International Baccalaureate®
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 13	14 - 27	28 - 39	40 - 50	51 - 62	63 - 73	74 - 100

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 12	13 - 27	28 - 37	38 - 51	52 - 63	64 - 77	78 - 100

Higher level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

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

The range and suitability of the work submitted

It was pleasing to see that only a small minority of the sample reports failed to present topics suitable for anthropological field research, and almost as many reports presented well-focused research questions as those presenting acceptable but not well-defined questions.

A majority of reports presented issue-based research. Gender issues were a popular focus of these: gender roles and perceptions of gender identity accounted for 7 of the 23 issue-based reports, for example, women and their increasing participation in the labor market in Argentina; accounting for female teachers' preference for kindergarten teaching in Asunción; male/female differences in concerns with personal grooming.

Context-based research projects typically concerned themselves with various narrowly-defined groups, for example, reports dealt with the social life of diplomats in Paraguay; social identity and membership in gated communities; Asian subgroups in a school community in Australia; types of participation and interaction in relation to use of space in a rock concert.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A: Identification of an issue or question.

The proportion of well-focused research reports to the total number of samples was somewhat lower than was true in the November 2007 session, and it continues to be true that centres vary markedly in the extent to which their candidates present well-chosen and well-focused research questions.

Criterion B: Presentation of data.

Candidate performance fell somewhat in comparison to last November. The number of candidates who successfully presented the data is almost the same as the number of candidates who failed to present the data appropriately. However, presenting data in sufficient detail and clarity given the word limit remains a real challenge for most candidates.

Criterion C: Interpretation of data.

The critical point in assessing performance under this criterion may be in determining whether or not the candidate's interpretation gives clear (or "general") support to the research question. 12 of 37 candidates were judged to have not interpreted data so as to provide clear support for their research questions, almost exactly the same proportion as was the case last November, which, however, represented a clear improvement over recent years. Again, centres varied greatly as to their candidates' success. As has usually been the case, a minority of candidates developed analytical frameworks. Some candidates who did present analytical frameworks were unclear as to appropriate detail, and/or applied them in a superficial manner, as was the case of several candidates who mentioned functionalism, or "psychological functionalism", but did not apply the theory accurately or productively.

Criterion D: Justification, comparison, and critical evaluation.

The HL IA report for November 2007 noted improvement in performance under this criterion, and in this session further improvement was seen, with about 2/3 of candidates presenting a substantial degree of comparison and evaluation of research techniques. Still, the great majority of candidates lacked appropriate detail in the critical treatment of their research procedures.

Criterion E: Personal experience and ethical issues.

Last November, the HL IA report noted "marked improvement over the past several examination sessions" with respect to this criterion. The trend continues, with a slight improvement over the November 2007 session evident. It now seems clear that teachers are conveying the importance of a sense of ethical procedure in preparing students for HL research, although it remains the case that centres vary greatly in performance with respect to this criterion.

Criterion F: Anthropological insight and imagination.

The proportion of candidates receiving credit for at least some degree of "anthropological insight" was about the same in this session as was the case in November 2007, while more

than twice the proportion of candidates received full marks than in November 2007. Still, as has been noted for several criteria, results varied markedly between centres.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

- The "steady improvement" noted above with respect to some criteria over the last several sessions, in both November and May, is continuing. Next November's session will be the last guided by the present subject guide (the "2002 Subject Guide"). Clearly, at this turning point, it is especially important that teachers carefully note changes in IA guidelines and in the criteria, as presented in the new Subject Guide first examinations in 2010). They should also examine the corresponding Teacher Support Materials publication, which presents marked reports with examiners' comments, as well as the IA guidelines and assessment criteria. Teachers will note that significant changes have been made in the HL assessment criteria, which should make them more student-and teacher-friendly. Both the Subject Guide and the Teacher Support Materials publication may be accessed through the IB Online Curriculum Centre site (the OCC).

- Referring most directly to Criterion C (interpretation of data), there continues to be much room for improvement in applying anthropological theory in providing analytical frameworks for interpreting data. Consulting the TSM publication mentioned above may aid teachers in helping students find and apply appropriate theory. Short periodical articles, available in anthropological periodicals, or in readers suitable for student use, may also offer models for well-focused research projects. Further, the OCC site for Social and Cultural Anthropology offers listings of resources relating to ethnographic methods, and more specifically, to student research projects.

Standard level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 9	10 - 11	12 - 14	15 - 16	17 - 20

The range and suitability of the work submitted

As noted last year, the requirements of this component seem to be quite well understood. All samples seen included both observation reports and critiques and met the word limits, meeting component requirements. The different public settings chosen for observation were all generally appropriate and candidates completed this first part, including the written report, quite effectively. Most of the critiques were focused on the written report and addressed at least some of the assessment criteria: however this part remains more problematic for some candidates/centres. In several cases the critique was used inappropriately to elaborate on the event/place observed or on the observation experience itself, rather than the written report of the observation. This is a key distinction and needs to be clearly understood by both teachers and candidates.

Candidate performance against each criterion

This was very similar to last year: for most candidates performance on criterion A was strongest, with a good many of the written reports seen both well detailed and clearly organized – though teachers should consider whether a simple chronological notation is sufficient to be accepted as "well-organized". This should be within the reach of all candidates. In terms of the critique, this year's performance on criterion B (nature of the observation and role of observer) was less successful with a good many candidates finding it difficult to recognize ways in which their own position, either socially or physically, shaped their written report. However performance on criterion D (assumptions, judgements and bias) was stronger with candidates more often able to recognize that some of their statements reflected social as well as personal biases, and identifying relevant examples in their written reports. Criterion C (description and analysis) continues to be the area where candidates seem to have most difficulty in recognizing this distinction in their own writing and identifying examples. Criterion E (demonstration of anthropological understanding - in part a holistic measure) varied more widely, usually reflecting individual performance on other criteria.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

1. Teachers are reminded that the **Assessment Criteria for this Internal Assessment component have been revised** under the new programme for first examination in **2010** (see new Guide p.43-44). It is essential that students are made familiar with these criteria and that teachers review the objectives and guidelines.

