

SOCIAL & CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 12	13 - 25	26 - 39	40 - 51	52 - 62	63 - 74	75 - 100

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 12	13 - 25	26 - 38	39 - 50	51 - 63	64 - 75	76 - 100

Higher level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

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

The range and suitability of the work submitted

The trend toward the presentation of appropriate topics seen in recent sessions continues. No reports moderated presented an inappropriate topic, and a great majority of reports offered well-focused research questions or issues.

While some candidates clearly linked research to their conceptual/theoretical learning, they were not always successful in their efforts. Most reports tended toward the descriptive rather than toward the analytical or theoretical.

Approximately twice as many candidates chose issue-based topics as chose context-based topics. Typically, candidates chose issues and research sites well-known to them. Examples of successful issue-based topics included a study of how high school senior girls act in creating self-images for a graduation ball; a study of the symbolism in a peace march event; a study examining how gay and lesbian teens negotiate between online "out" identities and everyday "closeted" identities; a study considering whether or not urban graffiti express resistance.

Context-based research projects usually focused on research sites familiar to the candidates, for example, a school library and its rules; the ritual nature of a Dungeons and Dragons game session; power relationships in a martial arts class, and gender roles in a female-oriented surfing school – an especially successful report. Context-based projects frequently lacked an adequate focus and an analytical framework.

For example, there was a largely descriptive report on Day of the Dead celebrations in a Mexican town, and an overly descriptive treatment of gender roles in a Finnish reindeer-herding family. Other overly general and poorly focused reports included several based on group observations concerning cultural identity, religious ceremonies, and the integration of football among indigenous communities in Chiapas, Mexico.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A: Identification of an issue or question

Almost twice as many reports earned full marks here as did not. The trend seen in the past several sessions toward increasingly well-focused research topics continues. However, it is still the case that centres vary markedly in this respect. In some centres, all or almost all reports merited full marks, while in others few or none did well with respect to this criterion.

Criterion B: Research techniques

The great majority of candidates presented appropriate research techniques. However, less than half of candidates could clearly describe and justify their research techniques, and only a small proportion earned full marks for this criterion. Again, as with some other criteria, centres varied strikingly in the degree of success their candidates achieved. Under the new 2010 programme, candidates can choose only one research/collection technique. Still, many candidates chose and discussed more than one technique, and most of the successful reports fall into this latter group. Candidates were not always realistic in their assessment of the relative merits of various techniques. This was especially true in regard to questions concerning objectivity and subjectivity.

Criterion C: Presentation of data

The great majority of candidates presented data appropriately, but very few were able (following the terms of the criterion) to present data in both an organized and detailed manner. The issue of good detail appeared the most problematic. A number of candidates presented data graphically. This mode may certainly be an effective way to economically and clearly present data, but occasionally graphically-conveyed data presentation, especially in the case of very simple or straight-forward data, did little to improve the presentation. At worst, some graphically-assisted presentations raised more questions than they answered, and some were contradicted by accompanying narrative material. A few reports suffered from having data essential to the candidate's argument appear only in the appendices.

Criterion D: Interpretation and analysis of data

Only a very few achieved full marks here, for which a candidate must provide a "detailed interpretation of the data...within an appropriate analytical framework." While a good majority of candidates provided appropriate analytical frameworks, a sizeable minority provided no analytical frameworks at all.

Criterion E: Ethical issues

With the 2010 examinations session, this criterion is exclusively concerned with question of ethics, and no longer includes consideration of "personal experience" in the research process, now covered more in criteria B and C.

Performance under this criterion was less satisfactory overall than in recent sessions, with half of the reports either reflecting no concern with ethical issues, or merely mentions them. A substantial minority of candidates discussed ethical issues, but the discussion tended to be limited to issues of gaining permission to do fieldwork and of getting the consent of informants. Broader issues, concerning for example the ethical aspects of representation and positionality in ethnographic reporting, were rarely discussed. Only a small proportion of IAs achieved full marks here.

Criterion F: Anthropological insight and imagination

In the 2010 programme, the maximum mark under this criterion has been raised to 3. Results seen in this session were generally encouraging. A good number of candidates demonstrated good or excellent "insight and imagination," and very few demonstrated no insight at all. Candidates must have asked anthropologically valid and well-focused questions in order to demonstrate good or excellent insight, and showed some sense of what constitutes anthropological analysis of data. Even though candidates may show many of the shortcomings noted here with respect to other criteria, they may still be rewarded for posing sound and interesting anthropological questions, and for showing how these guide field research.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

- As noted in recent sessions, while there has generally been improvement in the extent to which candidates choose anthropologically appropriate and well-focused research questions, this still varies markedly between centres. Guiding candidates toward worthwhile research topics and (most critically) helping them define a well-focused research question remains the most important and possibly the most difficult task a teacher faces with regard to the HL IA fieldwork. If a candidate does not clearly focus on a topic it is to be expected that data presentation is at least likely to lack detail, and that the interpretation and analysis of data are likely to lack clarity and remain superficial, no matter what level of theoretical sophistication of the candidate. Certainly, the degree of insight and imagination demonstrated will also suffer from an overly-broad approach.
- Both teachers and candidates will benefit from studying the guidelines and assessment criteria carefully (pages 44–48 in the Subject Guide for first examinations in 2010), in addition to studying the marked IA samples presented in the Teacher Support Materials (TSM). Both the Subject Guide and the TSM may be accessed through the Online Curriculum Centre (OCC).
- As remarked above with regard to Criterion D, integrating anthropological theory in a detailed analysis is a task that most candidates find difficult. The 2010 IA assessment criteria make clearer the demands compared to the old criteria regarding the expectation that anthropological theory will be employed in interpreting and analysing data. The frequent omission in these reports of any analytical framework in analysing data, which is much more apparent in some centres than in others, indicates that a number of centres should improve upon integrating the teaching of theory with the practice of field research. Again, close study of IA exemplars in the TSM publication should be an important aid in approaching this difficult task.

- The criterion concerning ethical issues (Criterion E), makes it clearer than before that candidates must engage with ethical issues. Teachers should focus clearly on this problem. Too many candidates still seem to proceed under the illusion that asking non-threatening questions of their informants absolves them from having to consider ethical questions. Both the new Subject Guide and accompanying TSM describe ethical issues that should concern the candidate in much greater detail than was required in the previous programme.

Standard level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

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

General

As there have been recurring misunderstandings of the purpose of the Critique since the introduction of the SL IA, this report is prefaced with some instructional comments. The Critique is **not** meant to correct perceived mistakes made in the Observation. Candidates are instead required to **reflect** on their fieldwork experience; how personal choices have framed the choice of venue, the focus of the observation, and the selection of data recorded.

In the SL IA, it is not a “mistake” to be biased when observing and recording but rather a mistake not to **recognize** that bias was involved in the assumptions made. This should be covered in the Critique. The SL IA is geared to illustrate some of the challenges all ethnographers face and to show that the careful fieldworker must be aware of his/her own cultural influence and experience so as not to skew data collection.

