

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 13	14 - 28	29 - 36	37 - 48	49 - 60	61 - 71	72 - 100

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 12	13 - 25	26 - 37	38 - 48	49 - 61	62 - 72	73 - 100

Higher level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

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

The range and suitability of the work submitted

This session's results continue a downward trend noted in May 2012, in that a majority of candidates [60%] did not present appropriate and well-focused research questions, and four candidates presented inappropriate research questions.

As has been the case consistently in recent sessions, issue-based research topics outnumbered context-based issues by more than two-to-one. Examples of successful issue-based reports included an examination of changing ethnic identification as represented symbolically by the loss of traditional dress in Chiapas; a very imaginative study of a secondary centre poetry slam program which allows youth to display "resistance and agency;" and an insightful examination of how Swazi healers help to maintain Swazi political structure.

As usual, context-based reports focused on places familiar to candidates, especially schools, clubs, sports teams and neighbourhoods. Successful examples included an innovative examination of how territory helps define self-identity among teenagers in a rural Colombian neighbourhood; a thoughtful investigation of ethnic segregation in an international centre; and a report examining how a ritual-creating though non-religious urban dance group creates group identity among culturally-diverse participants.

It seems evident that issue-based or context-based approaches are not to be preferred one to the other. Both have their strengths and characteristic shortcomings. Issue-based reports frequently lacked detail in data presentation, and especially if approached through a poorly-focused research question, were often overly general in data presentation, and superficial in their analyses. Context-based reports tended to be overly descriptive. Both approaches frequently lacked analytical frameworks, as required by the assessment criteria (see Criterion D). It should be noted once again that some centres have clearly made progress in responding to this requirement, although it continues to be the case that Criterion D is probably the least well-served of the criteria. Furthermore, it should be noted that this criterion still seems to be the criterion most commonly misapplied by teachers.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A

As mentioned above, candidates in this session were less successful in presenting appropriate and well-focused research questions than in May 2011 or May 2012. This fact points to an ongoing need for guidance, which will be addressed under recommendations, below.

Criterion B

Performance against this criterion showed some improvement from the May 2012 session, as close to half of candidates were able to both clearly justify and describe their research techniques, and no candidate presented inappropriate techniques. As usual, performance varied markedly among centres. It remains clear that some centres have carefully guided their candidates in appreciating the focus on method which characterizes this component, while other teachers seem to routinely leave the selection and justification of research techniques up to the candidates. In particular, a majority of candidates did not adequately represent the context under which research was undertaken, that is, they did not describe one or more of the following: how informants were selected, what the independent or “background” variables distinguishing them might have been, the number of informants involved, and the circumstances as to time and place under which they were contacted.

Criterion C

Under this criterion performance was slightly less satisfactory than in recent sessions, with three-quarters of candidates not succeeding in presenting detailed and well-organized data, and slightly more than 20% of candidates were judged to have presented data inappropriately. There were a number of examples of research projects in which it was not even clear that any data had been systematically collected. Here again, there was a wide variation between centres as to candidates’ success. Another issue which continues to be a problem concerns the practice of presenting data, whether in interview form, descriptions, or tabular data, in appendices. Since appendices are not included in the word limit, were this practice to be tolerated there would be no effective limit to the extent of data which might be presented!

Criterion D

Performance against this criterion was quite similar to that seen in the last several sessions. Candidates still seem to find this criterion more difficult than any other. Almost half of the candidates in this session did not present even a rudimentary “analytical framework” (see Criterion D). Only two candidates [in my allocation] received full marks under this criterion. Application of anthropological concepts and theory to data analysis was often hampered by the candidates’ omission of necessary definitions of concepts such as “rites of passage,” “globalization,” “commodification,” “ethnicity,” “identity,” *etc* and also by the misapplication of theoretical approaches that were not well understood, or were only superficially applied.

Criterion E

A positive trend continues in evidence with respect to the identification and discussion of ethical issues, as approximately two-thirds of candidates offered at least some discussion of ethical issues arising in the course of the field experience, while only about half of the candidates accomplished this in the May 2012 session. Still, it remains true that presentation and discussion of ethical issues is a concern in a number of centres. The expanded guidelines relating to ethical issues that were introduced in the subject guide may have helped raise awareness of the importance of these issues, but in some centres candidates are still not clearly aware of their responsibilities as field workers. Again, as in the two previous May examination sessions, some candidates still seem to have the idea that covert observation of individuals is ethical as long as the observer is not intrusive. The broader issues of ethical practice in fieldwork and ethnography, such as questions of selectivity of data, representation, positionality and reflexivity, were again not regularly addressed, although this session saw some progress in these areas of ethical sensitivity as well. These latter issues have been a central concern of ethnographers for at least the past 40 years, and it is not unreasonable to expect higher level (HL) candidates to show some degree of acquaintance with them.

Criterion F

Under this criterion, calling on candidates to demonstrate “anthropological insight and imagination,” performance was about the same as in May 2011 and May 2012, with more than half of the candidates receiving less than two marks (three being the maximum), and only one in 12 candidates receiving full marks. To do well under this criterion, candidates must have presented anthropologically valid and well-focused issues, and must show some sense of what constitutes a distinctly anthropological analysis of data. Some evidence of reflexive and critical thinking about the process of data gathering and issues of interpretation of data is also expected for full marks under this criterion, although as indicated in the discussion of Criterion E above, some improvement was seen in candidates’ critiques of their methodology.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Selecting and focusing the research question: As mentioned above, candidates in this session were less successful in presenting well-focused research issues or questions than was the case in the May 2011 and May 2012 examination sessions. As much as ever, centres varied markedly in the degree to which their candidates were able to focus their research. It remains true that working with candidates in selecting worthwhile, feasible research issues, and guiding them in focusing these issues, is the single most important and probably the most difficult task facing the teacher. Some suggestions for working through stages in the process of refining a topic idea into a focused research question are found in the guidelines for the higher level internal assessment (HL IA) found in the *Teacher Support Material (TSM)*, accessible through the Online Curriculum Centre (OCC).

Data presentation and analysis: As has been the case for many sessions, only a minority of candidates achieved a detailed and well-organized presentation of data. Both teachers and candidates will benefit not only by studying the IA guidelines and assessment criteria found in the subject guide (pages 44–48), but by studying the marked and annotated IA samples found in the *TSM*. Both the subject guide and the *TSM* may be accessed through the OCC. Teachers should plan to devote some class time to preparing candidates for the IA component, as well as allocating sufficient time for individual conferences as the individual projects develop. There are many published guides to student field research available, a number of which may be found on the Teacher Resource Exchange site of the OCC. Studying the marked exemplars with examiners' commentaries found in the *TSM* will also aid both teachers and candidates in understanding how successful candidates integrated analytical frameworks into their data analysis, which was evidently the most difficult task faced by candidates this session and in most past sessions.