2. Given the continued struggle with criterion C (description and analysis – this becomes Criterion B in the new programme), and its wider implications for the development of all anthropological knowledge and understanding, it is essential that teachers incorporate classroom activities that help candidates recognize this distinction not only in terms of internal assessment but also in their own reading of any ethnography. This should become a part of frequent classroom practice.

3. Candidates continue to need to be helped to reflect more self-consciously on ways in which their own position (i.e. class, ethnicity, gender etc.) frames their assumptions, observations and understandings of all social and cultural relations, processes - and observations.

4. Finally, some candidates still seem unclear about expectations for the critique: it is important that teachers and candidates review and discuss the revised assessment criteria B, C, and D (2010) quite explicitly.

International Baccalaureate®
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

Higher level paper one

Component grade boundaries

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

The areas of the programme which proved difficult for candidates

Weaker scripts tended to be short, very descriptive and either directly quoted from or very closely paraphrased the text. This continues to be a problem and candidates who depend very heavily on quotations (particularly those who do not even acknowledge this by the use of quotation marks) do not do well. Careful reading of the passage is essential as a misunderstanding may lead to irrelevant answers. In this paper, for example, some candidates wrote that parents went on motherland tours to find children to adopt. Some candidates appeared to read more into the text than was present and incorporated their own opinions on adoption, family life and the nature of modern nuclear families into their answers to questions 1 and 2. This was unnecessary and for the most part irrelevant.

In a very small number of cases it was clear that candidates had not finished their answer to question 3 because they had run out of time in the examination. A small number of candidates did not appear to have the time to attempt question 3 at all and these candidates therefore received no marks at all for this question. Too many candidates failed to locate the comparative ethnographies they selected for question 3 and several had no ethnography at all in their question 3. A handful of candidates simply described the comparative society as "my society" or "western capitalist society". The very small number of candidates who answered the questions on the paper out of sequence (for example, answering question 2 and 3 before question 1) tended to produce rather weak scripts overall.

The levels of knowledge, understanding and skills demonstrated

These varied from the very good scripts which had well-formulated, focussed and detailed answers incorporating relevant anthropological concepts and theories to the questions to the very weak which were extremely brief, showed errors of understanding, discussed irrelevant material, were very descriptive, repeated the same material in both questions 1 and 2 and rarely rose above quotation and paraphrases of the text. It is a pity that some candidates did not answer one of the questions on the paper as this has a significant impact on the overall mark a candidate can obtain.

The best scripts selected a relevant group within a social context for the comparative question while far too many scripts had no fully identified comparative society. However, even the weakest scripts showed an awareness that comparison was required and did attempt, albeit poorly and often only implicitly, to compare the transnationally adopted children with other groups where membership of a group depended on clear and well delineated rituals and other social practices and interactions.

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

Question 1

The weaker answers to this question simply quoted directly or closely paraphrased sections from the examination text. These answers remained purely at the level of description and usually failed to show any real understanding of the passage itself. Such scripts often showed a failure of understanding by quoting irrelevant material or by quoting material which was potentially relevant but then adding a comment to this which showed a lack of clear understanding. Some of these scripts appeared to serve as a starting point for candidates to express their own opinions on adoption rather than to deal with the material provided in the text. Some candidates did not describe the motherland tours in their answers but chose instead to write about life in Norway for the adopted children. These candidates invariably then repeated this material in their answers to question 2.

The better scripts were able to take the term "identity" and work with this to show how identity construction is a process that is social but that has limits as with the appearance of the Korean adopted children who feel Norwegian but look, no matter what, Korean. The complexities of identity construction were tackled by a small number of candidates. Strong scripts provided examples to show how the adopted children were both Norwegian and Korean but in different ways and how the adopting parents handled this situation. The best scripts were able to discuss both the impact of the motherland tours on the parents as well as on the children and to draw out the relevance of these differences.

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

Question 2

While question 1 requires candidates to demonstrate their ability to understand the passage at a primarily descriptive level the second question requires candidates to use material from the text but to move towards anthropological generalisations on the basis of this material. The weakest candidates provided purely descriptive answers to this question and the very weakest again depended heavily on direct quotations from the text.

Material used to answer this question was either not always relevant or the candidate failed to show how the material might be relevant to answering the question. Many candidates repeated material from question 1 in question 2.

The better answers were able to understand how shared social practice and integration into a social network serves to make the adopted children Norwegian. For these candidates there was no need to discuss as some weaker candidates did, in rather essentialist terms, the impossibility of such a transformation as though culture were rooted in the genetic make-up of individuals. The contradictions in the social situation of people who feel Norwegian but look Korean was sometimes viewed as a biological inevitability by candidates who did not appear able to move beyond biological determinism of a very basic kind. Some candidates also appeared to view the adoption practices of Norwegian parents in terms of civilised nations

adopting or taking children from less civilised places and a very small number discussed the situation of the adopted children in terms of a poorly expressed and not terribly coherent nationalism.

Some candidates were able to discuss the name changes and transformation of the legal identities of the adopted children as rites of passage where one status is left behind and another status/identity taken on.