There is also a serious misunderstanding, which unfortunately also includes teachers, of Criterion B on the difference between description and analysis. Teachers regularly give high marks here even when requirements are not met. What is needed is awareness of the ways in which description can carry unintended meaning and recognition that analysis is substantially different. See recommendations below.

The range and suitability of the work submitted

The work submitted continues to improve each year as centres are becoming more familiar with the SL IA component. There was a wide range of work, reflecting both candidate ability and the instruction received. The new criteria have collapsed the previous Criteria B and D into C, on assumption and bias, and this seems to have helped candidates formulate their ideas more clearly on the position of the observer. Some candidates used their Critiques to continue with the observation report rather than use the Critique to discuss the observation itself. Criteria are not always applied correctly.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A: Completion of the written report

The report continues to be the best executed section of the SL IA and candidates are commenting fully on the many interesting choices of public places in which one can unobtrusively observe and record social interaction. Candidates have submitted a varied selection of observation sites and there was a distinct originality in many of the reports. Very few of the samples were undertaken in sites or contexts considered to be unsuitable; these included evenings with friends or lengthy background information on familiar places. Some candidates are still participating or interviewing rather than observing but these are fewer each session, indicating that teachers are guiding the process more carefully. Some reports lack enough detail to engage candidates in meaningful reflection of who they are when they observe. Some candidates are still rendering a mere list of activity organized chronologically, and this leaves them with very little to critique.

Criterion B: Description and analysis

Criterion B, previously Criterion C, is still the most challenging of the SL IA exercise. The important difference between description and analysis is not understood by many candidates. Phrases such as “I did not have enough inference” indicate that not only have some candidates misunderstood the word in its context here, they have misunderstood the purpose of the discussion. Candidates do not always perceive analytical insights, perceptions or assumptions that were included in their reports.

Capable candidates were able to recognize that when they recorded an incident of “a mother roughly dragging a small boy” or “the overweight family ordered huge meals” they inferred a negative attitude. These candidates did not see their descriptions as “mistakes” but rather a reflection of attitudes, and this was aptly discussed in the Critique.

Others were able to recognize when they are adding an analysis to the events they note in their reports. Categorizing and counting the gender and race of café patrons, for example, is an attempt at analysis that was recognized by the more insightful candidates. This can be problematic, as mentioned below, but it is nonetheless analysis to be noted in the Critique.

Only the better IAs demonstrated the ability to distinguish between description and analysis in any well-reasoned manner and, on occasion, the examples from the observations chosen by candidates to make this distinction were not always relevant. In some cases, despite general discussion of description and analysis, no examples were provided in the Critiques from the observation reports themselves. Candidates do not always recognize inferences linked to social categories, such as race or ethnicity. These are often taken at face value.

Criterion C: Focus, assumptions and bias

Candidates generally recognize personal biases. Social biases are less noticed. Problematic was the use of the Critique to eradicate perceived mistakes as though assumption based on personal inclination and experience is unacceptable even in a prospective anthropologist. The purpose of the IA is to give insight into the challenges of objectivity by asking candidates to record their own data. Only some candidates were aware of these methodological issues. Assumptions involved in categorizing people as “typical” or “average” is often overlooked. Race is often used as a descriptive factor in the report but rarely mentioned in the Critique. Few candidates seem to be aware that biological categories can reflect social and even political positions.

Criterion D: Critical reflection

If candidates have not understood the SL IA well, they cannot complete this criterion successfully. This was often the most challenging of the assessment criteria and, while many were able to analyse and evaluate parts of their work, relatively few were able to critically analyse and evaluate the written report as a whole. Some seemed to think that “critique” meant show what was wrong rather than evaluate.

A few centres appear to direct candidates to compare their observations to an ethnography and then to consider this appropriate evidence of “anthropological understanding”. Unfortunately this often leads to implausible comparisons between high school candidate experience and the *Yanomamö* or some other inappropriate and forced ethnographic “similarity” or “difference”. Candidates do not need to include reference to any published ethnography in order to meet Criterion D as this does not in itself involve critical reflection.

It was pleasing to see some candidates reflecting on both a personal and anthropological level in discussing the nature of fieldwork, its challenges in terms of selection and analysis of collected data. These Critiques were to a good standard.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

All observations should be just that, observation, and ideally with the candidate in one place for the whole hour. Candidates should be made aware that they can edit and shape their observations for the report. If candidates submit reports that are too limited to be of much use in the critique they may be asked to review their field notes and include additional information. They need material to work with for the Critique and a simple list of the times particular people walked in and out of a café, for example, is insufficient. Teachers should guide candidates in the writing of field notes for the observation.

Teachers should look more carefully at the Criteria, especially criterion B, and develop ways in which they can convey the intention behind the requirements. Class discussion on what constitutes analysis as opposed to description can be useful, and examples of how inference can give unintended meaning can be pursued. Candidates should be encouraged to search for inferences and analytical expressions in their report and should be encouraged to identify social as well as personal biases. Candidates should also be made aware of the reflective aspects of the SL IA. It can be instructive to apply the Criteria to ethnographic material covered in class or to essays written by candidates in order to work concretely with the Criteria as a preparation to doing the Critique.

Further comments

Some centres mistakenly used the old criteria and teachers were required to re-mark the IAs using the correct criteria. Candidates who did not apply the new criteria to their critiques were put at a disadvantage.

More teachers than usual appeared to have failed to meet all formal requirements to include properly completed 3/IAs and 3/CS than in the past. This could be due to changes in the criteria and should be noted next year. Teachers should also ensure that the word limit is adhered to.

Higher level paper one

Component grade boundaries

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

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

Some candidates misunderstood parts of the text and their answers to the questions reflected these misunderstandings. In other cases candidates failed to read the questions carefully enough and so did not directly answer the question as set.

Weaker scripts were mostly descriptive, close to the text and, in the weakest cases, heavily quoted from the text itself (and this was not always acknowledged).

In a handful of cases candidates were not able to complete all the questions on the paper. This was a particular issue for question three where the question was either not attempted at all or left unfinished. This is a pity as question three has more marks allocated to the question than the other questions on the paper.

A small number of candidates wrote very long and detailed answers to question one but this meant that they were then short of time and so produced very short answers to question two (which often repeated material from question one) and insufficiently detailed answers to question three.

The societies chosen for comparison in question three were not always fully contextualized, particularly in relation to when the ethnographic data were gathered. A publication date for an ethnography is not necessarily what is meant by ethnographic contextualization. In some cases the candidates did not describe the case study chosen fully enough. Some candidates appeared to use films viewed in class as their comparative ethnography and this was not always effective and often appeared to have made it harder for a candidate to fully contextualize the comparative “ethnography”.

Anthropological concepts such as globalization and anthropological understandings of identity were not always well discussed.

In the weakest scripts the candidates did not manage to carry out the comparison required in question three. Such answers tended to describe an ethnographic context with no direct comparison to the salsa dancers in the text and often with no explicit relevance to the issue of “identities” as required by the question.