Ethical issues: While improved performance in the treatment of ethical issues has been evident in recent sessions, there remains much room for further improvement. The subject guide presents a much expanded list of ethical principles to be kept in mind while planning and carrying out fieldwork. Anthropology as a discipline has become increasingly concerned with ethical issues over the years, and almost all contemporary textbooks and guides to field research treat ethical issues extensively; further, codes of professional conduct published by major professional organizations are readily accessible online. Ethical concerns, and their development across the history of the field, should constitute a major topic of study in the HL Social and Cultural Anthropology course.

Issues of organization and format: While there is no specific format for the HL IA report, unlike in the case of the extended essay, it is advisable for teachers to produce a suggested format for their class, intended, for example, to raise candidates' awareness of the requirements reflected in the assessment criteria, and to encourage clarity of organization. Use of a table of contents, subheadings, and a bibliography specifically deserve attention, and should be part of classroom preparation for the IA. As mentioned above in regard to presentation of data, teachers

should take care that candidates understand that appendices are for the presentation of ancillary material only, and should not be used to present basic data.

Group work for the IA: Teachers are reminded that they should clearly describe the circumstances under which group work, if any, was undertaken (for guidelines on group work for the IA, refer to the subject guide, page 39). It is the teacher's responsibility to insure that data interpretation and analysis are each candidate's own work.

Standard level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

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

The range and suitability of the work submitted

On the whole the range and suitability were acceptable, with the expected variation in standards between individual candidates and also between centres. Centres which produced better work had clearly prepared their candidates with a sound anthropological background and had conveyed, not simply the formal techniques for meeting the assessment criteria, but had also instilled a genuine sense of the complexities involved in observing and interpreting any social interaction.

There were a variety of observation sites chosen by the candidates, most of who appeared to be quite engaged in their projects. However, there were instances where candidates observed for several hours, interviewed those observed, took part in social events that were the subject of the observation, none of which meets the observation requirement.

Many of the critiques demonstrated good efforts at reflecting upon the broader implications of "positionality" especially in terms of how biases might have shaped their understanding of what was observed. Many critiques also then went on to try to conceptualize their reflections within a larger context of anthropological, including methodological, issues and social categories.

Too many candidates used their critiques to continue with the observation report rather than use the critique to discuss the observation itself. In a few cases candidates used the critique to discuss fieldwork methods in general rather than focusing on the critique of their own observation. Also, as in previous sessions, too many candidates consider that the purpose of the critique is to find fault with the observation and so set about listing perceived mistakes. This is not suitable and does not serve the purpose of the standard level internal assessment (SL IA), which is self reflection in the context of fieldwork.

Again, as in the past, Criterion B on description and analysis continues to be the most challenging for candidates, the criterion seemingly most difficult to grasp.

As in the past some candidates use terms such as "race" unproblematically to describe the strangers they observe and even when candidates did try to discuss the merits or demerits of the term the discussion was only partially successful.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A

On the whole most candidates chose a suitable focus for their observations and most managed to describe their observations reasonably well. Those who had been better prepared for their observations were able to focus on particular aspects of their observations and so produced more structured and logically selective observations. Those who had no clear focus for observation were more likely to produce more disjointed descriptions. On the other hand, some candidates had been instructed to focus specifically on body language or certain kinds of interactions, and this limited the possibility for candidates to discover what they are personally drawn to as an observer, which is a central issue of the SL IA.

Criterion B

Many candidates were unable to answer in full Criterion B. Only the better candidates were able 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 irrelevant. This continues to be the most challenging of the criteria for candidates and perhaps teachers alike as candidates are regularly awarded more marks than warranted.

Criterion C

In relation to the focus, assumption and bias of the observation, most candidates were able to recognize that their position as observers was a relevant factor in their observations and some were even able explicitly to take this beyond a simple recording of their physical location while conducting the observation. Most candidates appear able to identify at least some of their biases. Even so, biases of social origin were often overlooked (for example, noticing race/ethnicity, as if this was a self-evident way of classifying people). It was rare for candidates to identify ideological biases. Some candidates attempted to consider the ethics of observation or of what they observed but with a few clear exceptions did not always do this well.

Criterion D

Critical reflection was one area where many candidates were able to score a few marks because they mentioned anthropological concepts or methodological issues but the next step of taking this knowledge to the point of being able to critique the observation report on the basis of this knowledge seemed beyond the grasp of most candidates.

A central issue with the critiques: rather than providing examples from their reports, candidates tended to enter into a discussion of what they perceived as mistakes they made during their observation exercise. They were therefore unable to fully develop the issue of subjectivity and bias as many perceived their biases as “failures”.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

- There are two areas of concern that need serious attention: Criterion B that requires an ability to recognize that description is essentially different from analysis, and the

misunderstood notion that candidates should use the critique to correct perceived mistakes made in the observation. Both of these issues continue to significantly bring down marks and future candidates could gain by clearer instruction in these areas.

- Description and analysis: Candidates can be encouraged to unpack the inferences they make during observations. For instance, when they jump to conclusions about behaviour, despite the paucity of their data; or when they explain a behaviour on the basis of an assumed relationship between people. Many candidates include some form of analysis in their reports but neglect to later identify this as an attempt to generalize and make conclusions. Candidates need to be encouraged to identify and discuss the difference between description and analysis in their reports. It seems that Criterion B is also being misunderstood by some teachers who regularly give high marks in SL IAs where description and analysis in the observations have not been identified or considered.
- There are as such no “mistakes” in the report; it is not a mistake to be who you are, and to note what you chose to notice. The central purpose of the SL IA is to allow candidates to experience some of the challenges of fieldwork, especially the intertwined challenges of subjectivity and selectivity. The observation is completed at the beginning of the course when candidates are unfamiliar with methodological issues in anthropology and therefore are not expected to understand that bias can cloud conclusions. The critique then, is their opportunity to recognize what venues, people, and behaviour catch their attention and how they then choose to analyse what they observe. For example, a fashion conscious girl could observe and analyse only clothing style at a shopping centre but still be able to write a solid critique on the kind of observer she was without it being a “failure” that she did not notice much else. She could speak to issues of subjectivity. She will have learned something, about who she is as an observer and about what all anthropologists must deal with in the field, that is, the challenges and ethics of objectivity.

Higher and standard level paper one

Higher level component grade boundaries

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

Standard level component grade boundaries

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

Higher level paper one

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

There were no specific areas which appeared difficult for candidates; almost all were able to attempt all three questions and showed evidence of studying anthropology. The paper was well-balanced and enabled the high achieving candidates to develop sophisticated responses, while lower achieving candidates could still get to grips with the fundamental concepts and achieve a fair grade.