A few candidates wrote of adoption in terms of bureaucratic processes serving to construct an ideal family based on western understandings of what a family is. These candidates were able to show how the attempts to smooth over any elements that might call into question such an idealisation of "family" challenged commonly held assumptions about everyday family life. They were also able to show that there are social institutions and practices at both the state and also personal levels in place to bring into being and maintain this ideal of "family".

Question 3

Popular comparison societies were the Puerto Ricans in New York and the Trobrianders in Papua New Guinea. In the former case membership involved various rites of passage and involvement in group activities including violent and illegal ones. The best answers using Bourgois ethnography were able to show how the membership of one group meant exclusion from membership of another. In the case of the Trobriand material membership involved taking part in appropriate exchange systems and these, in the better answers, were also defined in terms of lineage and gender.

Some candidates also chose their own societies which were usually not well defined and which the candidates appeared to have little anthropological knowledge of. These latter responses tended to remain at the level of shallow generalisation and lacked anthropological insight. The responses drawing on the candidate's own society tended to reproduce stereotypical statements. Candidates should be discouraged from writing common sense and journalistic generalisations about their own societies and should not include this material unless they have made a detailed anthropological study of their own society which shows that they have subjected their society to the careful analysis and scrutiny required by anthropologists.

Some candidates included several sentences describing the chosen comparison ethnography in terms of research methods used in the ethnography, FTIs etc. and while this material was generally correct it lacked immediate relevance to the question and took time away from answering the question directly.

Some candidates described an ethnographic example but then did not explicitly compare this to the case of the adopted children in Norway. The best comparisons interwove material from the adopted children text and their chosen ethnography throughout showing both similarities and differences. Others failed to obtain more than four marks because the comparisons were not sustained or fully developed (mostly showing a few similarities and no differences). The very weakest scripts showed no evidence of having studied a relevant ethnography. Several candidates appeared to run out of time and left the question unfinished or simply did not attempt to answer question 3 at all.

The type of assistance and guidance the teachers should provide for future candidates

Question 1

Candidates should not depend on quotations for their answer to this question and neither should they simply produce a list of points which are not integrated into a coherent argument. Although this is a primarily descriptive question candidates should be able to discuss the descriptive material and to draw from this some clear interpretation and conclusion about the issue that the question is dealing with. Careful reading of the text is necessary in order not to mis-read what is being said and so lead to discussions which are not relevant. If candidates are not entirely clear about part of the passage they would be best advised to avoid mentioning it at all in their answer. Candidates should be discouraged from over-interpreting and should be warned not to go off on tangents where they discuss their own opinions on contemporary social matters in question 1. Better answers to question 1 tend to be more than just one or two sentences long and as this is a question that requires no more than a sensible and relevant understanding of the text itself this is a question that all candidates could and should do well on. Candidates should be encouraged to see if they can answer the question from several perspectives. In this case the tours had different impacts on the children and the parents and the candidates who were able to recognize this and discuss it were given marks for this.

Question 2

Candidates should avoid repeating material from question 1 in question 2. Further, although some descriptive material from the text is necessary in this question the candidates should be encouraged to move from close reading of the text to generalisations drawing in some of the anthropological concepts and possibly theories that they have studied and which are relevant to the question. In this case candidates who were able, for example, to write incorporating anthropological discussions of identity and rites of passage all developed acceptable answers to the question. Candidates need to show that they can develop a coherent and sustained answer to the question that draws on material from the text as supporting evidence for their discussion.

Question 3

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

Candidates should be encouraged to stick to the text and the material in the text as the basis for their answers.

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

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

Higher level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 6	7 - 12	13 - 16	17 - 20	21 - 24	25 - 28	29 - 40

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

As in previous examinations the same key areas of the programme continue to prove difficult for some candidates and these include: the definitions of central concepts and terms in questions; the understanding of basic concepts; the use, or rather more often, lack of anthropological theory; and the interweaving of relevant theory and ethnography (see report from May 2008 for a more detailed outline of the problems in each of these areas). Too many candidates simply failed to answer the question on the paper preferring instead to reproduce what appeared to be class essays which were irrelevant. A particular failing in this examination appeared to be the lack of appropriate theoretical knowledge to answer questions on contemporary issues. For example, far too many candidates attempted to answer the question on globalisation (number 12 on the paper) using anthropological theories that pre-dated the 1950s and this meant that the candidates were poorly equipped to deal with the question and hence did not do well on the marking criteria. A significant proportion of candidates also failed to demonstrate a detailed knowledge of a sufficient number of societies across the two questions they answered. A small number of candidates were not able to complete both essays in the time available. These candidates produced scripts with very uneven essays across the paper.

The levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

The same points made in the report for May 08 broadly apply to the work of candidates in this examination. That is to say, centres varied widely in the ability of their candidates to present and properly apply theoretical perspectives. Some candidates produced exemplary work showing high levels of knowledge and skill in answering the questions. These candidates have a broad range and in-depth of knowledge of anthropological theory, the history of the theories, a sound ability to select and use relevant concepts and detailed knowledge of several ethnographies which they are able to draw on to produce detailed, reasoned, analytically sound and thoughtful essays. At the other extreme, however, some candidates were only able to demonstrate very elementary knowledge of anthropological theory and showed little evidence of having studied the requisite number of ethnographies in detail. These candidates tended to fall back on unacceptable commonsense generalizations and were often compelled to answer questions drawing on their own limited, often misrepresented and stereotypical knowledge of their own societies.