Unfortunately, in a few instances candidates reproduced homophobic stereotypes about male dancers or German “feminists” (as the German female salsa dancers were all assumed to be).

The levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

It was very impressive to see the high standards and achievements demonstrated by some social and cultural anthropology candidates. As always some candidates demonstrated excellent comprehension skills, critical thinking under pressure, and the ability relevantly to interweave materials/ ethnography/ anthropological concepts to make strong and well developed points.

Some of the stronger scripts showed an ability to bring in relevant anthropological concepts and theorists in question two, as well as to produce convincing abstract discussions supported by carefully chosen descriptive examples drawn from the examination text. There were some very good, anthropologically insightful and reflective answers, using relevant, fully contextualized ethnographies.

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

Question One

In question one, weaker candidates relied heavily upon the text and quoted their answers rather than summarizing in their own words. There was also considerable overlap or repetition between question one and two in some of the less strong scripts. Some candidates spent time detailing the difference between sex and gender or showing that they had additional ethnographic knowledge about the situation in Northern Ireland. Time spent, however correctly, providing information that was not directly relevant to the question or which took too much time to develop often meant that candidates did not spend sufficient time in answering the actual question.

Better candidates were able to bring out the complexities of the issues raised by religion and gender in local contexts, relate this to communities of salsa dancers and to the identities that different groups form in relation to the dance. Strong scripts were able to handle practical matters (such as physically moving from one religious area to another in the case of Belfast) with more abstract notions such as conceptualizations of equality in the case of Hamburg's German salsa dancers.

In particular some candidates were able to discuss the ability of dance partially to overcome religious and geographical divides in Northern Ireland; while for Germans the dance challenged accepted gender practices and so brought different cultures into contact in ways that made the dancers rethink their taken-for-granted gendered ways of being.

As ever some candidates managed to mis-read the text and sometimes built their answer on these misunderstandings. In particular some candidates made some odd (and inappropriate) comments in relation to the sexuality of male dancers in general, and some even went so far as to suggest that women from Latin countries are perfectly accepting of male dominance and so do not find this troubling in the salsa classes.

Question Two

Question two answers sometimes repeated points from question one rather than concentrating on issues of identity in a global context.

A key difference between this paper and previous paper 1s is the requirement for candidates specifically to address the viewpoint of the anthropologist in order to gain more than 4 marks for question 2. It became apparent that while some centres had clearly impressed the need to discuss the viewpoint of the anthropologist not all had.

Those candidates who wrote otherwise very good answers to this question but did not mention the viewpoint of the anthropologist were unable to gain full marks for the question and this really was in many cases quite unfortunate.

Stronger answers linked identities to globalization and were able to discuss the different forms of identity in process that were apparent in the text. Differences between the identities of local populations (Irish and German) were contrasted with the need felt by some migrant groups from Spain and Latin America to perform their identities in a diasporic context. Better answers showed that candidates were aware of the need to create and reaffirm identities but that the motivations for this vary depending on context. For some salsa identities are related to escapism and fantasy while for others they are a link to a distant homeland. Identities may be imagined but this does not render them any less powerful or important.

Better answers were able to refer to relevant anthropological theories of globalization and localization in their answers. Often these candidates were able to correctly cite the work of Appadurai and they also showed an awareness of the globalization of material as well as cultural products that made salsa dancing possible across the world.

Question Three

Candidates who did particularly well on question three often did so because they chose well contextualized and well justified comparative ethnographies. Those who did not do so well often appeared to have ignored the focus of the question (which was on identities) and produced answers that compared dance or some other feature of globalization to the text, but did not link this to the identities of the dancers in the text or the identities of the comparative group.

Candidates who were able to demonstrate an understanding of the fluid and contextual nature of personal identities in social context and to demonstrate how localization processes impacted on identities did particularly well.

While more and more candidates now understand the need to contextualize the comparative ethnography there were some candidates who did not adequately historically contextualize their work and appeared to assume that a date of publication for an ethnography was sufficient to make this clear.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

As ever, some centres performed better than others and appeared to have succeeded in encouraging candidates to describe, analyse and generalize relevantly, as well as cite sources.

In particular, while most candidates do reasonably well on the more descriptive question one, some do not, as noted in last year's report. Candidates giving descriptive answers in question two limit the marks they can achieve as this particular question also requires the demonstration of analytical skills and the ability to generalize. This year for the first time candidates were also required to recognize the viewpoint of the anthropologist and those who did were rewarded for this while those who did not found their marks restricted to 4 marks for question 2.

While more candidates are showing that they have studied relatively recent ethnographies which prepare them for question three, a significant minority continue to use material from the early decades of the twentieth century.

While candidates should be well informed of the pioneering ethnographic work conducted by anthropologists in the early twentieth century this is not always material that will provide suitable comparative material for a question that often requires much more recent ethnographic data and theory to provide a complete answer to the question.

In question three the most significant failings were poor choice of comparative ethnography and failing to produce a systematic comparison. In order to achieve the latter, candidates need to do more than make a brief passing reference to the ethnography on the examination paper. Some candidates simply wrote everything they could remember about their chosen ethnography without any link to the question or the examination text. Candidates should be encouraged to be selective in their choice of what to write about for question three.

Candidates should be strongly discouraged from making negative and stereotypical comments about groups on the examination paper (in this case the assumptions that all male dancers must be gay and that Latin women are somehow complicit in systems of male domination and oppression which they accept as “normal”). These last comments relate to only a small proportion of candidates. It is a concern that these candidates after following a period of anthropological study should hold such views uncritically.

Higher level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 6	7 - 12	13 - 18	19 - 23	24 - 27	28 - 32	33 - 44

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

This was the first examination of the new curriculum and with changes both to the examination paper and some of the assessment criteria. It was pleasing to note that many centres had prepared candidates for the new assessment criteria D and E which are assessed over both essays. However, a significant proportion of candidates appeared unaware of the requirements of these criteria or chose to ignore them and so lost up to 6 marks over the paper as a whole. These 6 marks out of 44 are ones that should not be difficult for candidates to achieve with relative ease and so it was disappointing to find that so many were failing to do so. The difference of 6 marks is often enough either to raise or lower a candidate's performance on this paper by two grades.

As in previous sessions 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 ability to apply this knowledge to ethnographic data and to the question in a relevant manner; and the interweaving of relevant theory and ethnography.

Some candidates relied heavily or exclusively on film for their ethnographic materials and this often led to answers that lacked depth and were not always well contextualized. The use of film worked best when supported with published materials on the same society/topic.

A very small number of candidates used only one society to answer both questions and a handful of others wrote on just two societies. A small number of candidates failed to complete the second essay on the examination paper and this appeared to be the result of poor time management during the examination.

