

SOCIAL & 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

Clear improvements were seen in this session over last November's session. With twice as many reports offering well-focused research questions as those presenting acceptable but not well-defined questions.

A majority of reports presented issue-based research. The issues addressed varied widely. One large sample seemed collectively focused on issues relating to particular occupations, for example, four reports focused on various aspects of the social roles of sales personnel; two focused on social and economic issues concerning domestic workers; lawyers and physicians were the foci of two other reports. Several other reports focused on the interpretation of symbols and symbolic interaction, for example one examined the meanings behind drinking maté; a second report focused on the rise of a particular urban youth subculture; while another researched the meanings and practices related to a new national holiday.

Content-based reports focused on a wide range of institutions, for example: class and prestige issues at a swimming club; a wedding as a rite of passage; the role of alcohol at family gatherings; the functions and meanings of a "parade of nationalities" in one urban neighbourhood; a comparison of social contexts of football and polo matches; a comparative study of several girls' "coming out" (*quinceañera*) parties; an examination of daily life in a faith-based university student residence.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A: Identification of an issue or question

As mentioned above, the proportion of reports presenting well-focused research questions was clearly higher than in recent sessions. It is still the case that centres vary markedly in the extent to which their candidates present well-chosen and well-focused research questions.

Criterion B: Presentation of data

There was also a marked improvement with respect to data presentation, as a strong majority of candidates presented data in an appropriate manner. Still, most candidates left room for significant improvement in clarity and detail of presentation.

Criterion C: Interpretation of data

The critical point in assessing performance under this criterion seems to be in determining whether or not the candidate's interpretation of data gives clear or at least general support to the research question. Almost half of the sample reports moderated were judged to have not interpreted data so as to provide support for their research questions, a slightly larger proportion than in the last two November sessions. Once again, centres varied greatly as to their candidates' success. Only a minority of candidates developed analytical frameworks, and sometimes a proposed framework was improperly or only superficially applied. It may be remarked that the criterion concerned with interpretation in the new (2010) programme explicitly calls for providing an analytical framework, and is worth 4 marks rather than 3.

Criterion D: Justification, comparison, and critical evaluation

It is satisfying to report that the improvements noted with regard to this criterion over the past several sessions continue to be seen. Three-quarters of the reports sampled achieved a satisfactory level of comparison and evaluation of research techniques (*i.e.*, at least 3 marks out of 5). Still, most reports lacked some degree of clarity and/or detail regarding these tasks. It should be noted that the tasks concerned in this complex criterion will be differently presented under the new criteria beginning with the May 2010 session.

Criterion E: Personal experience and ethical issues

A majority of reports sampled showed a substantial concern with the issues raised here (that is, they received at least 2 marks out of a maximum of 3). Again, performance under this criterion shows a gradual upward trend over the past several sessions. Still, it is true that centres vary greatly in candidate performance with respect to this criterion.

Criterion F: Anthropological insight and imagination

The great majority of candidates received at least some credit under this criterion, with the same number receiving full marks as receiving none. Clearly, candidates must have asked anthropologically relevant and well-focused questions to demonstrate "anthropological insight", and must have some sense of what constitutes anthropological analysis of data. It may be noted that in the new programme (2010) this criterion will be little changed, but will have its value raised to 3 marks.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

- The improved performance in some criteria noted above still allows for considerable room for improvement. At this point, it should be remembered that beginning with the May 2010 session the IA assignment will be subject to a new set of guidelines and assessment criteria, as detailed in the 2010 Subject Guide (pages 44–48). Teachers 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 candidate- and teacher-friendly. Both the new Subject Guide and the Teacher Support Materials publication may be accessed through the Online Curriculum Centre (OCC).
- There remains much room for improvement in applying anthropological theory to the construction of analytical frameworks for the interpretation and analysis of data. Again, as previously noted, the 2010 assessment criterion addressing data interpretation (criterion D) explicitly calls for presenting an “analytical framework” if the candidate is to receive more than one mark (now out of 4 marks).
- Short periodical articles accessible in topical anthologies or readers, as well as ethnographies, may also offer useful models for designing well-focused research projects. Further, the OCC Curriculum Resources list for the subject offers notes on relevant reference works discussing research methods, and suggestions for candidate research as well as discussions of IA guidelines and criteria are often featured on the OCC discussion forum.

