 Candidates presented the full range of responses to this question. There were some truly excellent responses that drew on a wide variety of theory, including Barth, Scott, Marx, Foucault, and Bourdieu. Many candidates effectively and convincingly used ethnography. Studies of Sherpas, Bedouins, Nuyoricans and Trobriand Islanders were in

many cases, properly contextualized and effectively employed. Some weaker student confused structure with structuralism. Some did not understand the dynamics of structure and agency. The weakest candidates relied too much on personal experience or general opinions of how individual identity is shaped.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Teachers are commended on their ability to focus on fundamental theoretical issues, rather than simply asking candidates to memorize information from theoretical schools. However, they should not do this at the expense of developing the candidates' understanding of the history of anthropology. Teachers need to provide students with a range of theoretical perspectives and schools and help them to understand not only the detail of these schools, but also how they fit together historically – Who influenced who? Why? When? Deeper knowledge of individual theorists and schools, particularly those that are more contemporary, would also allow students greater success in Paper 2 as they could use this knowledge to help frame their analysis of social issues. For paper 3, this should improve their ability to score points on criterion D, which requires students to understand influences and reactions that have occurred throughout the history of anthropology.

Teachers need to take the time to help students understand the theoretical perspectives of the ethnographers they study. This means dedicating significant time to each study, potentially revisiting studies and comparing them as candidates build their ethnographic repertoire. Also, while many teachers provide an impressive range of resources to their students, they are reminded that the syllabus requires the study of four societies in detail. While many teachers go beyond this, they should not do so at the expense of depth. In some cases, students are exposed to such a breadth of resources in written and visual form, that they clearly have not had the time to explore any in the depth required at higher level. In one or two other cases, candidates seemed to study only two societies, which limited their ability to respond to questions.

Candidates may benefit from the introduction of theory early in their studies. It is often not appropriate to have student read about or from major theoretical schools right away. However, fundamental theoretical issues can often gradually be introduced in simple terms. They can then be revisited and understood in more depth as students read more ethnography. In this way, it may be useful to conceptualize one's course as being taught in a circular, rather than linear manner.

Candidates need to practice developing analytic essay frameworks with their teachers. This will help candidates move away from disorganized or descriptive papers. This should be done alongside the assessment criteria. In some cases it seemed as though students had not been directly exposed to the syllabus or criteria. Please share these documents with students as appropriate in their course of studies.

Candidates should also practise question selection with their teachers. The challenging questions can solicit very good responses from those who feel up to the task. However,

candidates should be trained to write to their strengths and answer questions for which they have maximum knowledge.

Finally, to give candidates theoretical breadth, teachers should ensure that they include theory that ranges from the time of functionalism to postmodernists and global theorists. They do not need to cover every theorist from the history of anthropology, but enough that students can get a sense of major trends in the discipline. Theory selected should couple the ethnographies read by students (which should also represent a range of time periods).

Standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

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

General comments

As is usually the case, most candidates were able to demonstrate some understanding of the text, in this case in terms of the complex interaction between tourists and the Mursi of Ethiopia, and to present relevant comparative materials. Although the wording of the comparative question (3) was apparently confusing in terms of the number of comparisons required (as many as half the candidates provided two cases rather than one), almost all candidates identified appropriate materials and were given credit for this. As usual, the range of achievement was wide with the critical difference being the ability to think and write conceptually - here in terms of commodification and consumption - and thus analytically rather than descriptively.

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

Although a good many candidates had some familiarity with tourism as a conceptual framework, only a few were able to link this effectively to larger processes of globalization and commodification or in the case of this specific text to issues of symbolism and cultural identity. It is the ability to link specific ethnographic materials to these larger contexts and concepts that is critical in this component— and this was too often missing this year. Perhaps as a result, more candidates than usual seemed very text dependent, sometimes virtually reproducing it extensively in place of answering in their own words. Another problem for many was a misreading of the text itself, specifically with reference to the claim about the lip-plates as “disfigurement” to avoid slavery in the past: a careful reading here frequently distinguished the stronger papers from the rest. And in question 3, systematic comparison and the careful identification of ethnographic material continues to be a problem for many, resulting in parallel descriptions – even just narratives – too often without a clear focus on interactions as required by the question, and with poor identification. It may be worth noting here, that more often than not the Mursi themselves were nowhere identified either.