The breadth of ethnographic resources used and the depth of analysis evident varied widely as usual. While there was considerable variation within centres with large cohorts of candidates the centres with a relatively small number of candidates for examination showed less marked variation.   Candidates in several centres consistently failed to satisfy the requirement of showing detailed knowledge of a sufficient number of societies.

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

Section A

Question 1

This was a question which produced some good as well as some very weak responses. The strongest answers showed how kinship, and in particular material and non material exchanges, between kin that might be both ritualised and/or institutionalised continued in the modern world among both traditional and westernised social groups. Some very interesting answers dealt with fictitious kin and showed how kin-type relations were adapted to contemporary social contexts. In this respect some candidates chose the work of Bourgois to demonstrate how criminal groups in New York reproduce family structures and how leaders of drug gangs care for their workers along the lines of a head of household. The workers for their part are expected to show loyalty and respect as they would to a head of household. Others chose to use the Trobrianders to exemplify the continuation of important kin relations at the time of a bereavement. These latter scripts often dealt with kinship in the modern world in clearly gendered terms. The very weakest answers simply berated the supposed lack of family values in the modern world and railed against the nefarious workings of capitalism with little by way of ethnographic evidence or anthropological imagination and insight to support their statements.

Question 2

This was quite a popular question but not always for the right reasons. Many candidates simply wrote essays on the division of labour and/or compared the division of labour across two societies. These answers appeared simply to reproduce class essays and the candidates were, on the whole, unable successfully to adapt their class work to fit the specific requirements of the question. While some of the essays on the division of labour were sound they failed to gain high scores because they lacked relevance to the question on the examination paper. This was a pity and a matter that should be addressed in preparing future candidates for examination.

Many who did answer well on this question again chose gender as a way of distinguishing groups or chose two groups in the same geographical region with different positions of power and hence access to resources. The San in Botswana were a popular choice as were the Trobrianders and the Puerto Ricans in New York.

The best scripts not only focussed on the question itself and discussed access to resources (which were sometimes not material resources but resources of value in some other way to the society) but both compared and contrasted these.

Question 3

Relatively few candidates attempted this question and those who did were not often able to define moral systems convincingly. Weaker answers dealt with power relations and ignored the relations between power and morality. The best answers set out what was understood by a moral system and then used this to show how local ideas of right and wrong were used/ manipulated/ worked with to achieve socially desirable goals by those in positions of power. Some even ventured to consider how those in power are able to define the terms within which they worked and to impose these on the wider society.

Question 4

A question which was not well answered on the whole. Candidates tended to focus on either religion or identity but not explicitly to consider how the former might impact (or not) on the latter. Relatively few candidates even attempted to define what they meant or understood by religion and identity – the key terms in the question. Some candidates suggested that colonisation and the conversion of populations from a traditional religion to a major world religion such as Christianity not merely altered social identity but destroyed it altogether. Unfortunately, such answers rarely managed to provide sufficient ethnographic material to support this position. Very few candidates were able to suggest that religion might be one, perhaps for some, key component of identity but that it was unlikely to be the only element of one's identity. Identity as a concept was relatively poorly understood and mostly taken for granted as unproblematic.

Question 5

This was a popular question and produced some good answers. Candidates who were able to discuss the obligations as well as rights that often come with marriage and who were able to do this in terms of the different implications of marriage for males and females as well as for the changes that a marriage brings to the wider kinship network produced the strongest answers. Some candidates explored the implications of post-marital residence and the impact of this for the spouse who moves from one home to another at marriage. The weakest answers did not discuss the question itself and were often limited to little more than descriptions of marriage rituals including "marriage by capture" and the arranging of marriages by elders.

Question 6

This was a popular question but one that was misunderstood by a significant proportion of candidates who chose to answer this question. In some cases candidates chose similar age groups within one society (often male and females of the same age within a society not similar age groups across two societies as required) while in others they simply described a series of age groups in one society (typically, children, adults and the seniors in one society). The very weakest essays said little more than children do not work too much, adults do quite a lot and the elders in a society deserve respect. Those candidates who compared a society studied in class with their own age group or society produced particularly weak answers.

Stronger answers were able to discuss, for example, rites of passage in two societies or to consider the power relations, access to socially valuable knowledge or some other matter that one age group had and another did not within one society. Symbolic approaches to the answer to this question were also often thoughtful and reasoned.

Section B

Question 7

This was not a very popular question and one that was not, on the whole, well answered. The uses of identity to achieve political ends was rarely explicitly considered as a way of answering this question and few of the candidates who attempted this question seemed very clear about either how to understand "political" or "identity" in the question. This is a pity as the ethnographic studies of the successes and failures of identity politics and the strategic use of identity to further the goals of particular groups are widely available and accessible to candidates at this level.

Question 8

No candidate answered the question in relation to ethnicity and very few did on either indigeneity or nationalism. The few who did were not altogether clear about what indigeneity or nationalism were and this hampered them in the development of their discussions on the subject. The very weakest answers did little more than simply state that anthropologists study lots of things and this helps us to understand them. There was little evidence that these topics had been studied or that candidates had the conceptual and theoretical knowledge to be able to answer these questions well.

Question 9

The better answers to this question were nuanced, sophisticated and showed knowledge of development as a problematic term that has been variously understood and implemented over time and around the globe. Relevant ethnographic examples were provided by the candidates who wished to demonstrate both the positive and negative possibilities of development and the manner in which anthropologists have been able to show that development is not a straightforward matter and that different sub-groups within a society may well both benefit and be disadvantaged by any particular programme of development.

The weakest answers simply defined development as "change" and therefore any change of any type anywhere, anytime appeared to be covered by the term development. Some candidates wrote in terms of evolution and the move from savagery to barbarism and thence to civilisation. Not all of these candidates appeared aware of the serious limitations of such an approach to development and change in social terms.