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. The samples moderated included both observation reports and critiques and, in most but not all cases, 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. As in previous years, in a few 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. However this was seen less than in previous years. This is a key distinction and needs to be clearly understood by both teachers and candidates.

Candidate performance against each criterion

This was 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”. In several cases, this appeared to result in the presentation of virtually raw data. This criterion should be within the reach of all candidates and as of 2010 is worth 5 rather than 4 marks. In terms of the critique, this year’s performance on **criterion B** (nature of the observation and position of the observer) was somewhat more successful with more candidates recognizing some of the ways in which their own position shaped their written report. **Criterion C** (description and analysis) continues to be the area where candidates seem to have most difficulty both in recognizing this distinction in their own reports, and in identifying and discussing relevant examples. Performance on **criterion D** (assumptions, judgments and bias) was variable with some candidates able to recognize ways in which some of their statements reflected social as well as personal biases, and identifying relevant examples in their written reports. **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

- Teachers are reminded that the **Internal Assessment component has been revised** under the new programme for first examination in **2010** (see new Guide p.41–44). It is essential that teachers review these changes carefully, and that these changes are communicated clearly to candidates.
 - The goal and task remain essentially the same, however the word limits have been slightly increased (Report from maximum of 600 to 700 words, and the Critique from a maximum of 700 to 800 words), and the Assessment Criteria revised.
 - Teachers are now advised that if the new word limits are exceeded, their assessment must be based on the first 700 (report) or 800 (critique) words.
 - Assessment criteria have been reduced from five to four, essentially combining B (Focus of the observation) and D (Assumptions, judgments and bias) into the new C (Focus, assumptions and bias) now worth 6 marks. There is some revision to the wording and weighting of other criteria.
- The **distinction between description and analysis** (as of 2010, criterion B rather than C, still worth 4 marks). This criterion continues to be the least effectively demonstrated and continues to need close attention in terms of classroom practice, not only in terms of internal assessment but also in any reading of ethnography.
- Candidates continue to need to be helped to reflect more self-consciously and explicitly 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 and processes – as well as most observations and analysis (now criterion C and worth 6 marks). Teachers also need to help candidates recognize the difference between social and personal assumptions and biases.

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 and examination that appeared difficult for the candidates

As in past sessions the weaker scripts were very short, very descriptive and either directly quoted from or very closely paraphrased the text. Some candidates misread the text, for example, writing that children were allowed to smoke and drink alcohol in the guerrilla camps. Careful reading of the passage is essential as a misunderstanding may lead to irrelevant generalizations and therefore weak answers. In a 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 for this question. Too many candidates failed to adequately locate the comparative ethnographies they selected for question 3 and some did not make any comparative points at all in question 3. Some candidates simply repeated material from question 1 in question 2.

The levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

These varied from the excellent scripts which had well-formulated, focused and detailed answers incorporating relevant anthropological concepts although very few indeed were able to draw on relevant anthropological theories to answer 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 did not manage more than brief quotations or paraphrases of the text. 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.

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

Question 1

The weaker answers to this question simply quoted directly or closely paraphrased sections from the examination text. These answers remained purely at the level of description and usually failed to show any real understanding of the passage itself. There were some scripts that revealed a misunderstanding of what the passage stated and some of these scripts made comments about guerrillas and war. This suggested that the evidence for these comments were drawn from reading outside the passage. This is not a problem in itself but can be when the earlier reading or ideas work to counter what the set text actually states, and the candidate is unable or unwilling to evaluate past knowledge in the light of the examination text; and then simply ignores or misreads the examination text in favour of earlier knowledge or ideas.

Some 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 what parents should do and what children should do rather than to deal with the material provided in the text. Some candidates wrote on the failings of parents without seeming to realise that some parents were killed or captured or traumatised and that their “failures” as parents were not of their own choosing. These answers tended to reveal the rather ethnocentric limitations of the candidates. Very few candidates were able to write not only on what some children did during the war and how their roles were altered but also on how the adults viewed these role changes. A few candidates attempted to weave in anthropological concepts but these were not always relevant and those few candidates who focused on discussion of anthropological concepts then found themselves short of time to provide sufficient and detailed descriptive examples from the text to produce a full answer to the question.

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 generalizations on the basis of this material. Too many candidates provided purely descriptive answers to this question and some merely paraphrased 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 simply repeated material from question 1 in question 2.