Defining terms

The central concepts appearing in questions were often undefined, poorly defined or only partially defined. These terms, such as "status", "ethnicity", "role", "moral systems", "consumption", "socialization" and "class", were often not clearly defined and this left candidates struggling to make their answers relevant to the question. 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

Centres varied widely in the ability shown by their candidates to carry out theoretically informed discussions. Candidates appear to be using terms such as "agency" very loosely and as if this applies to any decision made by anyone in any context. Candidates also sometimes seem to consider that pre-Geertz anthropologists were incapable of interpretation or any of the theorized partial understandings and multi-vocal multi-positional stances taken by those now described as "postmodern".

While there has certainly been a shift in anthropological practice (particularly in terms of anthropological "authority") this is more one of shift along a scale for many anthropologists rather than a complete break with a past tradition in the discipline.

Ability to answer all parts of a question

Too often candidates ignored key words in a question or focused on one part of the question to the detriment of the rest. For example, in question 2, kinship may have been written about but social change *and* kinship were rarely covered in the same answer. Again, in question 8 candidates wrote about consumption (though they wrote mostly about production) in relation to either material practice or symbolic practice but not in relation to both as the question required.

The levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

As stated in previous reports, centres varied widely in the ability of their candidates to present and properly apply theoretical perspectives. Some candidates produced extremely good answers demonstrating detailed levels of knowledge and skill in answering the questions. These candidates had a sound range and knowledge of anthropological theory, a keen ability to select and use relevant concepts and detailed knowledge of several ethnographies which they are able to draw on to produce detailed, reasoned, sound and thoughtful essays. At the other extreme, however, some candidates were only able to show very elementary knowledge of anthropological theory and sometimes there was little evidence of having studied the requisite number of ethnographies in sufficient detail to do well on the paper.

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

Question 1

This was a relatively popular question but a fair proportion of candidates who answered this question failed to link their chosen topic – most often migration – to globalization in any systematic manner. These were good essays on migration but not always so good on globalization **and** migration. Relatively few candidates chose the option to link environment to globalization and these essays worked best when candidates had strong materials to show how a threat to the environment had led to social action.

Typically, candidates chose ethnographic examples from indigenous or disempowered local groups who have organized against transnational corporations threatening their land and health or where migration has led to changed gender roles following migration (often internal migration) by women to find work in multinational companies. Ethnographies used included Pun Ngai's *Made in China* and work on maquiladoras in Mexico.

Some candidates also considered globalization and the environment in relation to tourism in particular with groups such as the Masai in Kenya.

Stronger answers incorporated relevant concepts from anthropologists such as Appadurai, though there were occasions when terms such as "ethnoscape" were mentioned but never convincingly developed in essays. When candidates do choose to use theoretical concepts they need to integrate these into their answers to demonstrate not only their knowledge of the terms, but their abilities to apply and use the terms in a relevant and convincing manner in relation to the question.

Question 2

Again a relatively popular question and on occasions answered very well by candidates who not only showed that they knew discipline-specific kinship terminology but that they were able to use this in a focused and apt fashion. Popular comparisons were between matrilineal groups such as the Trobrianders and patrilineal groups (of which several were available including the Sherpas discussed by Ortner, the *Yanomamo* by Chagnon and Lizot *etc.*). Some candidates considered changes to arranged marriage practices in South Asian communities in the contemporary global context.

A common failing in this question included the inability to define what was meant by kinship or to define this so broadly as to include any and all social relations. Another recurrent problem was that candidates wrote sound and detailed essays on kinship using good ethnographic materials but then never made any reference to social change. Those candidates who did this therefore failed to fully address the question and their marks for their essays reflected this.

Question 3

This question was not among the most popular on the paper but when it was answered the essays tended either to be very good and produced by candidates who had positively chosen the question because they had strong knowledge and relevant ethnographies to use to answer it, or by relatively weak candidates who appeared to be choosing the question for lack of any other that they could answer. Strong answers included those who used the work of Ortner on mountaineering and showed how religion had been used in a strategic fashion by the Sherpas to take some control and gain respect from the Sahibs they worked for. Some of these essays also incorporated a gendered aspect to the question by discussing the rise of women Sherpas and how religion had been used to prevent this in the past.

Question 4

This question was perhaps the most popular on the paper. It was most often answered in relation to the gender option and here Bourgois' ethnography of Puerto Ricans in New York was very often used as a core ethnography. Answers were often descriptively strong though less so on conceptual and theoretical grounds. Candidates were able to write on the division of labour but were, on the whole, unable adequately to define what they understood by inequality. This term was often taken as given and not a term that required any discussion. Occasionally, this question produced essays that demonstrated differences between genders, for example, but did not show that these differences were ones of inequality.

When candidates answered this question they usually tried to define what they meant by gender, ethnicity or class (the most popular of the options in order of popularity) and some discussions were more convincing than others. Often definitions of class were weak and oversimplified while those of ethnicity were sometimes no more than commonsense generalizations.

Question 5

This question was not answered by many candidates and of those who did, and did well, used Danny Miller's work on cell phones or Abu-Lughod's work on the Awad 'Ali production and sale of formerly private songs were often used as ethnographic examples. Some candidates used materials on the use of radio and video by indigenous groups such as the Kayapo. In some of these essays it was a pity to note that although generally along the correct path candidates were unable to produce very detailed ethnographic information and the scripts remained at a rather general level.

However many of those who did attempt answers to this question struggled to find relevant ethnographies and to link these to changes in group interactions. With the increased ethnographic work now published on the Internet and cyber activities and given that most of the candidates for this examination are using these technologies on a regular basis this is one field of ethnographic study that may merit more attention in future years.

The very weakest answers were general discussions about the use of the Internet by young people.

Question 6

There were some very strong answers to this question and the best often used Scott's work *Weapons of the Weak; everyday forms of peasant resistance* and in particular the section "Beyond the words of war: cautious resistance and calculated conformity" to provide them with the conceptual terms necessary to frame their answers. Some candidates used Weber's definition of power to consider resistance by those with relatively less power in a society or group. Weaker answers were unable to define resistance and this led to rather vague essays where any agitative action by any individual or group could be construed as resistance. While it was clear that candidates in this latter group had some idea of what resistance might be and how an anthropologist might study it they lacked a strong theoretical foundation to make sense of the ethnographic materials they had.

Question 7

This was a fairly popular question and was most often answered in relation to the division of labour. Sometimes candidates concentrated too much on writing about the division of labour and did not relate this back to access to resources. Popular ethnographies for this question were the *Yanomamo* and also the *Ju'hoansi*, with the focus on gender in relation to access to resources and the division of labour.

Space and place was rarely chosen as an option although some did discuss this in relation to Bourdieu's work on the Berber house and the essays on status and role tended to be relatively weak as candidates did not define or distinguish status and role clearly. These did not often go beyond general and vague statements about the powerful member of a society having more access to resources than the less powerful sectors of a society.

Question 8

The key failing in the answers to this question was to consider production rather than consumption and so not to answer the question at all. In these cases candidates were able to discuss production, often in Marxist or Marxist-derived terms but were not able to then move from this to the consumption of goods and services.