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

Almost without exception candidates had a comparative ethnography “up their sleeve” – the higher achieving scripts seemed to have a choice to pick from. Most were able to attempt an identification of the viewpoint of the anthropologist, although not always accurately.

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

Question 1

All but a few understood the basic ideas presented in the extract and were able to articulate these. Many managed to introduce valid generalizations. However, several candidates treated this question as an exercise in English language comprehension and simply restructured the text itself to provide a response without adding any anthropological insights. To achieve more than two marks the candidate must

demonstrate some study of anthropology, through introducing relevant concepts, *etc* from outside of the text itself.

Question 2

This appeared to be handled better than in previous years, but then the subject matter is quite “core” in terms of Social and Cultural Anthropology so candidates should have encountered plenty to work with. Many presented well-reasoned arguments regarding the viewpoint of the anthropologist, and all but a few managed to invoke some relevant theory for analytical purposes. There was a tendency for some of the lower achieving scripts to produce a “tossed salad” of all the theories and concepts they could think of – even if they were contradictory – seemingly in the hope that something must be relevant and might pick up marks.

Question 3

Most responses were good and had a relevant comparative ethnography to call upon. Precise identification of this seems to have improved, and there were some excellent responses which offered well-reasoned comparisons of both similarities and differences, alongside some elegant anthropology. This was very good to see. Only a small number of responses offered inappropriate, general and non-ethnographic, comparative material (eg “Native Americans”).

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- It might seem obvious, but candidates should bear in mind that examiners are looking for evidence of the study of Social and Cultural Anthropology. If the response to a question could have been written by anyone with a bit of common sense, and shows no evidence of this study through, for example, correct use of discipline-specific terminology, and/or discussion of the examination material in relation to relevant theory, then there is a limit to how many marks it can achieve. Put another way, responses should include anthropology from outside of the examination paper.
- Candidates should not rely on memorising a single ethnography in detail and then squeezing a contrived response to question 3 around it.

Further comments

Generally this paper was handled well by candidates.

Standard level paper one

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

Overall, the majority of candidates were able to demonstrate a general understanding of the text. This session, an extract which examines the meanings inscribed in a transnational market exchange – Fairtrade – in which consumption practices, moralities and power relations are intertwined in a postcolonial context.

Many answers were more descriptive than analytical. Some remained on a descriptive level or were quite dependent on the text; these responses showed difficulty to offer generalizations and demonstrate conceptual knowledge. Some candidates relied on “common sense” understandings rather than trying to demonstrate knowledge of the core anthropological terms and concepts involved.

Though the majority of candidates seemed familiar with the key concepts this extract discussed – mainly related to exchange systems and power relations – not many candidates attempted to define or discuss them. This became evident particularly in question 2 where candidates were expected to discuss the power relations in Fairtrade practices from the perspective of the anthropologist and also provide a conceptual argument. Though some candidates were able to make vague references to the anthropologist’s viewpoint, many found it difficult to make explicit recognition and analysis of how this viewpoint frames the argument.

In a small number of cases candidates were not able to complete all the questions on the paper. Particularly, question 3 was sometimes left unfinished, or so brief as to be too short to gain a good mark.

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

Many candidates appeared to be familiarized with anthropological concepts and issues of the extract chosen related to the areas of the programme. Exchange systems (such as reciprocity and market exchange), the concepts of gift and commodity, colonialism, globalization and power relations seem to be concepts and areas of study covered by many centres, in contrast to the concepts of morality or consumption. Thus, the range of achievement was generally related to the ability to discuss and apply specifically anthropological concepts and approaches and to develop answers that were analytical and anthropologically informed.

Many candidates were able to make sound statements about the viewpoint of the anthropologist, giving evidence of teachers preparing their candidates in this aspect. Still this is an aspect that leaves plenty of space for improvement.

Most candidates presented detailed ethnographic material and successfully established its relevance to the questions. It is promising to read a good range of well structured answers

drawing on several updated, contemporary ethnographies across the candidate cohort. These candidates showed an ability to produce convincing comparisons supported by relevant, fully contextualized ethnographies.

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

Question 1

Most candidates seemed capable of identifying relevant points/examples but generalizations were limited. Many candidates were able to understand that the construction of meaning was different for both parties, but there were some challenges in fully grasping the complexities of these different views.

The more successful responses offered relevant generalizations and showed anthropological understanding; but others were rather dependent on the text itself. Lower achieving scripts relied heavily upon the text and quoted answers rather than summarizing in the candidates' own words. A small number of answers were composed almost entirely of quotations from the set text. A few candidates introduced a comparative ethnography in this question, which is not required.

Question 2

Higher achieving answers provided detailed analysis and discussion, showing good understanding of power relations within well-supported conceptual frameworks. Some candidates were able to identify the moral dimension behind this commodity exchange and brought in their knowledge producing insightful responses. In this sense, some candidates made good use of Mauss' notion of the gift or introduced some neo-Marxist terms and concepts.

In general most candidates were able to state there was an asymmetrical power relationship. In many cases this was established by quoting too heavily from the text rather than providing evidence of further anthropological understanding. For example, though colonialism was often mentioned it was seldom developed or explained.

There was a more comprehensive attempt across the candidate cohort to include the viewpoint of the anthropologist in the response to this question. This point though, remains challenging for a significant number of candidates. Some answers discussed it in terms of emic/etic distinctions, others considered the anthropologist to be potentially biased in various respects, and when this was well justified the response was given credit. However, only a few answers were able to make reference to what framed the anthropologist's analysis or read with a perceptive eye to understand his critical viewpoint.

Question 3

Relatively the most successful question, proving that most candidates are well acquainted with ethnographic materials during their courses. Most candidates

successfully identified and presented a relevant ethnographic case for comparison. Similarities and differences are usually well-argued in terms of comparative relevance; though many candidates failed to fully develop both. Difficulties lie mainly in the depth and contextualization of answers.

It is pleasing to see that many centres are incorporating some more contemporary materials into their readings which provided opportunities for relevant discussions and comparisons. Popular ethnographies chosen were Bourgois' *In Search of Respect*, Okely's *The Traveller-Gypsies*, Lee's *The Dobe Ju'hoansi*, Malinowski's *Argonauts of Western Pacific*, Weiner's *The Trobrianders of Papua New Guinea*, Safa's *The Urban Poor of Puerto Rico*, Chaves' *Shadowed Lives*, Kraybill's Amish materials. Others worth noting included Holmes-Eber's *Daughters of Tunis*, C. Stack's *All Our Kin*, Queslatti-Porter's *Infitah and Independence*, Lessinger's *From the Ganges to the Hudson*, Lincoln Keiser's *Friend by Day, Enemy by Night*, Brennan's *Selling Sex for Visas*, Salazar Parreñas' materials on Filipina migrants, A. Ong *Factory women in Malaysia*, Pun Ngai's *Made in China*. All of these provided relevant materials for comparison.