While the better answers not only gave the examples of José and Elva but were able to discuss the differences in their experiences in gendered terms, many more simply cited the life experiences of José and Elva (not always correctly) and provided no discussion at all. As well as considering the personal development issues that related to children who had grown up during the war in guerrilla camps, only the stronger candidates also considered the economic situation of the nation as another factor in the difficulties besetting young adults. The connections or possible connections between individual life history and the structural constraints on agency imposed on individuals by circumstances such as war were touched on in only a very small number of answers (essentially an agency – structure response).

Question 3

Popular comparison societies were the Ju-Hoansi, the Trobrianders and the Puerto Ricans in New York. Not all candidates were able to develop comparisons that included similarities and differences and some provided no explicit comparative material at all. Others did describe their comparative society but then failed to show how a change had affected this society and so did not fully answer the question.

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 generalization 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 generalizations about their own societies, and should not include this material unless they have made a detailed anthropological study which shows that they have subjected their society to the careful analysis and scrutiny required by anthropologists.

Some candidates spent unnecessary time writing about the merits of a particular anthropologist and not on the actual ethnography produced by the anthropologist.

The best comparisons interwove material from the examination text and their chosen ethnography throughout showing both similarities and differences. Candidates who tried to write on one society first and then on the second before producing a third section drawing out similarities and differences often ran out of time and so did not provide enough discussion to obtain high marks.

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.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Question 1

Candidates should not depend on paraphrase 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 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 impact of the war on the roles of children was viewed practically by the children ("I joined the guerrilla to provide for my family") and in a very different way by the parents ("the children were not adversely affected as they were too young to understand what was really going on").

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 generalizations drawing in some of the anthropological concepts and, if relevant, theories that they have studied.

In this case candidates who were able, for example, to incorporate anthropological discussions of gender or structure and agency, 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 generalizations all throughout the answer. Candidates should be discouraged from comparing the ethnographic text 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.
- **Reminder:** the new programme will have first examinations in May 2010 please see the new assessment criteria for each kind of question (new Subject Guide pages 33–34). This clarifies how marks are awarded.

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 that appeared difficult for the candidates

As always the same key areas of the programme continue to prove difficult for some candidates and these relate to the definitions of central concepts and terms in questions; the understanding of basic concepts; the use, or rather more often, lack of anthropological theory; and the interweaving of relevant theory and ethnography.

In this examination session it was also apparent that some candidates were citing the work of journalists and not anthropologists as their core ethnographic data. Articles from the *National Geographic* are not suitable alternatives to serious ethnographies and the failure of candidates that used such material to understand and be able to apply anthropological theories and concepts is, in part, due to the non-anthropological data that candidates used and on which they based their answers.

Also very clear in this examination session was the inability of many candidates to cite more than two societies in their answers across the paper as a whole. Too often exactly the same material was used with the same descriptive examples in both questions.

The very weakest candidates used their own societies as an ethnographic case although in many cases these candidates failed even to locate their own societies in terms of nation state (here candidates wrote “in our society...” as if this was self-evident and required no further contextualization).

One candidate tried to answer the entire examination paper by providing a sentence or two on almost every question. Clearly this candidate did not do well. A few other candidates only answered one question or failed to complete the second essay on the examination paper. These candidates also failed to achieve high marks as a consequence of what may have been poor examination skills.

Very many candidates made errors in identifying their chosen ethnographies and also the ethnographers and the historical context when the ethnographic data was gathered. Malinowski found himself carrying out fieldwork in many decades of the 20th century in places which included Africa and India. The Ju-Hoansi were sometimes described as horticulturalists in rainforests and the Yanomamo were not only sometimes described as hunter-gatherers but Yanomamo women appeared to gather many mongongo nuts (as occasionally did Inuit women).

Defining terms

The central concepts appearing in questions were often undefined, poorly defined or only partially defined. These terms, such as "tradition", "ethnicity", "gender", "moral systems", "ideology", "race", "class", and "development" are too often not seen as problematic and in need of definition. Often the terms are used in over general and commonsense ways rather than in the more specialized ways in which they are used by anthropologists. Some candidates also wrote as if terms such as “class”, “caste” and “rank” were synonymous and failed to distinguish between these in their answers.