The second difficulty many candidates had with this question was the inability to discuss consumption in material **and** symbolic terms. Often answers focused on one or the other but not both.

A popular ethnography used to answer this question was material on Kula in the Trobriand Islands.

This question would have benefited from some more contemporary theoretical knowledge of consumption derived from theorists such as Lyotard and Baudrillard as used by anthropologists in recent years.

Question 9

This question produced some excellent answers but mostly relatively weak ones. Strong answers were able to define their terms and show that they were confident of what, precisely, socialization meant in relation to their chosen ethnographies. Interesting essays used materials from Reddy's work on Hijra's in India (*With Respect to Sex: Negotiating Hijra Identity in South India*) and Condry's work on hip-hop in Japan (*Hip-Hop Japan: Rap and the Paths of Cultural Globalization*).

Although candidates often had a general idea of what was meant by the terms of the question only those who had clearly studied this in class were able to produce reasoned and detailed answers that went beyond fairly obvious and commonsensical understandings of socialization. Some candidates attempted hypothetical discussions which did not prove convincing or effective (e.g. what would happen to a Yanomamo raised among the Juhoansi?).

While some candidates attempted to use terms such as "agency" to explain the limits of socialization very few were able to use such terms convincingly.

Question 10

Again, as with other questions on this paper candidates who did well on this question were those who clearly defined what they meant by a moral system and then linked this directly to their chosen option. Candidates who wrote generally on decision making or social control, for example, but did not link this to moral systems did not do as well as they perhaps should have. Those who were able to discuss authority, legitimacy and power relations (even with a reference to Foucault) tended to do better as they had some conceptual terms with which they were able to apply to ethnographic data.

Relatively few candidates, however, chose to answer this question and weaker answers tended simply to assume that those empowered to lead or make decisions in a society were legitimated by the moral system of the society. However, candidates who took this position were not always able to discuss this with reference to detailed, relevant ethnographic materials.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Candidates should be reminded that key terms used in questions must be defined, and applied to the ethnographies discussed in the essay. Commonsense understandings of terms such as “socialization” or “class” are not sufficient.
- Teachers need to help candidates achieve a balance between conceptual development and theoretical exposition and analysis. The over general and weak use of terms such as “agency” or “habitus” do not demonstrate real knowledge and application of conceptual terms.
- 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, centres should endeavour 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. In this paper candidates would have benefited from recent work on consumption and from a clearer understanding of contemporary theories of consumption.
- Candidates lost marks in the new curriculum if they were not able to show detailed knowledge of three societies. This was a pity as the two marks awarded for knowledge of three societies ought to be two marks that every candidate is able to achieve on the paper. Criterion E (breadth of knowledge of societies).
- Candidates should be strongly encouraged to answer all parts of a question and not to only write on the one part that they know more about. Candidates should also be discouraged from simply reproducing class essays in the examination. The precise wording of the examination question may require a rethinking and reordering of material produced in class. This was clear on this paper, for example, in question 4 relating to the division of labour and inequality where candidates sometimes appeared to be reproducing a class essay on a similar topic.
- All candidates should be made aware of the new criterion D (processes of change and transformation within and across cultures and societies) as, again, the possible 4 marks available on this criterion are really ones that all candidates should be able to achieve.

Higher level paper three

Component grade boundaries

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

General comments

The standard of candidate answers to Paper 3 questions has improved. While the full range of answer quality was present in the examination papers overall, centres seem to be teaching a good variety of materials and candidates are able to apply them to the questions set. Most candidates included the three key elements in their papers: theoretical perspectives, ethnography, and theoretical schools. In some cases, candidates were very skilled at recognizing the perspective and theoretical schools that influenced a particular ethnographer. However, in other cases, the correlation between theory and ethnography was a struggle for some candidates, as the theory they included did not readily link to the ethnography presented (for example, social evolutionism applied to Bourgeois' *In Search of Respect*, or post-modernism applied to Chagnon's *Yanomamo*).

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

While performance varied immensely between centres, a critical understanding of theoretical perspectives was missing from a significant number of candidates. When perspectives were correctly defined, some candidates struggled to clearly explain how these perspectives grew out of, and influenced, both ethnography and theoretical schools. Candidates seemed to find the "idealist" perspective particularly difficult to define and apply to questions. Explicit links between theoretical perspectives and schools was also limited for many candidates.

In a few cases, candidates demonstrated limited knowledge of theoretical schools, notably those that were dominant prior to 1970. This made it difficult for these candidates to apply theory to an understanding of contemporary issues.

In some cases, the candidates misunderstood perspectives. This was the case, for instance, with candidates that discussed contemporary societies pervaded by consumerism and economic stratification as illustrations of materialist perspectives.

While almost all candidates included ethnography in their answers, many found it challenging to sustain their arguments. Sometimes there was essentially no use of ethnographic materials, but other times there was only vague allusion (usually based in popular media as opposed to ethnography) to contemporary issues as the basis for analysis and discussion.

In the case of the stronger answers, candidates made effective use of theoretical perspectives, schools and ethnography, but a critical perspective was sometimes missing.

For some candidates, there was no reference to theoretical schools in the essays resulting in no marks for criteria B and D.

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

Overall, there is a good level of awareness linked to theoretical perspectives, ethnography and schools of thought. Some centres are evidently teaching contemporary theory and ethnography, and are also linking these materials to more traditional schools of thought. Such an approach gives candidates a strong overview of the discipline, and helps them to understand the modern relevance of anthropology. Strong answers linked well-selected theory, ethnography and theoretical issues together.

The materialist perspective was quite often well understood and explicitly linked to Marxist, cultural ecology and/or cultural materialist schools. Structure and agency was also an area of strength to which many candidates competently linked ethnographic materials. In the best cases, these answers were well informed and quite effectively applied to / illustrated by relevant ethnographic materials. Synchronic and diachronic concepts were also well discussed, although the links to theoretical schools often lacked depth.

Many candidates presented clearly focused answers that contained a logical focus. Candidates tended to be most successful with criteria A and C.

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

Question 1

Most candidates focused on linking a conflict-centered perspective with one of the perspectives listed as options (cohesion-centred, diachronic, particularistic). However, many candidates found it challenging to link these perspectives clearly to relevant schools of thought. Very general references to conflict theory remain in essays (e.g. “the conflict theory”, or referring only to Marx’s work from the 1800s). Candidates could have focused on theorists such as Gluckman or one of many political economists. In the weaker essays, candidates understood conflict too literally, stating that it was inherent to societies that took part in physical violence and not understanding conflict as a theoretical perspective.

Question 2

This question elicited many strong answers. Overall, candidates demonstrated a good understanding of structure and agency. They were often able to focus clearly on one ethnographer and highlight the relevancy of these perspectives to the work of that person. Bourgois was a popular choice. Kathleen Hall and Abu-Lughod were also used effectively. The best candidates linked the perspectives and ethnography with theory, such as Bourdieu, political economy, cultural production, and post-modernism. Some candidates effectively linked perspectives to ethnography but struggled to include any relevant theoretical schools.