Question 10

Very few candidates answered on this question and only those who were able to define – and hence show their understanding of what "shared historical experience" might mean – were able to produce sound answers to this question. Candidates had fewer difficulties in explaining status but linking status to shared historical experience in their essays was harder for some to manage.

Question 11

There were some very good answers to this question and often the chosen ethnography was Lee's work on the changes to hunter-gatherer lifestyles over the period from the 1960s to the 1990s in Botswana. The better candidates were able to show how the attempts by a nation-state such as Botswana to treat all its citizens as equals may in fact lead to the disruption of particular social groups and the loss of local linguistic, cultural and subsistence knowledge. A few candidates were able to discuss such processes as forms of neo-colonialism.

Weak answers to this question were not able to show that they understood what a nation-state was or what the relationship between a nation-state and local social organization might be. These latter scripts tended to simply describe changes in the lives of small-scale societies and to consider this a sufficient answer to the question.

Question 12

This was a fairly popular question the answers to which all too often suffered from missing, incomplete, or distorted definitions of globalization. There were some very good answers, using appropriate concepts and references to theories/ theorists of globalization. Too often, however, the question was seen as an opportunity to lament the homogenizing and culturally destructive effects of modernization.

Weaker answers showed that candidates simply did not have the appropriate conceptual and theoretical knowledge to answer the question and were often struggling to find an analytical framework to make sense of their descriptive ethnographic material. Such candidates resorted to social evolutionary theories of a very dated kind, or were forced to describe contemporary globalisation using functionalist theories or the structural functionalism of Radcliffe-Brown. In these instances candidates were let down not at the level of the ethnography but at the level of the theoretical grounding that HL candidates are expected to have. This was a pity as it was clear that many candidates were trying hard to produce good answers and were failed by their lack of relevant conceptual knowledge.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Candidates should be reminded that key terms used in questions are almost always problematic, and must be defined.

- Teachers need to help candidates achieve a balance between conceptual development and theoretical exposition and analysis. The conceptual and theoretical information a candidate must include in a higher level essay needs to be integrated with the ethnographic material and relevant to the question. Theory often seemed to be "injected" into an argument for its own sake. On occasion irrelevant discussions on ethnographic method were added to essays and then simply ignored for the remainder of the essay.

- A significant number of candidates continue to omit some, most or all identifying information about the ethnographic material discussed. Some centres however, had clearly encouraged candidates consistently to demonstrate care in the identification of sources. Candidates should not find themselves in the position of having to answer

any question on the basis of their own commonsense, limited and untheorised knowledge of their own society.

- Candidates should be discouraged from attempting to answer a question on a topic that they have not studied. They should be made aware that a term in common usage may have a specific meaning in anthropology and that an everyday understanding of the term is not sufficient to answer a question well.

- Candidates need to be introduced to a broad range of anthropological theories and concepts as well as to ethnographies which serve to link with or exemplify the theories candidates are taught. In particular, schools should 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. No candidate should be answering a question on globalization, for example, using 19th or early 20th century anthropological theories to attempt to make sense of 21st century social and cultural phenomena.

- A significant proportion of candidates also failed to demonstrate knowledge of a sufficient number of societies across the two questions they answered. While it is not possible to tackle this matter with the current marking criteria such candidates will find themselves losing marks in examinations from 2010 and schools should make sure that future candidates are well prepared for the examination in this respect.

- Some candidates were unable to complete both the questions on the examination paper and these candidates often, as a consequence, produced very uneven answers. Candidates should be well prepared to spend equal amounts of time on each question and to have sufficient practice to be able to complete both questions in the examination.

- Candidates should be advised not simply to repeat a class essay in the examination, as this is unlikely to be the best way to gain a good grade on the paper.

Higher level paper three

Component grade boundaries

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

General comments

Many candidates displayed a general knowledge of theory. However, only a minority showed that they had detailed theoretical knowledge. It is important that candidates move beyond giving a cursory summary of a set of ideas. In addition, candidates should be able to criticize the ideas they are discussing. Understanding how a set of ideas fits into the wider discipline would help candidates to analyse their merits and how they relate to other trends within the discipline. At minimum, candidates should be historically contextualizing theory.

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

While some centres are teaching a wide range of ethnography, it seems as though particular centres are still relying on materials from the middle of the 20th century. While these are fine, they need to be coupled with contemporary materials so that candidates can develop a fuller understanding of the history of anthropology.

Linked to this, candidates struggled to discuss the ways in which theoretical schools have reacted against each other and been influenced by each other. This kind of discussion needed to be set within analytical frameworks that allowed candidates to link theory, FTIs and ethnography. Instead, some candidates presented mainly descriptive papers that contained memorized points. Teachers should note that the distinction between candidates who can describe and those who can analyse is clearly outlined in the Group 3 Grade Descriptors posted on the Online Curriculum Centre. These are the types of skills that form part of the decision making around where grade boundaries lie.

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

It is clear that some centres are teaching a good range of ethnography and theory. However, as in past years, this is not consistent across centres. All candidates are now including ethnography as part of their responses. This is a marked improvement over past years. Candidates now need to work towards fully identifying these sources and more deeply recognizing the place of ethnographic materials within the context of the theoretical history of the discipline.

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

Question 1

Overall, candidates struggled with this question. Very few could identify schools of thought relevant to this discussion. For example, it would have been appropriate to contrast the functionalists, following Durkheim, desire to build a "science for society" (and the FTIs associated with this), with a post-modern approach. A few candidates did bring post-modernism or interpretivism into their responses but did not associate any specific anthropologists with these schools. None referred to the tensions between interpretivism and positivism outlined in FTI 4.6. Some candidates did not seem to understand the question at all.