Application of theory

Centres varied widely in the ability shown by their candidates to carry out theoretically informed discussions. Candidates from several centres typically made little or no reference to theory, and regularly applied modern and culture-specific common-sense wisdom to interpret and analyze ethnography. In the case of one centre virtually all candidates appeared to have been taught to memorize two introductory theory sections, one on psychological functionalism and one on structural functionalism. These were then included, one per essay, by each candidate no matter what the question and no matter whether or not it was relevant to the question. Once the candidates had written out their pre-prepared paragraph(s) on theory this was then mostly ignored for the remainder of the question and the rest of the essay was purely descriptive with often little reference to any anthropological concepts or theory. These candidates were not well served by such an examination strategy.

Ability to answer all parts of a question

Too often candidates ignored key words in a question or focused on one part of the question to the detriment of the rest. For example if the question was on colonialism **and** development the candidate might well write reasonably on colonialism but virtually ignored development and so failed to answer the question which asked for a discussion of the relationship of both colonialism and development. In other cases candidates ignored the word “change” as in question 8 and simply wrote on the circulation of goods without considering how changes in this might also lead to changes in social relations.

The levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

Centres varied widely in the ability of their candidates to present and properly apply theoretical perspectives. Some candidates produced very good work showing detailed levels of knowledge and skill in answering the questions. These candidates had a sound range and knowledge of anthropological theory, a sound ability to select and use relevant concepts and detailed knowledge of several ethnographies which they were able to draw on to produce detailed, reasoned, 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.

The breadth of ethnographic resources used and the depth of analysis practiced varied widely as usual, and the variation shown between centres was clearly more marked than intra-centre variation. Candidates in several centres consistently failed to satisfy the requirement of showing detailed knowledge of four societies.

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

Section A

Question 1

This was a relatively popular question but a fair proportion of candidates who answered this failed to explain what they understood by the term “tradition”. This was taken as given and often led to discussions that failed to take into account the complex nature of tradition as a concept that is often understood as static and “timeless” by members of a given society or group, but which social scientists have shown is fluid and changes to respond to changes in local and wider power structures as well as to meet other social changes. In other words, tradition may be thought of as static but, in fact, it changes to meet contemporary needs. Candidates who were able to show how one group/class/segment of society could use, manipulate or control “traditions” for their social, cultural or other ends produced the stronger responses.

Question 2

Those who wrote on class often produced relatively weak theoretical discussions as they appeared to have no solid definition of class (Marxist, Weberian or other) to work with. Some chose to write on class, caste and rank often as if these were simply interchangeable terms.

Such essays did not do well as they were not sufficiently focused on the question and failed to write specifically on class itself.

Ethnicity was written on by relatively few candidates and again, if the term was sufficiently well understood (which it often was not) and the candidate was able to link ethnicity to social relations then the candidates did reasonably well.

Many candidates wrote on gender but here they often failed to explain what was meant by the term (too many gave gender a straightforward biological definition – female sex, male sex = gender) or failed to provide any evidence of any conceptual/theoretical knowledge drawn from the study of anthropologists working on gender. Many candidates who answered on this question appeared to be reproducing a class essay on the division of labour and this meant that they often included material that was only tangentially relevant to the question.

In general while candidates did try to write on the term that they had chosen, relatively few were able to link this to any form of “social change”. Hence these candidates did not achieve the best marks possible for this essay as they had not fully answered it.

Question 3

The main failing in the essays on this question was the lack of discipline-specific knowledge of kinship and kinship terminology that was demonstrated in the answers. Very few candidates seemed to have any idea of descent, alliance or other specific kinship matters that might have helped to focus on the question. Most essays were descriptions of family life usually rising little above commonsense matters and often focusing on the division of labour at a relatively superficial level. Some candidates discussed marriage rituals but few were able to link kinship to access to resources, transmission of knowledge *etc.* over the generations, or political and ideological systems that might be strengthened (or not) by any given kinship system. Those candidates who were aware of matrilineal systems (the Trobrianders) were not able often to discuss post-marital residence patterns (avunculocal) and when they did errors were often made (about where women resided pre and post marriage for example). The link between matrilineality and women’s status was often not well expressed.

Question 4

This question was not very frequently answered. The key problem here was the understanding and definitions used for the key term “ideology”. For some candidates ideology was no more than “ideas” and this understanding did not lead to very nuanced and well developed responses to the question. Other answers focused on economic organization – again often on the gendered division of labour but then failed to link this descriptive material to ideology. Overall, even when the empirical data was relevant or potentially so, candidates failed to demonstrate just how this might be related to the concept of ideology.

Question 5

This was a relatively popular question and many candidates answered on this.