Question 3

Many candidates competently defined “synchronic”. Many also linked this perspective to appropriate schools, such as structural functionalism or biopsychological functionalism. A few candidates contrasted this perspective to “diachronic” and identified relevant theoretical schools that linked to this perspective, such as political economy or historical particularism. A few candidates also connected diachronic notions to Bourgois’ *In Search of Respect*. Most candidates found it difficult to find ethnography that was relevant to “synchronic” (they could have drawn from Malinowski’s *Argonauts of the Western Pacific* or Lee’s *Dobe Ju’/Hoansi*).

Very few candidates recognized why anthropologists (largely in the early to mid 20th century) chose to take a synchronic perspective. Very few candidates included the needed triangulation of how perspectives, schools and ethnography all influenced one another within the context of “synchronic”.

Question 4

A few candidates presented interesting and engaging answers to this question, drawing on issues such as gender and racism. However, this question posed a considerable challenge for many candidates. While a few candidates included relevant materials, there were many who based their discussion of “contemporary social issues” on general hearsay or popular media, rather than ethnography. Some candidates had difficulty in applying relevant theory, struggling to use schools such as social evolutionism in relation to crack houses in El Barrio (rather than drawing on the more immediately relevant schools that are discussed by Bourgois in his ethnography). Discussion of perspectives was often unfocused.

Question 5

There were a few appropriate answers to this question, such as those that contrasted Levi-Strauss to Cultural Ecology. However, many candidates had difficulty correctly defining “idealism” and identifying relevant ethnography and theory that linked to this perspective.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

It is essential that teachers spend time clarifying the nature of the theoretical perspectives. Teachers should highlight the perspectives as candidates study ethnography and theoretical schools. It is a good idea to revisit perspectives as they study different ethnographies and schools so that candidates can see how and why anthropologists would take a particular perspective. Most candidates seemed to understand that these are not inherent in societies, but part of the analytical view taken by an anthropologist. This understanding needs to be maintained and, when not present, developed.

Centres need to ensure that candidates are given the opportunity to develop an understanding of contemporary theory. By studying a variety of ethnographic sources (supported with theoretical readings) candidates should develop an understanding of how and why anthropologists take particular perspectives and how these are relevant to the overall history of the discipline. Linked to this is the need for teachers to foster an understanding of theory as it links to the ethnographic case studies that form the focus of their course. For example, it is logical for candidates studying Bourgois to look at how political economy, post-modernism or gender theory are relevant to his approach. Similarly, candidates studying Bourgois may also find it useful to study Wolf, Scott or Bourdieu. Many centres are clearly already doing this (or linking clearly relevant theories to other case studies they have chosen). As mentioned in the overall comments, some candidates attempted to link social evolutionism to Bourgois, which was difficult to say the least.

Candidates need to see how theory is relevant to understanding contemporary social issues. This should be a core part of the study of ethnography in the IB social and cultural anthropology course.

Standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

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

General comments

As numbers of candidates at SL continue to grow, it was encouraging to see that candidates were able to demonstrate at least a general understanding of the text, in this case in terms of the different experiences of salsa dancers in Belfast and Hamburg. However many answers remained largely descriptive rather than analytical, suggesting a lack of familiarity with relevant anthropological terms and approaches, limiting overall achievement. Many candidates were also able to present quite detailed comparative ethnography that was generally relevant and more often than not identified appropriately, although quite often the discussion needed to be more closely focused on the notion of identity as called for in the comparative question 3. As usual, the range of achievement was wide with the critical difference being the ability to think and write conceptually – here in terms of globalization and identity – and thus analyse rather than describe. As in previous years, the best answers – and there were some excellent ones – made this distinction very clear.

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

Although the text itself was quite straightforward and accessible, in terms of the programme a lack of recognition, definition and application of relevant anthropological terms and concepts in relation to identity and globalization was a key limiting factor for many. This resulted in answers that were essentially descriptive rather than analytical and sometimes offering little more than a “common sense” reading. This was also evident in the inability of a good many answers to move beyond specifics to develop either larger generalizations (question 1) or explicit and systematic comparisons (question 3). More specifically, an understanding of identity as a social and contextual, even relational product, seemed quite problematic, with many candidates seeming to treat it as self-evident and static rather than contextual and dynamic. Similarly, globalization was also more often than not treated uncritically, providing little evidence of relevant anthropological discussion or approaches. In terms of the examination, the new criteria for question 2 – that candidates recognize the viewpoint of the anthropologist – was clearly problematic for most. Some candidates were not sufficiently focused in terms of addressing the specific requirements of each question, and finally, although some candidates gave full identification and contextualization for their comparative ethnographic case, many did not.

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

Almost all candidates were able to complete all three questions and most were able to demonstrate quite detailed knowledge of relevant ethnographic materials and to structure their answers as a comparison, although some were not sufficiently focused in terms of the comparative question.

In addition, in several centres candidates appeared to have quite strong analytical and comparative skills, evident in their ability to develop informed generalizations, as well as offer more critical discussion of the text and their own comparisons. This kind of work stands as a reminder of what candidates at this level can do.

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

Question 1

Most candidates were able to describe, more or less in their own words, some of the ways in which religion or gender shaped the different experiences of salsa dancers in Belfast and Hamburg and to offer at least some limited generalizations, although these were sometimes minimal or missing. The most successful answers were able to move beyond generalization, demonstrating a more critical understanding of ways in which individual and group identity is shaped by context, previous experience and pre-existing ideas and beliefs: this was perhaps best demonstrated in relation to local understandings of gender. The least successful answers were either very text-dependent and/or limited to rather minimal description.

Question 2

Although most candidates were able to demonstrate a general *descriptive* understanding of the relationship between salsa dancing as a global product and group identity, more analytical discussion was usually quite limited. More often than not both globalization and identity were treated as self-evident terms, demonstrating little knowledge of relevant anthropological discussions of and/or approaches to either. While some candidates were able to point to the irony of the situation for Latin Americans, for whom salsa dancing in Belfast or Hamburg, became an affirmation of a new and imagined self-identity, other candidates used their own assumptions rather than reading critically, often misrepresenting the origin of salsa itself as well as essentializing identity in rather simplistic terms. Only a few candidates were fully successful in recognizing the viewpoint of the anthropologist, most clearly stated in the final few lines which make an argument about localization, where distinctive group identities are fashioned in a local context in relation to a single global product. This argument about the tension between globalization and localization should be familiar to candidates studying at this level and it was disappointing that so few articulated this here. Other possible ways of addressing this new requirement were at least implicit in some answers, for example in noting the selection of gender and religion as analytical categories as well as most basically, suggesting a distinction between emic and etic perspectives.