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

Some candidates did not fully contextualize their ethnographic materials. Quite often a candidate would only mention a very generic reference to a group of people, without any identification in terms of place, author or historical context. A publication date for ethnography is not necessarily what is meant by ethnographic contextualization, but the description of the historical context of the ethnographic account.

Another weakness was related to answers being more narrative than comparative in nature and structure. Some candidates will extensively develop a description of the chosen ethnography disregarding the basic requirement that is to establish a comparison, based on similarities and differences.

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

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- In terms of examination skills, candidates should be reminded to read the questions carefully and structure their answers accordingly. Practice with previous paper 1 texts and markschemes is critical to this goal. Candidates should be encouraged to be explicit in demonstrating their understanding of concepts by, for example, defining the terms used. Candidates should make sure they are actually answering the questions,

and be aware that question 1 is usually descriptive but question 2 is more analytical.

- Teachers need to help candidates clarify key command terms in questions, to make sure that answers are relevant and closely focused; again, practice with previous texts should be helpful here.
- In question 1, candidates need to use their own words rather than rely heavily on quotations. Candidates are expected to go beyond simple description, to develop some generalizations that are relevant to the terms of the question and to link them to relevant points and examples given in the text.
- In question 2, in order to gain full marks, candidates should be encouraged to work on developing their analytical skills so that they can move beyond merely offering descriptive responses.
- In question 3, candidates should learn to present a comparative ethnography in terms of author, place, and historical context. Many candidates missed out on receiving more than 4 marks for this question because they seemed unaware of the need to present the ethnography in full detail.
- Overall, candidates should be able to discuss and develop a conceptual understanding of the ethnographic materials they read. It is this conceptual framework that will enable them to discuss the ethnographic materials more effectively and critically.
- Finally, in terms of ethnographic materials, it is important that teachers try to ensure that candidates are familiar with some contemporary ethnographic works. In the last half century a great deal of very good material has been published by anthropologists and it is a pity that candidates are not always given the opportunity to read some of this more recent work in addition to classic older material.

Higher level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 6	7 - 13	14 - 15	16 - 20	21 - 26	27 - 31	32 - 44

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

Too many candidates are failing to demonstrate clear knowledge and understanding of anthropological concepts, theory or theoretical perspectives. When candidates do use terms that are appropriate in relation to other materials they are not often enough explicitly linked or discussed and explained. Also, many candidates produced answers that lacked systematic and explicit comparison or which simply did not answer the question, or all parts of the question. In other cases candidates did not appear to understand some of the key terms used in the questions: for example *class* and *sexuality* were misinterpreted and *ethnicity* and *race* were quite often conflated. In terms of the ethnographic material used some candidates simply listed many brief ethnographic examples in their answers rather than comparing or analysing a few well-chosen ethnographic cases at greater length. This was an instance where the range of ethnographic citations did not make up for the lack of depth of analysis and interpretation. In terms of the programme, political organization, beyond a passing reference to "band, tribe, chiefdom and state", was usually very limited, and discussion of human or cultural rights was discussed, at best, in common sense and was sometimes quite personal rather than in anthropological terms.

A small proportion of candidates failed to write about three or more societies in detail and some managed to answer questions without referring to any ethnographic material whatsoever. A small number of candidates were able to answer one question on the paper quite well but then struggled to find a second question that they could answer to the same standard.

While it is good to note that some candidates are now clearly distinguishing between ethnographies and texts produced by journalists or others it was a little disconcerting to have several candidates in this examination session refer to the ethnographies they have studied as "novels".

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 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 answered questions for which they seemed to be rather unprepared, for example on question 10 where many candidates appeared not to grasp what was meant by "human rights" or "culture rights".

Very few candidates were able critically to evaluate and/or compare the ethnographic material they wrote about using appropriate anthropological conceptual and theoretical terms and knowledge.

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

It was reassuring to see that many candidates were able to demonstrate quite extensive knowledge of relevant ethnographies, a good number of which are quite contemporary, and were able to use this more or less effectively to construct a sound, if not always very analytical, response. There were, as always, some excellent scripts demonstrating high levels of knowledge and understanding across all three components. These scripts were exemplary and showed the kind of work that can be achieved at this level. It was encouraging to see some quite good levels of understanding and ability effectively to apply the concepts of agency and ideology to relevant ethnographic material. It was also encouraging to note that some centres are now teaching some more contemporary theory and that candidates are beginning to be able to use this knowledge to good effect in their scripts. Another feature that was positive in this examination session was the number of candidates who were explicitly making comparative points both ethnographically and also theoretically and conceptually.

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

Question 1

This question was quite popular and usually quite well dealt with by most candidates focusing on changes in kinship or power relations. Lower achieving answers tended not to discuss changes at all, even when reciprocity and one other term were discussed, and a few ignored reciprocity altogether in order to write everything they knew about kinship or power relations or consumption practices. Many candidates were able to cite Mauss and some defined different types of reciprocity. Many candidates used Bourgois' *In Search of Respect* and Ortner's *Life and Death on Mount Everest* as the ethnographies for changes in both kinship and power relations. Others used Brown's *Mama Lola*, Herdt's *Sambia: Ritual, Sexuality and Change in Papua New Guinea* and Newman's *No Shame in my Game*.

Question 2

This was another popular question and candidates drew on a wide range of materials (though not always ethnographic) to examine changing gender relations, and to recognize some of the contradictions and tensions that emerge when women begin to work in greater numbers in the public sphere. However globalization as a key concept was often poorly conceptualized as almost any kind of change, with occasional general references to technology, the economy or western ideas, and then used in relation to other materials without explanation or explicit linking. In some scripts globalization was mentioned in the first few sentences and then simply ignored for the remainder of the essay and these answers often read as though they were class

essays on the division of labour reproduced with minimal changes for the examination. Candidates used Ehrenreich's *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers in the New Economy*, Ngai's *Made in China*, Bourgois' *In Search of Respect*, Ortner's *Life and Death on Mount Everest* or a range of texts on the Na/Mosuo in China and the Inuit including the Irwin report (*Lords of the Arctic: Wards of the State*). Candidates who were able to write using gender relevant concepts and theories as well as able to relate this to globalization tended, perhaps unsurprisingly, to produce the highest achieving scripts.