Question 2

This was a very popular question but not always well answered. A large group of candidates attempted to answer this question by equating particularistic to emic and universalistic to etic. Instead, they needed to have a broader understanding of these FTIs, which includes particularists aiming to offer explanations from a particular social and historic context, whereas universalists seek commonalities to humanity. This requires understanding not only the ethnography studied, but also the role of the ethnographic study within the broader

discipline. For example, many missed that Richard Lee wrote about the Dobe Ju/'Hoansi with the intention of contributing to neo-evolutionist thinking and literature regarding hunting and gathering peoples. Similarly, Bourgois' study of East Harlem could be seen as representative of classic neo-Marxist thinking (see his entry in the McGee & Warms text, 2000). In both of these examples, the ethnographers were drawing on both particularism and universalism. Perhaps the most common obstacle to success, was the desire on the part of candidates to present lists of memorized points about theoretical schools, rather than presenting details about theories in an analytical framework.

Question 3

Responses to this question came from a small group of schools. Unfortunately, many of the candidates who chose this question did not have a good grasp of the issues. Some correctly linked cultural ecology and other neo-evolutionists to materialism but very few of these clearly defined to FTI. Those who could explain the issues struggled to link them to ethnography.

Question 4

This question solicited responses from a broad range of schools. There were some excellent answers that drew on the ethnographic works of Bourgois and Scheper-Hughes. These responses were coupled with ideas of Bourdieu, Giddens and Appadurai. Some candidates clearly defined the FTIs that were the focus of this question and included them in an analysis that linked theory and with ethnography and FTIs. Other candidates misunderstood agency as being about the individual and structure as about the group. Instead, the emphasis should have been on agency as the capacity for individuals or groups to act and shape their world around them, and structure as social and material contexts constraining action. It was clear that some candidates were well prepared with ethnographic sources that relate strongly to issues of globalization, while other candidates were drawing from materials that dated mainly from the 1950s and 1960s.

Question 5

This question solicited a wide range of responses. Some candidates were able to clearly link theory, FTIs and ethnography. Other candidates discussed schools of thought in general terms but their responses lacked specific and did not draw on FTIs to help explain the school of thought that formed the focus of their answer. Similar to other questions, candidates from particular centres relied mainly on descriptive answers that listed memorized points. These answers asked any kind of critical perspective.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

While candidates are writing complete papers, they could use more practice in learning to write an analytical essay. Teachers should set aside time to teach candidates how to develop analytical essay frameworks. They should also help candidates to understand that they need to write in a systematic manner, and always explain the relevance of all parts of their response to the question. This will help candidates move away from disorganized or descriptive papers. This should be done alongside the assessment criteria.

Teachers should select theoretical and ethnographic material that helps candidates to gain a fuller picture of the history of anthropology. This means teaching theory from the functionalists up to the global theorists. It also means actively linking ethnographies as tied to this history. Candidates should know why an author might have chosen particular theoretical perspectives and approaches. It is also imperative that candidates are able to discuss whom a theorists and/or ethnographer might be influenced by and reacting against.

Teachers might find it helpful to use extra resources found in theory anthologies or journal databases to help themselves and their students gain a deeper understanding of the theoretical perspectives of ethnographers. The Online Curriculum Centre should also be used as a resource to start discussion around critically analysing ethnographies - it is very likely that teachers have colleagues around the world drawing from the same set of resources.

By focusing on essay writing skills and a deeper theoretical understanding of ethnographies, it is hoped that teachers will also be better equipped to teach students how to tie all of the three major elements of Paper 3 together. Many candidates discuss theoretical issues, theory and ethnography separately in their essays – almost as three separate responses. Instead, they should be using these three elements in tandem to explain their responses to the question. The new 2010 syllabus is quite clear in this goal. Please note that the criteria now refer to "perspectives" (formerly "issues"), theory (which could be interpreted as schools of thought) and ethnography.

Standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

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

General comments

Most candidates were able to demonstrate some understanding of the text in terms of general ideas about some of the social and cultural processes involved in the construction of identity in the context of transnational adoption, to recognize the different perspectives of adopted children and their adoptive parents, and to identify some relevant comparative materials. However fewer candidates were successful in linking this knowledge to the specific ethnographic materials presented in the text, and more answers than usual remained at the level of generalization rather than specific analysis. Other answers tended to be only descriptive, often quite repetitive and sometimes very close to the text. Most candidates were able to complete all three questions but many did not give complete identification for the comparative case.

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

In terms of the examination there was a considerable variation between centres in terms of the ability to develop a close analysis of the specific ethnographic text. Although some candidates were apparently quite knowledgable in terms of psychological approaches to the construction of identity, more often than not this was presented with little or no reference to the details of the text, ultimately suggesting rather limited anthropological understanding. Often it was these same candidates who found it difficult to develop a systematic comparison, simply presenting other ethnographic materials – sometimes of more than one society – and with very limited identification, although again, this varied between centres.

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

Most candidates were able to demonstrate some knowledge of the ways in which identity is constructed in terms of general social and cultural processes, and to distinguish between what may be given by biology or blood and what is acquired or learned. Some candidates recognized that this distinction was part of a larger anthropological discourse. The most successful candidates were those who were able to use this knowledge to develop a close analysis of the text. Most candidates were able to describe cultural identity in terms of patterns and shared norms; more successful candidates were able to recognize how these might be experienced differently by children and parents, generating some of the kinds of contradictions described on the "motherland" tours.