Question 3

There were some good answers to this question that framed their comparison in relation to anthropological approaches to the construction of identity as a dynamic and social product. These answers provided careful identification and contextualization of their ethnographic case to develop an informed and systematic comparison with the salsa dancers described in the text. Most often contrasting examples were more successful in terms of maintaining close focus on the issue of identities whereas those who chose “similar” examples, for example focusing on dance and/or ritual/performance most often illustrated by the *Dobe Ju/hoansi* (Lee 1960s–1990s) *The Forest People* (Turnbull 1961) and the *Yanomamo* (Chagnon 1960s–1990s), became more descriptive or treated identity as self-evident and given, rather than open to negotiation and change.

In addition to the problem of making the chosen case relevant, identification of the ethnographic materials was quite often incomplete (for example, including only the date of publication or no time frame at all) and presentation was more descriptive – often in narrative form – than comparative. For all of these reasons, many answers to this question were less successful than is often the case, but illustrate clearly what candidates need to keep in focus: to make sure that they have recognized and defined the key comparative term(s), chosen ethnographic material that is relevant – or can be made relevant – to the question and is developed in context and in systematic comparison to the given case.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- This session was the first examination based on the new programme which for SL Paper 1 involves no change in format or weighting (this remains at 30%, see new Subject Guide page 26). However in addition to the usual markschemes made available after each examination, there are **new assessment criteria for each question** (see new Subject Guide page 30), **which clarify how marks are awarded and should be in the hands of, and familiar to, both teachers and candidates**. As these criteria are independent of any particular text, it is strongly recommended that they be used with previous Paper 1 texts in regular classroom practice.
- In particular **two criteria should be emphasized**. For question 1 it is now explicit that candidates are expected to go beyond simple description, to develop **some generalizations** that are relevant to the terms of the question and can be linked to relevant points and examples given in the text. For question 2 candidates are now asked to identify the **viewpoint of the anthropologist** if they are to score at the highest level. If candidates are to meet these expectations, they need to become part of everyday classroom practice. It is **strongly recommended** that teachers work with previous Paper 1 texts with their candidates, linked to each unit of study or theme, to develop these skills and understandings.
- In terms of practice, it remains essential that teachers work with candidates to make sure that they are familiar with key anthropological concepts and approaches and to help them recognize how these can be linked to materials presented in a given text. This year more than ever, examiners commented on the apparent lack of this kind of knowledge and understanding in many cases. This is also relevant for the teaching and learning of comparative skills (question 3) which are essential for both Paper 1 and Paper 2.

Here again, the new assessment criteria should be helpful in guiding instruction. Teachers may also need to remind candidates that comparative ethnography is not expected in answers to question 1 or question 2.

- Teachers also need to help candidates clarify key question terms, to make sure that answers are relevant and closely focused; again, practice with previous texts should be helpful here.
- Finally, in terms of ethnographic materials, it is important that teachers try to ensure that candidates are familiar with some contemporary materials and understand why it is essential to give full identification and context for the chosen case.

Standard level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 15	16 - 21	22 - 27	28 - 33	34 - 44

General comments

This was the first examination based on the new programme which opened up Paper 2 (previously divided into 2 sections), allowing a free choice of two out of ten questions, at the same time it introduced some new assessment criteria across both essays. With a continuing increase in SL candidates and several new centres, it was encouraging to see some of these new centres beginning to establish a solid level of achievement. As is usually the case, the quality of work seen varied enormously, from outstanding in some cases to all but minimal in others, and with a wide range in between. Where some scripts showed strong evidence of anthropological knowledge and understanding and good analytical and comparative skills, others seemed at best common sense or personal responses, with little evidence of anything anthropological at all. More than usually, examiners this year commented on the overall lack of specific knowledge of core anthropological concepts and analytical skills. As noted by one examiner, many candidates “are still describing the ethnographies rather than utilizing them to support arguments, discussions and comparisons.” Thus many answers were largely descriptive, sometimes demonstrating quite detailed knowledge of ethnographic materials and some comparative skills but often missing any discussion of relevant core concepts. Although many candidates appeared to have quite detailed ethnographic knowledge across a range of societies or groups, some centres seemed limited in their choices, where ethnographic materials were rather similar and/or do not address all aspects of the programme, and these were generally less successful in establishing the relevance of their materials. Overall the critical difference between stronger and weaker scripts was not only the range of ethnographic knowledge demonstrated (now assessed by new Criteria E as well criteria B) but also the ability to use anthropological concepts and approaches to develop answers that were analytical rather than descriptive (assessed in criteria A). The new criteria D, assessing overall knowledge and understanding of processes of change and transformation as evidenced across both essays, also posed problems for many candidates.

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

With some notable exceptions, many scripts demonstrated very limited knowledge of relevant anthropological concepts and arguments across most themes/topics, with little or no discussion of relevant key terms. Knowledge of processes of change and transformation (2.2 societies and cultures in contact) if addressed at all, was presented in very general terms with little evidence of specific anthropological knowledge and many scripts demonstrated little understanding of culture as dynamic. As this is now assessed in the new criterion D, taking both essays into account, many candidates lost marks here. In terms of the examination, conceptual knowledge and analytical skills were often quite limited and ethnographic materials – although these represented a large part of the responses – too often were not carefully identified or contextualized. Given the limited conceptual knowledge in evidence, a good number of candidates did not focus sufficiently on the precise terms of the question, leaving answers either very general, incomplete, or not directly relevant.

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

In terms of the programme, many candidates were able to demonstrate quite detailed ethnographic knowledge of several societies or groups, as well as some limited anthropological understanding of themes/topics including gender and the gendered division of labour, status and role, the process of socialization and in some cases, social control. In terms of the examination itself, most candidates also demonstrated some comparative skills, although these were rather often descriptive rather than analytical. In several centres a strong and consistent performance demonstrated good conceptual and comparative knowledge, as well as analytical skills and understandings, suggesting what can be achieved at this level.

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

Question 1

This was quite a popular question, more often focused on the relation between globalization and migration, although there were several quite well developed answers using ethnography from Ladakh or Jamaica (usually focused on tourism) to examine the relation between globalization and the environment. Although more often than not globalization was not clearly defined in anthropological terms, more successful candidates were able to make quite good use of relevant ethnography – for example *Shadowed Lives* by Chavez – to discuss ways in which globalization and migration were often mutually reinforcing processes. Less successful candidates focused only on either globalization or migration rather than their relation, or misunderstood the term “migration” given the context of the question and tried to use ethnographic material that was at best very indirectly relevant (such as the *Yanomamo* by Chagnon and *Dobe Ju/hoansi* by Lee.) Quite a number of candidates were somewhat dependent on documentary films here: while useful as supplementary material, these cannot, on their own and used uncritically, substitute for ethnographic material. For this question some, but not all, candidates were able to use relevant documentary materials quite effectively, including careful identification and some sense of context.