Question 3

This was another popular question and agency seemed to be quite well understood in itself and quite often with reference to structure in terms of the discussion of the limits of agency. There were some quite well-informed discussions of limitations on women's agency as well as groups subordinated in terms of class and/or ethnicity. Candidates drew on Okely's *Traveller Gypsies*, Scheper-Hughes *Death Without Weeping*, Nash's *We Eat the Mines and the Mines Eat Us* as well as the ubiquitous *In Search of Respect* (Bourgois). Some candidates were able to write well on resistance using Scott's *Weapons of the Weak* and some incorporated Anderson's work on imagined communities though when they described face to face groups as "imagined" the result was not convincing. Fong's *Paradise Redefined: Transnational Chinese Students and the Quest for Flexible Citizenship in the Developed World* and Finkelstein's *With No Direction Home: Homeless Youth on the Road and In the Streets* were also used to discuss the limits of agency among young people while Newman's *No Shame in my Game: The Working Poor in the Inner City* was used to show how the poor find means to survive in spite of limited choices and the constraints on their agency.

Question 4

This question produced both excellent and very low achieving responses. At the top end candidates who wrote on transnational systems of production were able to use relevant ethnography such as Ngai's *Made in China* and link this to theoretical and conceptual material on nation states in diachronic perspective and in terms of politics/power as well as economics while always keeping the economic perspective foregrounded. On the impact of colonialism on economic organization, Bohannan's work on the Tiv of Nigeria was very well used. Interesting use was also made of Glick Schiller et al *Nations Unbound: Transnational Projects, Postcolonial Predicaments and Deterritorialized Nation-States*. However, many answers simply ignored the two options and wrote, usually descriptively, about economic organization in general and thus did not address the question.

Question 5

This question was rarely chosen and not usually well done. Better answers used, for example, the Kayapo in relation to their political organization against the state and when this was contextualized as a form of colonialism or as a consequence of urbanization and the government's attempts to find means to produce energy to run

the developing cities, this worked well. Others wrote on world systems or dependency theory and linked this to globalization and to the forms of political organization that lead to increasing interdependency, though not equality, between nation states. In these cases when relevant ethnographic examples were provided to support the discussion the scripts were often very good.

Question 6

This was a popular question but modernity as a key concept was rarely discussed: most responses simply wrote about changes in beliefs and practices understood in very broad terms, and were often descriptive rather than analytical. Those who were able to define modernity as increasing bureaucratic systemisation (rationalization in Weberian terms), the development of mass education and mass literacy (and the ideological consequences of this), forms of “governmentality” (Foucault), and so on tended to have a clear focus for their answers and so produced higher achieving scripts. Candidates used ethnographic work on the !Kung and the Trobrianders – often with the former to show changes brought about by modernity and the latter as a comparative case to show how modernity may not lead to significant social changes, as well as older material on Iraq by Fernea (which unfortunately tended to be treated as though this text described how things were, are and always will be in Iraq). Higher achieving answers tended to select more contemporary ethnographic material where changes, for example in the education system, may have led to revised gender beliefs and changes in labour practices.

Question 7

This question was sometimes quite well answered with some effort made to discuss the three key terms and then use this explicitly in discussion of the ethnographic materials. Candidates who were able to define all three terms sensibly – often citing Marx and sometimes Gramsci for hegemonic forms of control, and Weber for the distinction between power and authority and were then able to apply this understanding to relevant ethnography produced some very good answers. Ethnographies used to answer this question were very varied from Bourgois work in El Salvador to Malinowski and Weiner on the Trobrianders and various ethnographers of the Yanomamo.

Question 8

This question was only occasionally chosen, with one or two interesting responses focused on indigenous movements but otherwise candidates struggled to establish any clear relationship between the environment and political organization. Some very good answers drew on the Kayapo ethnographies and attempts to prevent the building of dams planned by the Brazilian government. Other candidates answered this question drawing on Hodgson’s *Once Intrepid Warriors: Gender, Ethnicity, and the Cultural Politics of Maasai Development* and Barker’s *Ancestral Lines: The Maisin of Papua New Guinea and the Fate of the Rainforest*.

Question 9

This was an extremely popular question and produced a wide range of responses, several of which were particularly strong, largely because they discussed identity in anthropological terms. Age and religion tended to lead to somewhat descriptive rather than analytical responses, although a focus on rites of passage in terms of age was often more successful. Ethnicity was perhaps the most frequently chosen and sometimes well dealt with using Bourgois' *In Search of Respect* and Chavez's *Shadowed Lives*, but several of these answers slipped rather easily between ethnicity and race. Candidates had more problems with the other two options – sexuality which was glossed as gender in most cases – and class which was rarely defined and treated so generally as to apply to any kind of hierarchically ordered group and generally equivalent to status or rank. An interesting range of ethnographies was used to answer this question and included Young's *Women Who Become Men: Albanian Sworn Virgins*, Herdt's *The Sambia: Ritual, Sexuality, and Change in Papua New Guinea*, Graham Davies' *Challenging Gender Norms: Five Genders Among Bugis in Indonesia* and Brown's *Mama Lola*.

Question 10

This was not a particularly popular question and responses were split between the two options but in some cases both seemed to be answered simultaneously. Answers were often presented in terms of common sense, and sometimes in very personal terms. There were, however, a few scripts that managed to provide relevant responses, detailing for example the history and context for human rights as well as the implications for this as an assumed human social universal linked to appropriate ethnography. Cultural rights were not often well understood, rarely defined appropriately and even less often discussed in relation to individual rights.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Analytical and comparative skills are at the centre of effective thinking and writing in anthropology and these are the skills that need to be modelled, taught and practiced.
- It is equally important that candidates are helped to make the link between a key concept and other materials, as well as comparisons, explicit. Perhaps this needs to be more of a focus for discussion in terms of the kind of feedback given to candidates in the classroom.
- When a question has options to choose from it is in the best interest of the candidate to make clear which option is chosen and for the candidate to stick to this and not be tempted also to write on the other options given for a particular question.
- In terms of examination strategy candidates should be discouraged from attempting to answer a question on a topic that they have not studied or which is similar to, but not quite the same, as a class essay they have already prepared unless they are able to adapt this to answer the question that is set on the examination paper.

- Centres should 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.
- Candidates should be strongly encouraged to answer all parts of a question and not to only write on the one part that they know most about.