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

Many candidates seemed to have some familiarity with anthropological materials that addressed the issue of tourism, and were able to provide comparative materials that were directly focused on the issue. More successful answers also recognized ways in which commodification, power relations, symbolism, cultural identity and self-other perception were all factors in the production of complexity and discomfort in the Mursi/tourist encounter. And despite the double comparison often presented in question 3, almost all candidates were able to complete all three questions.

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

Question 1 Overall this was the most successful question with most candidates able to describe, more or less in their own words, the meanings of the lip-plates for the Mursi and for the tourists, but not always discussed as the question requires. Fewer candidates recognized that meanings for the Mursi were changing and becoming more ambivalent. As noted above, many candidates misinterpreted the paragraph mentioning “disfigurement”, with only a few able to identify it as an example of ethnocentrism.

Question 2 This was less successfully answered by many candidates who rather often all but reproduced whole sections of the text and provided no conceptual framework to develop any kind of analytical discussion. In place of analysis, some candidates used this question to present an almost apocalyptic view of the changes described in very essentialist and negative terms. Overall, many answers were little more than a general descriptive account of the Mursi’s changing view of their place in the world. More analytical answers – and there were some strong ones - were able to develop other aspects of the text here, for example the analogy to prostitution, to explore the process of commodification in the context of tourism and globalization. A few of the best answers also recognized the author’s (Turton) account as a positioned one.

Question 3 As already noted, the wording of this question led to some confusion, and some candidates provided two comparisons of interaction rather than one. Obviously this made it more difficult to develop systematic and detailed comparisons. Nonetheless many were quite resourceful in these circumstances and were given credit for this. Most cases presented were of asymmetrical power relations and were generally relevant to the question, but not always sufficiently focused on the interaction as required by the question. Where the comparative case was also about tourism, answers tended to focus on similarities, sometimes rather superficially and to neglect differences, and/or any discussion of the larger context. Sometimes this lack of context was compounded by the lack of careful ethnographic identification. Some of the more popular choices included Lee’s account of the Ju’hoansi, Turnbull’s *The Forest People*, Kraybill’s account of the Amish, Bourgois’ *In Search of Respect*, and Chavez’ *Shadowed Lives*. Also popular but usually less successful was

Chagnon's account of the Yanomamo which was quite often misrepresented and/or not closely focused on the terms of the question.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- As noted last year too, it is essential that teachers emphasize the importance of working with **relevant anthropological concepts and frameworks** that can be linked to the materials presented in the text. Practice with other such texts and mark schemes to identify relevant themes, concepts and frameworks needs to be incorporated into regular classroom activities.
- **Comparative skills** are also central to this component as well as to anthropological understanding generally and need to be developed across a range of topics and work with both similarities and differences. Again, frequent practice with previous texts and mark schemes can be useful.
- Candidates need to understand why it is essential to include careful **identification of any ethnographic materials** – including that of the text - in their answers. It seems that this can never be said too often! One way to do this is to make full identification an assessment criteria for any piece of written work throughout the course.
- As noted last year, candidates also need to understand and be reminded that they are expected to present their **answers in their own words** ; this year this was more often than usual not the case and effected many candidates marks.

Standard level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 16	17 - 21	22 - 26	27 - 31	32 - 40

General comments

This year there was a very wide level of achievement: where some scripts showed strong evidence of anthropological knowledge and understanding, others were at best common sense or personal responses, with little evidence of anything anthropological at all. This usually varied between centres with some producing consistently quite thoughtful and informed answers and others being much more varied, not only in terms of knowledge and understanding but also in the ability to develop analysis rather than simple description or narrative. Most candidates appeared to be confident across a wide range of topics although as in the past, answers in section B on processes of change and transformation, were more often lacking careful definitions of key terms and/or knowledge of relevant ethnographic materials. As these comments suggest, a critical difference between stronger and weaker

responses was the ability to use anthropological concepts and materials to develop an answer that was analytical rather than descriptive.