Question 2

This was not often chosen and not well answered, with only a small number of candidates able to articulate something close to an anthropological understanding of kinship in terms of relevant concepts. More often than not “times of social change” was barely addressed, though some discussion of Helen Safa’s account of the *Urban Poor of Puerto Rico* and sometimes Lee’s account of the *Dobe Ju/hoansi* were more successful in *describing* the role of kinship in the context of change, though there was little *evaluation*, as called for by the question. As in question 1, quite a number of candidates were almost entirely dependent on documentary films here, however in this case they were more often used uncritically and on their own which does not meet the requirement for ethnographic materials.

Question 3

This question was not often chosen and most answers tended to be descriptive, based on a specific ethnographic text (for example, Fernea’s *Guest of the Sheik* or Kraybill’s study of the Amish) which provided relevant material. However this meant that few candidates went beyond the particular case presented to discuss more general implications.

Question 4

This was by far the most popular question, most often focusing on gender (although ethnicity was also sometimes chosen), and produced the full range of answers, from anthropologically informed and good to read, to ethnocentric, stereotypical and very superficial. At their best, candidates were able to discuss gender as a social and cultural construct and frame their discussion in terms of relevant anthropological arguments; these answers were thoughtful and sometimes insightful. At the weakest, there was no evidence that candidates had any background in anthropology and apparently little practice in thinking and writing critically about their own experience or that of others. Answers in terms of ethnicity were fewer but also varied: at best, a few candidates were able to suggest some knowledge of different anthropological approaches (for example Barth or Erikson) but quite often ethnicity was used uncritically and sometimes interchangeably and incorrectly with race. Better answers here often depended on candidates' familiarity with relevant ethnography, for example, Bourgois' *In Search of Respect*, Chavez' *Shadowed Lives* and Foley's *Learning Capitalist Culture*, although this was no guarantee of success by itself. The few answers seen that focused on class or caste seemed often to confuse or misunderstand these terms. A sound knowledge and anthropological understanding of all these terms and their relation to inequality is fundamental to any introductory course in social and cultural anthropology. It was disappointing to see how often this was missing for a good number of candidates.

Question 5

This was not very often chosen and when answered it was done so in rather limited and/or very general terms with few candidates making the link to globalization. Several simply wrote about their own experience with no attempt to place this within an anthropological framework. Some of the more successful answers used Kraybill's Amish materials, which enabled them to address the issue of "altered group interactions" more or less effectively, although quite often the discussion of "modern media and communications technologies" was limited to the telephone.

Question 6

This was not very often chosen and was usually framed in terms of resistance to external forces such as globalization rather than as a process internal to societies. In several cases this generated quite a lot of unfocused ethnographic description, accompanied by inappropriate value judgements, in place of a careful comparison of forms of resistance, as asked for by the question. Better answers were dependent on knowledge of relevant ethnographic materials – in this case two societies, that provided different examples of resistance, however these were sometimes more descriptive than comparative.

Question 7

This was a somewhat more popular question most often focused on access to resources in relation to status and role, with a smaller number focused on the division of labour or space and place. The struggle here for most candidates was to make sure that they *examined the relation* rather than *describe the aspect they had selected*. Where they did the former, answers were more successful. Many candidates seemed able to use key terms such as division of labour and status and role more or less effectively, however they were more usually taken for granted as self-evident rather than discussed. As in question 3, when answers described only one case, there was little effort to move beyond the particular relation established to examine the relation claimed in more general or analytical terms.

Question 8

This question was rarely chosen but produced several quite informed answers where it was clear that candidates were familiar with the key terms and relevant ethnographic materials. However where candidates tried to answer using only their own cultural experience and little anthropological knowledge, as several did, often presented without context or identification, they were much less successful.

Question 9

This question was not very often chosen but sometimes quite well answered – and sometimes not. Answers here provided a good example of the difference anthropological knowledge, or the lack of it, makes – as already suggested in the observation on question 8 above. Where the anthropological concept of socialization (2.1 of the Subject Guide) was familiar and understood, candidates were usually able to develop some kind of argument in relation to their ethnographic knowledge with most claiming somewhat uncritically, that yes, individuals are the product of their socialization. For the candidate also familiar with the concept of agency (1.1 of the Subject Guide), this generalization was more likely to be questioned resulting in a more critical answer. For those who were unfamiliar with either, “socialization” was defined as “going out and having many friends” (this is a real example), neither understanding nor answering the question at all.

Question 10

This question was not often chosen but produced some quite informed answers, most often arguing that moral systems are a strong form of social control. The key limitation of many answers was a lack of clear definition, with moral systems taken for granted as self-evident and most often conflated with religion and/or illustrated with materials that were largely irrelevant. However some candidates who chose this question were able to discuss mechanisms of social control, linking these to values and social norms – including ideas about right and wrong – and providing relevant ethnographic materials to support and illustrate their claim.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- It would seem that a good many centres need to review the new programme which had its first examinations this session. For SL Paper 2 this involved a change in both format and assessment criteria, although weighting as part of the overall grade remains at 50%. (Details are on pages 29, 31–32 of the new Subject Guide). In terms of *assessment*, new criterion A (conceptual knowledge and analysis) is worth 6 marks; criterion B (use of ethnographic materials) remains at 8 marks and marks for comparison – now criterion C have increased from 4 to 5 marks. In addition, *two completely new criteria* have been added to be marked across both essays, focusing on knowledge of processes of change and transformation within and across cultures and societies (criterion D worth 4 marks) and on the breadth of knowledge of societies presented (criterion E worth 2 marks) which rewards candidates for their ability to demonstrate detailed ethnographic knowledge of more than one or two societies. A good many of the scripts seen this session did not address these two new criteria effectively. As noted in this report last year, it is essential that both teachers and candidates become very familiar with these new assessment criteria. It is recommended that these new criteria be incorporated into all course assessment rubrics.

- Knowledge and application of relevant anthropological concepts and arguments remains essential to successful performance and this is the key factor that distinguishes successful candidates, and sometimes centres from others. *Candidates need to be able to recognize and define key concepts in anthropological terms and to use them to develop or frame an argument supported by relevant ethnographic materials.* This has to be made central to any teaching programme: knowledge of ethnographic materials on their own cannot meet the requirements of the SL programme.
- However, knowledge of relevant ethnographic materials is also key: quite often this year it seemed that some candidates were limited by the ethnographic materials they had studied, either because they were somewhat outdated, rather similar, did not reflect a range of contemporary anthropological issues or were limited in term of regional and/or programme coverage. Others were rather often dependent on documentary films, which require more careful contextualization and discussion than was usually given to make their presentation effective as ethnography. Similarly a good number of candidates chose to treat their own cultural experience as ethnographic material, but without the necessary contextualization or critical discussion needed to do this effectively. Others are presenting historical knowledge without any identification or discussion of how or why this might/might not be similar to or treated as ethnography. Use of only short articles, ethnographic fragments, and of film limits candidates' answers: as the new assessment criterion E makes clear, over both essays, candidates are expected to be able to demonstrate detailed knowledge of at least three societies to earn full marks.
- Finally, careful identification and contextualization of ethnographic materials continues to be critical. Candidates need to understand why this is important and to be aware that this requires more than the date of publication.