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

Question 1

This question was not often well answered, with many candidates missing key elements given in the second paragraph. While most described the initial process of "rebirth" including naming, citizenship and new family, other references to socialization processes and activities of "typical" Norwegian families fixed in photographs, or to language that downplayed the child's origins were often missing. Only a few candidates were able to frame these examples/details in terms of relevant generalizations about socialization, or ideas about kinship and/or identity.

Question 2

In one centre this question usually produced very general discussions of different psychological approaches to identity (Mead, Freud, Maslow for example) with little if any direct reference to the text itself, limiting the level of achievement. Although some answers here did address the question of contradiction and sometimes perspective, this was rarely linked to the experiences described in the text itself but instead suggested only more general and hypothetical issues. Other candidates worked more closely and effectively with the ethnographic materials although only a few recognized the range of contradictions present for both parents and children in terms of explicit and implicit goals or the messages conveyed by appearance, actions and language. The best answers were able to show how these kinds of

contradictions derived from ideas about identity linked to "blood", yet produced in specific social and cultural contexts.

Question 3

Although almost all candidates were able to provide at least a satisfactory account of some of the ways in which individuals become members of a specific group, more often than not this was presented with a very limited or no comparative framework and incomplete identification of the case chosen. However there were also much more successful answers, drawing on a range of different ethnographic cases (the most successful were Bourgois' In Search of Respect and Chagnon's Yanomamo), where candidates were able to develop a comparative framework in terms of components of identity such as ethnicity, class, age or gender to identify similarities and differences to the case of transnationally adopted Norwegian children.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Candidates need to develop a clear understanding of what is expected and the kinds of skills required for this component. In some centres this seems to not yet be very clear.

- Teachers are reminded that for **November 2010**, candidates should be familiar with the **new assessment criteria for Paper 1** to be used in addition to the kind of paper specific markscheme currently in use: these are published in the new Guide (see p. 30) available at the Online Curriculum Centre.

- In terms of expectations, it is essential that candidates go beyond description and learn to identify relevant anthropological concepts and approaches, **but they must also learn to apply these, critically, to develop an analysis that draws on and uses the details of the text**.

- In terms of skills, **comparison** remains central to the demonstration of anthropological knowledge and understanding and needs to be practiced across a range of ethnographic materials and topics. In both cases, classroom work with previous texts and markschemes can be very useful.

- In their work with comparative ethnography candidates must be able to identify and contextualize their material, and understand why this is important. They also need to understand that presenting material from more than one comparative case is not a substitute for a sustained and systematic comparison with one case presented in detail, as required.

Standard level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 5	6 - 11	12 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 25	26 - 31	32 - 40

General comments

As in previous years, with a small drop in candidate numbers (45 in 2006, 62 in 2007 and 53 this year) the range of achievement was quite wide both between and within centres, but the overall level remained more than satisfactory, with continued evidence of some informed and thoughtful teaching and learning, which is encouraging in terms of what can be achieved at this level. As usual, the critical distinction between more and less successful answers was evidence of conceptual knowledge and the ability to use this to develop a well focused analysis, as well as comparative skills. In general terms, most candidates demonstrated some familiarity with anthropological ideas and materials and the readiness to think with and about them in the examination context.

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

As in previous years, many candidates continued to have much more difficulty with theme 3 of the programme – processes of change and transformation – assessed in Section B. This was usually linked to insufficient conceptualization, with all forms and processes of change treated as more or less interchangeable.

However this problem was more evident in some centres than others, and in relation to specific questions, for example on development (see question 9 below) and globalization (see question 12 below), which were two of the most popular questions this year. More generally in terms of the examination itself, there was quite often a lack of balance between the detailed presentation of ethnographic materials and comparison and analysis which was implicit at best, and focus in terms of the question was quite often lacking, as was careful identification of ethnographic materials. And in one case, candidates from one centre consistently disregarded the specific requirements of the question (see question 2 below).

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

Different groups of candidates were able to demonstrate their knowledge of specific topics which they were usually able to frame in relevant anthropological terms, and of a range of ethnographic materials. In Section A, the best answers addressed either issues of access to resources (question 2) or age groups (question 6), and in Section B candidates from one centre were able to write knowledgably about ways in which identity has become political in the modern world (question 7). As usual, the strongest answers were both analytical and comparative, indicating an understanding and appreciation of anthropological perspectives

and approaches. There was some evidence of an implicit understanding of culture and identity as dynamic and historically constructed. In terms of the examination, some candidates provided clear context for their ethnographic materials, although identification overall was often incomplete.

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

Section A

Question 1

Both answers offered arguments that compared the role of kinship, exchange relations and/or ethnicity as relevant mechanisms of social integration and/or identity in different societies. The more successful answer was sufficiently grounded in relevant ethnographic material to make quite an effective comparative claim.

Question 2

This was a popular question but produced two very different sets of responses. Candidates from one centre generally wrote quite effectively here, with some very strong answers, well grounded in theoretical approaches to stratification and power as well as relevant ethnographic materials often from Bourgois' In Search of Respect. In the other case, all candidates disregarded the requirement for internal comparison and simply provided parallel descriptive accounts of resources (and sometimes access to these) in two or three societies, with little anthropological conceptualization beyond a rather vague discussion of adaptation.

Question 3

Candidates were more successful in addressing the concept of power relationships in society, leaving the notion of moral systems more or less implicit; however there was some understanding that moral obligations implied by exchange relations, or ideas about respect and influence, could be made relevant here.