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 - 11	12 - 14	15 - 20

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

Some candidates failed to read the questions carefully enough and so either did not answer all parts of the question or included material that was not required for the answer. Others wrote very short answers of no more than a paragraph or two and so were not able to develop any detailed discussion or provide detailed ethnographic material. While many candidates did have some theoretical knowledge or knowledge of theoretical perspectives this was sometimes treated as an introduction to the question and once completed was simply left aside and not made relevant to the question or linked to any ethnographic material. In some cases answers began with a potted history of anthropological theory beginning with mid-19th century evolutionary theory and ending with a standard memorized outline of postmodernism no matter what question was chosen. These theoretical introductions were sometimes longer than the actual answer to the question or took up so much time that the candidate was not able to complete the answer to the examination question. A small number of candidates referred to theoretical perspectives but not to theory in their answers. In some cases theory/schools of thought were quite often presented without any historical context and where attempts were made to organize this material in chronological sequence errors were often made. While most candidates did attempt to make coherent and informed connections between the three examined components – theoretical perspectives, theory/schools of thought, and ethnography – it was clear that this continues to be a challenge for many. It was somewhat worrying to read a number of references to very outdated theory, usually 19th century forms of unilinear evolutionary theory, and find this then used as if it provided a valid analytical framework. Differently but also quite problematically, it was evident that some candidates had knowledge of quite limited ethnographic materials that would enable them to think and write about theoretical issues, and in some cases ethnographic materials were simply missing altogether. In too many cases structuralism was confused with a structure-centered perspective and too many candidates simply assumed that any binary opposition provided evidence of structuralist theory. While more candidates have at least some success with linking theoretical perspectives and some relevant ethnography, connections to theory/schools of thought were often not well made.

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

It was evident that most candidates had some knowledge of theory/schools of thought and some understanding of theoretical perspectives and in some cases, an ability to think and

write with and about them in an informed and, in the highest achieving answers, even critical way in relation to ethnography. In particular it was clear that many candidates had quite a good grasp of functionalism and structural-functionalism. In a small number of cases good descriptions and applications of structuralist theory were presented and in some different cases, there was good use made of symbolic and interpretive theory, cultural materialism, world systems theory or Bourdieu's theory of practice. While many candidates were able to cite postmodernist writers such as Clifford and Marcus only in a small number of cases were they able to link this knowledge in a convincing and relevant fashion to both the question in the examination paper and the ethnographic materials chosen to answer the question.

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

Question 1

This was quite a popular question and produced a range of responses with most somewhere in the middle. Responses were often more effective in linking ethnography with theoretical perspectives, and in some cases made no reference to any theory/schools of thought. Some candidates were able to work more or less effectively in terms of their understanding of functionalism, drawing on both Durkheim and Malinowski to explore assumptions about not only cohesion but also conflict in terms of how societies/communities worked and were able to link this to a range of ethnographic materials from the Trobrianders, to drug dealers in El Barrio NYC, to drugs in Buenos Aires, Nash's *We Eat the Mines*, Scheper-Hughes' *Death Without Weeping* and gangs in Managua. Other theoretical references were made to Marx and to Geertz in some cases with no more than just a mention of the names. In a few cases candidates answered on only one anthropologist or only either conflict or cohesion but not both.

Question 2

This was a reasonably popular question and on the whole produced some sound responses in the top to middle range, with some lower achieving answers that reflected minimal understanding of theory/schools of thought or theoretical perspectives. What often made the answer more effective was knowledge of ethnography that could be linked to both theory/schools of thought and a contemporary social issue which included poverty, discrimination/racism, gender inequality, and gangs/drugs. In some cases answers did not cite any specific contemporary social issue and simply produced very general discussions on the value of anthropology for understanding the world. For this question good use was made of *Death Without Weeping*, *In Search of Respect, Honor, Familia y Sociedad: el caso de Santander*, Finkelstein's *With no Direction Home* and Fong's *Paradise Redefined*, among others.

Question 3

This question was not often well answered. Responses were often limited and usually focused on societies and cultures in contact or belief systems and practices. While

most candidates could describe the diachronic perspective, they were usually unable to develop this in terms of theory/schools of thought beyond a passing reference to historical particularism. This meant that answers were mostly descriptive of "changes over time" with little analysis. In cases where political organization was chosen there was sometimes a list of different possible forms of political organization from band to state which was then ignored for the remainder of the answer. Often *Nisa* by Shostak was used to describe – and no more – how the !Kung have changed over time. In some of the lower achieving answers Fernea's *Guests of the Sheik* or Fadiman's *The Spirit Catches you and you Fall Down* were used uncritically and unreflectively to answer almost interchangeably and with the same ethnographic examples on "societies and cultures in contact" or "belief systems and practices". Some of the higher achieving answers incorporated Abu Lughod's work on the Bedouin and often discussed the impacts of sedentarisation on gender or Irwin's *Lords of the Arctic Wards of the State* for the Inuit.

Question 4

This was a reasonably popular question but one which, as it was defined in terms of theory/schools of thought, and also required comparative knowledge of two, may have appeared more demanding than other questions. The main difficulty candidates had with this question was the confusion of structure-centred with structuralism. Those candidates who wrote about "structure-centred" perspectives but not on structuralism did not produce material relevant to the question. One of the better answers to this question was able to outline Lévi-Strauss' "Myth of Asdiwal" and compare this to a structural functionalist interpretation of myths. Often, however, answers were quite limited; while some were able to describe, to some extent at least, two of the theories stipulated, they struggled to compare them or to make links to relevant ethnography. Radcliffe-Brown was variously described as a functionalist, structural functionalist and a structuralist theorist. He was also historically located anywhere between the mid 19th to the early 21st century. The same, *mutatis mutandis*, applied to many of the other theorists cited. Those who wrote well on postmodernism cited Glick Schiller, Appadurai and Hannerz as well as Abu-Lughod and Clifford and Marcus.

Question 5

This was a very popular question and produced many high achieving responses, most often evaluating an agency-centred perspective in the work of one ethnographer although a fair proportion of candidates took on the challenge of more than one perspective. Lower achieving responses had limited understanding of materialism and idealism which were often over-simplified and applied to ethnographic material with little or no understanding or ability to analyse this appropriately. In some cases candidates wrote on more than one ethnographer usually choosing one for one perspective and a second for another perspective and so not answering the question as set. In the best answers candidates had detailed knowledge of the work of an ethnographer which was examined critically in relation to at least one of the theoretical issues that they had also studied in relation to theory/schools of thought. Effective materials included Bourgois' *In Search of Respect*, Gutierrez de Pineda's

Honor, Familia y Sociedad, Brown's *Mama Lola*, Ortner's *Life and Death on Mount Everest* and Allison's *Nightwork*. Overall, these answers tended to be higher achieving than for other questions, and when done well best illustrated the kind of understanding this examination paper is all about.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- It is essential that the ethnographic materials selected for study are both appropriate and accessible in terms of the exploration of theoretical issues and perspectives. This makes the choice of course ethnographies a critical one, and one that should be frequently reviewed. Candidates from centres that select texts that are not ethnographies or by anthropologists may have to work harder to effectively link theory and theoretical perspectives to these texts.
- It is also essential that candidates are introduced to some relatively contemporary theory as well as to more classical approaches: we do our candidates a disservice when we ask them to think and write critically about anthropology in the 21st century without giving them some of the current tools for doing so. In this respect it was encouraging to see candidates able to cite transnationalism in the work of Glick Schiller and theories of globalization in Appadurai, for example.
- It is encouraging to see that many if not quite all candidates seem to have a better understanding of theoretical perspectives at least in terms of description, and some have begun to demonstrate quite effectively how to use these to think and write both with and about theories and ethnographies. This is not easy for many candidates at this level and in terms of teaching reinforces the importance of the previous two points. As challenging as it is, teachers need to provide candidates with the tools they need to demonstrate their abilities and achieve their potential. It is clear from some of the outstanding responses to this examination paper that this is perfectly achievable at this level.