Candidates produced essays on both myth and ritual. Again, most essays did show some knowledge of myth or ritual and were able to locate this in a particular society. However, candidates were less able to relate the myth or ritual to social practice and then to show how the myth or ritual contributed to either the maintenance or transformation of some defined social relation. Essays tended to be rather vague about how such acts as ritual or narratives

as myths were integrated into social life and social relations. Sometimes definitions of ritual or myth were rather general.

Question 6

This question was not answered by many candidates and the few who did were not on the whole able to define “moral systems” in any convincing fashion. This left them at a disadvantage when it came to knowing how or what it was about moral systems that helped them to define social relationships.

Section B

Question 7

This was a fairly popular question and was better answered in relation to colonialism than to development although not all definitions of colonialism were as sound as they might have been. Some candidates failed to obtain high marks for this question because they only wrote on colonialism at any length and only occasionally (or in some cases never) referred to development. Few were able to link colonialism and development systematically throughout the essay. Very few candidates were able to write about development and some who tried simply considered development to be the same as “evolution” or “change”.

Question 8

This question was very popular and led to many essays describing the kula ring without however, explaining how a change in the circulation or production of goods in the kula ring (if there was one) led to changes in social relations. A few candidates also wrote on the Ju'Hoansi and how wage labour has impacted on social relations between women and men and how the use of cash has altered the goods that are produced and exchanged. These latter scripts tended to be stronger simply because they were more clearly focused on the issues raised by the question.

Question 9

One essay was very general and based on common sense assumptions rather than detailed ethnography and a clear understanding of what might constitute “social significance”. The study of revivalist movements or conservative/fundamentalist religious groups and the social responses to these might all have provided relevant ethnographies on which to base a reasoned answer to this question.

Question 10

Again this was a quite popular question in this examination session. No candidate answered on consumption but the answers on migration and tourism were fairly evenly divided. While candidates were all able to describe migration and also tourism some struggled to describe how either social phenomenon resulted in changing social relations. This meant that most answers were generally in the right field but that they often lacked focus in terms of the specific issues the question required candidates to answer on. Many of the essays on migration read as though they were pre-prepared class essays that were based on a slightly different question.

A few candidates failed to realize that slash and burn subsistence patterns do not constitute “migration”.

The essays on tourism tended to be a little stronger with some good ethnographic examples including the Maasai in Kenya.

Question 11

No candidate answered this question.

Question 12

While many candidates answered this question no candidate was able to cite any anthropological theory post-1950 (structural functionalism) to make sense of contemporary social changes, and some used Malinowskian psychological functionalism as apparently the best theoretical approach to this question. This lack of knowledge of recent theorizing – much of which specifically deals with globalization – meant that these candidates were disadvantaged when it came to trying to interpret and analyse the ethnographies they described in their answers. However, most candidates did make an attempt to either answer for a continuing “local” or against the notion of any local in the world today and so demonstrated an attempt by candidates to focus on the question itself. Both approaches to the question were possible and plausible depending on the ethnographies chosen to answer with.

Some candidates cited a study of McDonalds in China without any contextualization, author *etc.* though one did mention that this was a paper one from a recent IB examination.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Candidates should be reminded that key terms used in questions are almost always problematic, and must be defined, as well, of course, as being understood. Commonsense understandings of terms such as “development” or “ideology” are not sufficient.
- Teachers need to help candidates achieve a balance between conceptual development and theoretical exposition and analysis. Paragraphs of theory memorized and regurgitated at the start of every essay no matter what the question do not demonstrate understanding and knowledge.
- A significant number of candidates made errors in identifying the ethnographic materials they discussed. While most did make some attempt to state when and where the data for the ethnography they cited was gathered, there were many errors placing societies in the wrong continents. Anthropologists were cited as having studied people they never actually met and often dates for the ethnographies were incorrect.
- Candidates should not learn to memorize a set of people, places, dates and ethnographers to scatter across their essays. But spend time closely reading and studying ethnographies to use appropriately in their essays.