Question 4

As with question 3, answers here too were usually more successful in terms of their discussion of religion **or** identity but struggled to clarify the relation between them. The more successful answers were those that were able to ground their discussion in clearly relevant ethnographic materials, such as Susan Brenner's text on young Javanese women in Indonesia.

Question 5

This was quite a popular question but not usually well done. Although there was evidence of bits and pieces of relevant anthropological knowledge and some understanding, with one notable exception, candidates did not focus on the key terms of the question – "change social relations" – but rather simply described different marriage practices (not always correctly) in several societies that they had studied, usually focusing on individuals rather than groups. This was a pity as some of the ethnographic materials most often presented (for example,

Harner's study of the Shuar in Ecuador and Mead's study of Samoa) could have been used quite effectively, as well illustrated by the one successful answer seen.

Question 6

This was a popular question in all but one centre, with the most effective answers focusing on the relations between two age groups – usually some version of child and adult - in the same society, and framing the discussion in terms of role and status, socialization and/or rites of transition. Strengthening the comparative framework, some answers also expanded their focus to show how age groups also varied in terms of gender and division of labour. Some of the better answers here were based on a detailed presentation of Mead's Samoan materials (although perhaps used a little uncritically); other cases used more or less effectively included Chagnon's Yanomamo, Chapman's Selknam and Okley's Traveller Gypsies although these were more often poorly identified.

Section B

Question 7

Although not often chosen, from one centre in particular, this question produced several strong anthropologically informed responses which were good to read, framing relevant ethnographic materials such as Conklin's Kayapo text or that of Brenner on Javanese women, in the context of globalization and resistance to western forms of modernization as well as approaches to the construction of identity. Other answers were much less successful, struggling to move beyond very vague generalizations about identity or to think through how this might be political.

Question 8

- indigeneity (1 answer) : the term itself was not really understood here, although the candidate was able to present some more or less relevant ethnographic material and comparisons.

- ethnicity (6 answers) : understanding here varied significantly between candidates from different centres. In one case, answers demonstrated quite a sound knowledge of relevant anthropological approaches – usually along the lines of primordialist, constructivist and instrumentalist – and an ability to link these approaches to relevant ethnographic materials; in the other case, candidates struggled to get beyond a misleading reading of ethnicity as ethnic groups, presenting largely descriptive accounts of "culture".

- nationalism (2 answers) : the term was not well understood in the context of anthropological conceptualization and discussion, beyond some very general notion of a common cultural identity that opposed others. Ethnographic support was very limited.

Question 9

This was a popular question but not very well answered for different reasons. Some candidates appeared not to understand the term "development" as implying a specific ideology and practice in terms of change, as well as a particular historical context and

relationship. Rather, the term was treated very generally to mean almost any kind of change and the question answered descriptively rather than analytically. Others, while sometimes able to provide references to potentially relevant economic and political processes or relations, focused almost entirely on quite problematic discussions of idealist and materialist arguments (and apparently different kinds of anthropologists); they were never able to ground their discussion in relevant ethnography or to quite bring the different pieces together in any coherent argument.

Question 10

These answers made little effort to provide any discussion of the consequences of "shared historical experience" whether in terms of an anthropological approach or with reference to the details of ethnographic material and context.

Question 11

Two answers were quite well focused in terms of trying to clarify the nature (and in one case the history) of the nation-state. Its relation to local social organization – and what this term in itself might mean - was more problematic, however ethnographic materials provided some relevant context for beginning to sort this out, and to suggest that in some cases this could be contradictory.

Question 12

This was a popular question but with one strong exception not very well answered. Although there was evidence that some candidates had some knowledge of relevant anthropological approaches (for example Appadurai and/or Friedman) and the kinds of processes involved (for example homogeneization or differentiation), the selection of ethnographic materials was not always relevant (or made relevant), and/or ethnographic materials were presented in a rather fragmentary form and without the local context necessary to really examine the question.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Teachers are reminded that **the themes, structure and assessment criteria for Paper 2 will change for the exam in November 2010.** These changes are published in the new Guide available from the Online Curriculum Centre. It is essential that teachers and candidates are **familiar with the new assessment criteria** and refer to these in classroom practice.

- Processes of change and transformation are identified in the revised programme as **Cultures in Contact,** as the second of eight themes for study in Papers 1 and 2 (new Guide p.9), and have been incorporated into all other themes (new Guide p. 17 – 20). Recognition of processes of change has also been added as a new assessment criteria for Paper 2 (new Guide p. 32). Thus teaching programmes still need to make sure that different processes of change and transformation are clearly distinguished and located in a specific historical context, and that globalization is recognized as a specific and recent phenomenon. *Globalization: the key concepts* by Thomas H. Eriksen (Berg 2007) might be a useful summary and guide.

- Candidates will continue to need to understand that all ethnographic description needs to be closely focused in terms of the question, and should be part of a larger argument that is both analytical and comparative. In some centres there was a tendency for candidates to present very detailed descriptions of specific ethnography that was not always well focused and rarely analytical.

- Similarly, candidates continue to need to understand that any general discussion of relevant anthropological approaches and concepts must always be linked to detailed ethnographic materials, to examine, illustrate and/or provide support for the general argument. This year in some centres this was not always the case.

- Overall there was evidence of familiarity with quite a range of relevant ethnography, but this was not always the case. Teachers need to make sure that materials are **as current and varied as possible**, (see new assessment criteria for Paper 2: new Guide p.32), and that candidates learn to provide some reference to the specific historical or contemporary context. And it needs to be said once again, that all ethnographic materials needs to be fully identified – rather often this year place, anthropologist and/or place were missing.