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

In terms of the programme Theme 3- processes of change and transformation continued to present a problem for a good many candidates/centres with key concepts more often than not discussed in very general terms with little distinction made between different processes, which were rarely defined. And in some cases it appeared that candidates did not understand key terms in questions they chose to answer (for example in #7 on social movements, #9 and #11 on commodification). In section A, answers to #2 on health and illness were quite often presented with little anthropological conceptualization and #3 on religion and morality was answered largely in common sense terms and with limited ethnographic support. In terms of the examination, analytical and comparative skills were quite often weak. In some centres ethnographic material was either presented in rather general terms or in several fragmentary pieces and without any specific examples, making any sustained analysis or comparison more difficult. Ethnographic materials were quite often not carefully - or in some cases correctly - identified.

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

In section A, the question on the construction of social identity produced a range of different responses which were often quite informed, making good use of different kinds of ethnographic materials; this was also the case on reciprocity where many candidates also appeared familiar with relevant concepts and materials. And many candidates appeared to have a sound understanding of some of the ways in which gender roles are constructed through both ideas and practices: this was particularly evident in the answers to the question about masculinity. In section B, candidates often appeared quite well prepared in terms of writing about migration, and sometimes about globalization, however in some cases this was much too broadly defined. In terms of the examination itself, strong performance in some centres indicated very good analytical and comparative knowledge, skills and understandings, demonstrating what can be achieved at this level.

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

Question 1 This was a very popular question and often quite well answered, with candidates most often interpreting 'others' as different social/cultural groups and able to illustrate this with quite specific ethnographic materials, although conceptualization in this context was often rather limited. The best answers focused on interactions both within and external to the group and made useful reference to processes of socialization or enculturation and sometimes to ritual processes, in the best cases developing sustained and detailed analysis of specific ethnographic material.

Question 2 This was quite often answered with most candidates comparing different understandings of health and illness. Here the key difference between stronger and weaker answers was the ability to frame the response in focused and sustained comparative terms, as well as the knowledge of relevant ethnographic materials. Comparison was usually made between scientific and more supernatural understandings, with the best answers presenting ethnographic materials that provided examples of both – for example, Anne Fadiman’s account of a Hmong family in California. Others cases that were quite well used included Lee’s account of the Ju’hoansi, Weiner’s of the Trobrianders and Chagnon’s of the Yanomamo.

Question 3 This was the least popular question in section A and not usually well done. Answers tended towards common-sense/personal responses with little anthropological reference and often no ethnographic materials. In one or two cases there was some attempt to locate change as part of a larger understanding of culture as dynamic rather than static, but the key terms were rarely defined and often morality was simply assumed as part of religion with little or no explanation. Several candidates presented general historical rather than ethnographic materials to illustrate their argument, which is not appropriate.

Question 4 This was a popular question and often quite well done, with most candidates familiar with different forms of reciprocity (if not with Mauss) and able to show that these continued to be important in different ethnographic cases, although only a few made explicit the importance of social relations in this form of exchange. Even fewer candidates considered reciprocity in relation to market forces in their argument, recognizing the larger context implied by the question: these were usually well done. Again, the best answers here were both conceptually informed in terms of analysis and well supported by detailed ethnographic materials.

Question 5 This was probably the most popular question in section A, and the quality of answers ranged quite widely. Rather often answers did not stay closely focused on masculinity, but became a more general discussion of gender roles giving more attention to women than to men. However there were some good answers here too, that made explicit some of the ways in which ideas and practices associated with gender, and masculinity in particular, are constructed and expressed in different societies – the more frequent choice. There were also some good answers, comparing changing ideas about masculinity in one society, most often based on Bourgois’ *In Search of Respect*. However here too, there was a tendency to present terms such as ‘machismo’ with little explanation. Weaker answers tended towards description and some comparison but with no conceptualization or analysis.