Standard level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 15	16 - 21	22 - 26	27 - 32	33 - 44

General Comments

This session saw continued growth in the number of candidates which is always encouraging, and overall achievement was a little stronger; although there were a few less excellent scripts than last year, there was also a reduction in the number of candidates performing at the lower end of the range, with some solid consolidation in the middle. Despite this consolidation, the quality of anthropological knowledge, understanding and skills demonstrated varied from excellent to quite limited, with a wide range in between. There are still too many candidates who seem to be writing quite often from a common sense rather than from an anthropological understanding, even when there is evidence of some ethnographic knowledge. Ethnographic knowledge continues to be the strength of many papers and it was encouraging to see some more current or updated materials in use this session; it was also good to see more candidates recognizing when their descriptive materials were not strictly “ethnographic” and commenting on this in appropriate ways. On the other hand there seemed to be more candidates referring to ethnographies as “novels” and to informants/consultants as “characters” which is obviously problematic. The key distinction between higher and lower achieving scripts continues to be in the knowledge and application of anthropological concepts, thus many responses continue to be more descriptive than analytical; and this session several examiners also noted that explicit and systematic comparisons seemed less evident than in past sessions.

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

Perhaps even more than was the case in May 2012, examiners continue to note that explicit knowledge of anthropological concepts or terms is more often than not largely missing and that terms are often used with very little definition or discussion. Even where used appropriately in relation to other materials, which was generally the case, candidates rarely made any link/connection explicit or offered any kind of explanation. Rather, terms were presented as if self-evident, suggesting little understanding of ways in which anthropological approaches are different from common sense ones. Directly linked to this, it also seemed this session that more candidates than usual did not understand some of the key terms used in the questions: for example class and sexuality were quite often misinterpreted and ethnicity and race were quite often conflated (see question 9 below). A second area that seemed difficult, again because it was so often missing, was systematic and explicit comparisons between different societies or different groups within a society: rather, different groups/societies were simply described side by side, leaving comparison implicit at best.

These two limitations, taken together, meant that papers were more descriptive than analytical, although there were some notable exceptions. In terms of ethnography, very few responses attempted any kind of questioning of the ethnographer's claims, and if they did, the comments seemed rather mechanical and were given little to no support. It also seems that some candidates believe that heaping brief example upon brief example in terms of ethnography constitutes a sound response, giving little time or space for comparison or analysis, and still too often ethnographic materials are not fully identified or given any substantial context. In other cases it was apparent that candidates were basing their answers almost exclusively on short summaries or films, which should not be the case: exposure to and familiarity with ethnography is essential to the course at this level. In terms of the programme a number of examiners commented that most candidates were not distinguishing effectively between different processes of change and transformation: thus terms like globalization, modernity, modernization and westernization were used interchangeably and with very little specificity. Thus some ethnographic choices did not apply well to the chosen question: for example, ethnographies from the 1950s may not be appropriate to address a question on globalization and certainly not in sufficient detail. Additionally, knowledge of political organization, beyond an occasional passing reference to "band, tribe, chiefdom and state", as well as of economic organization, was very limited and discussion of human or cultural rights was at best presented in common sense and sometimes quite personal rather than anthropological terms.

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

Given the difficulties detailed above, it is good to note that many candidates were able to demonstrate quite extensive knowledge of relevant ethnographies, a good number of which are quite contemporary which is encouraging, and were able to use this knowledge more or less effectively to construct a sound – if not very analytical – response. It was also good to see that more candidates were recognizing when an account was not ethnographic, and sometimes providing some appropriate commentary on this. And of course, there were some excellent scripts, if a little more scarce than usual this session, that were able to demonstrate critical kinds of knowledge and understanding across all three components, clarifying the kinds of work that can be achieved at this level. In terms of programme it was also encouraging to see quite good work done around the concepts of agency, ideology and identity, as well as the relationship between reciprocity and changing consumption practices. More generally, although this is not consistent across all candidates, many were able to demonstrate some understanding of processes of social transformation at least descriptively and were able to integrate some sense of this into their response, particularly in relation to gender relations where candidates quite often demonstrated quite extensive knowledge.

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

Question 1

This question was quite often chosen and most frequently focused on reciprocity and changes in kinship; some candidates were able to define and discuss key terms

where others simply used them, but almost all were able to demonstrate the relevance of their ethnographic materials. In particular, Stack's "All Our Kin", Safa's "The Urban Poor of Puerto Rico", Lee's "The Dobe Ju'Hoansi" and Weiner's "The Trobrianders of Papua New Guinea" were well used here.

Question 2

This was a more popular question and many candidates were able to demonstrate quite a good understanding of some of the complexities and contradictions of social change and its impact on gender relations, using a wide range of ethnographic materials from India, New York City, Mexico, Iraq, China, Tunisia and Botswana/Namibia. However globalization as a particular social process was not often well conceptualized, and gender relations were quite often reduced to gender roles, usually focused only on women, so missing any sustained discussion of changing gender relations.

Question 3

This question was quite often chosen and produced several of the highest achieving responses seen this session, which was encouraging. Most candidates were able to demonstrate some anthropological understanding of human agency and its limitations in relation to structure in different societies or communities. Many responses focused on women as a social group, using examples from the Awlad 'Ali Bedouin, Iraqi village women in the 1950s, women in Tunisia, China and India as well as in New York City. Others focused on the limitations of class and/or ethnicity often using the work of Foley, Bourgois and Safa quite effectively. Although some responses were largely descriptive, it was clear that this question engaged the candidates who chose it, which was good to see.

Question 4

This question was rarely answered and generally not well done as few candidates were able to present relevant ethnography: an exception to this were one or two thoughtful responses discussing the economic organization of colonialism, using Bohannan's materials about the Tiv.

Question 5

This question was not often chosen: as noted earlier, most candidates seemed unfamiliar with political organization as a general anthropological concept and responses were quite limited, usually focused on the relation between political organization and globalization. However, neither term was well understood and candidates struggled to find relevant ethnography. Materials used included Nanda's work with Hijiras and Lessinger's "From the Ganges to the Hudson".