Question 6 Although quite a popular question, this was not always well done, with weak conceptualization – for example kinship was simply glossed as ‘family’ and left at that – and any definition of key terms was too often simply assumed. Nonetheless, some candidates were able to make quite a strong case based on detailed presentation and discussion of ethnographic materials. The more successful answers usually focused on relations between kinship and either economic or political organization. Those that argued that religion was directly linked either to kinship or political organization were usually much less successful.

Question 7 This question was rarely answered and quite often misunderstood. It seems that few candidates had a clear understanding of what constitutes a social movement, and of

ways in which these have been globalized. The few relevant answers were most often based on indigenous movements, particularly that associated with the Kayapo in Brazil.

Question 8 This was quite a popular question in section B and often quite well answered, where candidates could draw on their knowledge of relevant ethnography such as Chavez' *Shadowed Lives* or Bourgois' *In Search of Respect*. Other candidates also focused on rural to urban migration as in Safa's work on Puerto Rico. As usual, the better answers were those that addressed the terms of the question, provided context and definition and were analytical rather than descriptive.

Question 9 With the occasional exception, this question produced almost uniformly weak answers with few candidates demonstrating a clear understanding of the term selected for discussion, and making little effort to present any kind of definition. Although most claimed that anthropology had given them an improved or new understanding of a given process, answers rarely demonstrated this effectively and much of the ethnographic material presented was only very indirectly relevant.

Question 10 This was a popular question and sometimes quite well done when candidates developed a clear analytical and sometimes comparative framework, but this was not always the case. Answers invoked a wide range of causes but these were usually listed, somewhat randomly, rather than discussed. More often, answers were based on ethnographic materials and were more descriptive than analytical. In some cases, candidates focused on individuals rather than social groups, thus not really addressing the terms of the question. Thus although there was some evidence of anthropological knowledge and understanding here, it was rarely sufficiently focused in terms of any sustained argument.

Question 11 This was not a popular question and often not well understood. While some candidates were able to describe the consequences of commodification in one society – usually in quite general terms - only a few tried to evaluate the processes involved. Too often commodification was simply glossed as the introduction of money as a form of exchange, with little sense of the ways in which particular values and relations might be altered in the process.

Question 12 This was the most popular question overall and produced both strong and weak answers. The critical difference was the ability of candidates to provide a clear and anthropologically informed account of globalization, which was all too often not the case. Far too many candidates continue to write about globalization as if it is a synonym for all and any kinds of change, with no attempt at definition and apparently little knowledge of anthropological discussion of the quite specific kinds of processes involved. In such cases, the ethnographic materials presented were often largely irrelevant in terms of the question. However there were other answers, often informed by discussion of Appadurai and/or Eriksen, that were clearly focused and thoughtful, often framed in terms of a tension between globalization and localization. This appears to be an area of study that deserves more careful discussion in many classrooms.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Teaching about processes of change and transformation, although no longer a separate topic or theme in the new programme (to be first examined in 2010), continues to need to be more precise and anthropologically informed. As in all topics, candidates are expected to be familiar with specific anthropological approaches, terms and definitions, and to construct their answers with reference to these, providing both definitions and relevant discussion. This needs to be central to all classroom teaching.
- However knowledge of anthropological concepts and approaches always needs to be linked to specific ethnographic materials to be able to support a more general argument. Although many centres appear to be working with a range of relevant and detailed ethnographic cases, this is not always the case. Condensed summaries tend to do a disservice to candidates and should not replace the close study of complete ethnographies. Candidates need to understand that all answers must be well supported by detailed ethnographic materials that are carefully identified in terms of time (ethnographic present is more important than publishing date), place and author, and the title of the ethnography: other kinds of descriptive materials are not appropriate.
- Teachers are reminded that all two-year programmes as of September 2008 should be working with reference to the new programme, to be examined in May 2010. This includes assessment criteria that are similar but not the same as the current ones. Both the new programme and new assessment criteria are available on the online curriculum centre and should be in the hands of all teachers as soon as possible.