Question 6

This was a very popular question and was quite well done in some cases, but many candidates had little traction on the concept of modernity and simply treated it as synonymous with modernization or globalization, often glossed as any kind of social change. However, most were more successful in describing ways in which belief systems and practices – treating these terms quite broadly – had changed in specific communities, including accounts by Kraybill, Fernea, Lee, Turnbull, Chagnon, Nanda, Fadiman and Weiner.

Question 7

This was not a popular question but sometimes produced quite successful responses focused on the relation between ideology and different forms of inequality including gender, ethnicity, class and academic achievement. Most candidates made some effort to explicate key terms and some identified some of the factors under which ideology – and thus power and authority – might be challenged. Others were more limited both by lack of clear conceptual understanding and knowledge of relevant ethnography. Some relevant materials used well here included, Bourgois' "In Search of Respect", Kraybill's work on the Amish, Abu-Lughod's work with the Awlad 'Ali Bedouin, Foley's "Learning capitalist Culture..." and a new/updated ethnography – Keiser's "Friend by Day, Enemy by Night".

Question 8

This question was rarely chosen and responses were often very general and unfocused. Some more effective responses focused on the political organization of indigenous groups in response to environmental threats or changes, using some of Turner's Kayapo materials as well as Lee's account of the Dobe Ju'Hoansi.

Question 9

This was the single most popular question and produced quite a number of high achieving answers across all options, when candidates provided at least some anthropological discussion of identity formation and the concept chosen and explicitly linked this to quite detailed and relevant ethnographic materials. However two options – sexuality and class – were more problematic as a good many responses addressed sexuality as if synonymous with gender, and class as if synonymous with any kind of system of hierarchy including rank and status. In both cases this usually led to a choice of ethnography that was at best only generally relevant and sometimes not relevant at all. Responses that focused on age or religion tended to be more descriptive than analytical, although a clear focus on rites of passage in terms of age and identity formation were more successful: materials used here included Kraybill's account of the Amish, Lee's account of the Dobe Ju'Hoansi and Turnbull's account of the Bambuti. Ethnicity was a popular choice and produced some of the highest achieving answers, working with Foley's account of "North Town" Texas, Chavez "Shadowed Lives", Kathleen Hall's study of Sikh girls in England and Bourgois' "In Search of Respect". However, ethnicity was not always well defined and a number of responses slipped rather easily between ethnicity and race. When sexuality was understood, there were also some well conceptualized and detailed responses;

materials included Nanda's work with the Hijira, Brennan's account of sex workers in the Dominican Republic, Weiner's account of the Trobrianders, Abu-Lughod's account of the Awlad 'Ai Bedouin and Bourgois' "In Search of Respect". Where candidates recognized the specificity of class as a system of primarily economic stratification, there were also good answers, using Safa's "The Urban Poor of Puerto Rico", as well as the studies already mentioned by Foley and Bourgois.

Question 10

This question was not often chosen and almost always not well answered: many responses were very general and not well focused, making no distinction between human and cultural rights, which were usually treated in common sense or personal terms. Some more effective responses included discussion of the relation between indigenous groups and nation-states, or used Fadiman's particular account of cultural conflict experienced by Hmong immigrants in the United States.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Conceptualization

The standard level course incorporates three fundamental components: anthropological concepts and approaches which provide the tools for argument and analysis, detailed ethnographic knowledge and comparisons, which together provide the materials for supporting, illustrating and evaluating anthropological questions and arguments. As was the case in previous sessions, while many candidates are quite well prepared in terms of their ethnographic knowledge and understanding and most demonstrate some comparative skills (although this session comparisons were too often implicit at best), many demonstrate quite limited knowledge and understanding of anthropological concepts and approaches. Yet these need to be at the centre of any and every course, class and exam response. It is this conceptual framework that enables candidates to discuss and analyse the ethnographic materials effectively and critically, to make and support an anthropological argument. Obviously, if candidates are to be able to construct any kind of anthropological argument, these key concepts must be taught, discussed and constantly used in relation to different ethnographic materials to ensure their effective and appropriate application. As noted above specific anthropological knowledge and understanding of several large theme and key concepts were problematic this session and as a result limited achievement.

Ethnographic materials

Many candidates demonstrated quite a detailed knowledge of appropriate ethnographic materials that were usually quite varied, and this session more often current or updated than previously. They were also more successful in recognizing the distinction between ethnographic accounts and others, which was good to see. Nonetheless there are still some centres where candidates seem to be too dependent on non-ethnographic materials, including films made for television, or where the nature of ethnography itself seems not to be understood. While other cultural materials may be valuable as supplementary materials, they should be used in

support of ethnography, not as a substitute for it, which is still sometimes the case. Although clearly improved this session, teachers still need to help candidates recognize how and why these differ, the implications of this and how to reference/discuss this in the examination context. Finally, complete identification remains an issue for many: minimally, this requires the names of the society or group as well as the anthropologist/author, the place and some context as well as the ethnographic present. Ideally, this would also include the title and date of publication but this is neither essential nor sufficient in itself. And although more candidates were successful in meeting the new criteria E, which takes account of the depth of knowledge across different societies demonstrated over the paper as a whole (2/44 marks), this remains an issue for others and deserves some classroom discussion. Generally candidates who can demonstrate depth of knowledge across different societies – at least 3 – are able to achieve higher marks than those who present bits and pieces of knowledge of many societies. At the same time, candidates need to learn to use their detailed knowledge selectively to shape their responses in relation to the concepts given in the question, which was not always the case this session.

Themes

Teachers need to examine processes of change and social transformation more precisely and critically so that candidates become more aware both of their differences as well as of their implications: rather often this session discussion was reduced to “good” and “bad” and, as noted earlier, globalization and modernity were seen as essentially the same. Regardless of the question chosen, knowledge and understanding of different processes of change is now assessed across the paper as a whole in criteria D (4/44 marks) and without more precise knowledge and understanding this remains a limitation for a good many candidates.

Exam preparation and essay writing skills

Finally, several examiners commented on the apparent lack of sound essay writing and comparative skills, apparent in a good number of candidates. Teachers need to spend time preparing candidates with exam practice and essay writing skills, which should be developed and reinforced through frequent classroom practice and specific feedback. Candidates are sometimes so focused on demonstrating what they know about an ethnography that they forget to answer the question. In particular, teachers need to move candidates away from describing ethnographies towards more systematic analysis and comparison. It is also critical that candidates understand that answers must be based on detailed ethnographic materials and not their own generalized experience, although this was perhaps less of a problem this session. Obviously, but worth restating, all candidates should be very familiar with the assessment criteria and it is strongly recommended that teachers use these from the beginning in their own ongoing assessment practice.