- Candidates should be discouraged from attempting to answer a question on a topic that they have not studied. They should be made aware that a term in common usage may have a specific meaning in anthropology and that an everyday understanding of the term is not sufficient to answer a question well.
- Candidates need to be introduced to a broad range of anthropological theories and concepts as well as to ethnographies which serve to link with or exemplify the theories candidates are taught. In particular, centres should endeavour to ensure that candidates are given sufficient time during the course of their studies to become familiar with some more contemporary ethnographies and some of the more recent theoretical developments in the discipline.
- For example, candidates who used structural functionalism to understand globalization were hampered in their ability to do well because their theoretical framework was inappropriate and did not best explain contemporary social and cultural change. In this examination session the significant amount of recent theorizing on global-local relations and the introduction of terms such as “glocal” would have significantly benefited those candidates who attempted question 12. It is a pity that most candidates appeared to have no knowledge of the last 70 years of social anthropological theorizing. Perhaps some teachers could spend a little less time on 19th century theories of evolution detailing notions of savagery, barbarism and civilization (which a few candidates knew about in some considerable detail) and a little more on the work of anthropologists in the late 20th and early 21st centuries.
- Some centres need to observe more closely that the programme in HL Social and Cultural Anthropology calls for candidates to demonstrate detailed knowledge of three or more societies, and that under the new programme to be examined for the first time in 2010, candidates will be penalized under the new examination criteria for failing to show detailed knowledge of at least three societies. Those candidates who used only two societies (sometimes where the second was their own) will not do as well as they might in future examination sessions.
- Candidates should be strongly encouraged to answer all parts of a question and not to only write on the one part that they know more about. Candidates should also be discouraged from simply reproducing class essays in the examination. The precise wording of the examination question may require a rethinking and reordering of material produced in class.
- As we move towards 2010, teachers should bear in mind that the new syllabus requires candidates to discuss social and cultural change as a matter of practice in all responses. Section B of the examination has been fully integrated with Section A from 2010 and teachers should note that globalization has been added as a suggested topic of study to all core themes. For example, it is clear that kinship can be discussed in contemporary as well as traditional frameworks.
- With the inception of the new (2010) programme, the old division between Section A and B will not exist, and issues of change and globalization will pervade the programme’s themes. It must be remembered that beginning with the 2010 examinations, candidates will be expected to show understanding of processes of change and transformation in at least one of their essays, or they will be explicitly penalized by losing marks in criterion D (see 2010 Subject Guide, p.35).

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

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

While candidates have improved in their ability to include all three key elements (theory, ethnography and issues) in their Paper 3 responses, most are still struggling to present these in the form of an analysis clearly relevant to the question. Many responses were descriptive in nature and seemed to rely upon memorized points, rather than demonstrating an analytical skill set. This was also linked to a clear difficulty on the part of the candidates to relate schools of thought to ethnography. Theory was often discussed and ethnography presented. Candidates were usually successful in linking ethnography to theoretical issues but struggled more in showing the relevance of theoretical schools to ethnography. The analysis needs to be more of a “triangulation” – candidates must show the relationship between all three of these elements. To do this, they must have an understanding of the major trends that have occurred throughout the past century in anthropology.

The candidates from one or two centres are placing heavy emphasis on social evolutionism and functionalism. While these are valid schools, candidates often seemed to be forcing them into responses that would have benefited from a broader understanding of anthropological theory. In other cases, candidates have been taught a wider range of theories but have not necessarily *learned* these theories or their importance to the discipline. Points were often presented that seemed to be absorbed through rote rather than through discussion and application. Candidates struggled to fully explain their ideas and provide suitable examples.

One final area of difficulty was that some candidates did not follow the instructions laid out in the question. For example, when the question asked for a focus on one or two schools of thought, candidates would give information (seemingly memorized points) on many schools. Some candidates also found it challenging to relate the information they presented to the specific focus of the question.

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

It was pleasing to see that most candidates incorporated all three key elements into their responses: theoretical schools, theoretical issues and ethnography. Candidates struggled to link theory to ethnography but did make a clear effort to link theoretical issues to ethnography.

Several centres seem to be slowly shifting their programmes to include a wider variety of theory. The best candidates were those who had a variety of schools of thought to select from and who had an idea of the theoretical trends that have occurred over the past one hundred years in anthropology. With a few exceptions, most candidates are correctly identifying ethnography in terms of place, author, and historical context.

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

Question 1

Many candidates were able to correctly identify theories relevant to this question. For example, functionalism (both psychological & structural) was used to exemplify universal theories and historical particularism was often used as an example of a more particular approach. However, most essays were descriptive in nature and did not explain the relevance of the theories to the question. Several candidates simplified the question to refer to etic and emic. Reliance on these terms should be minimized, as they are no longer as central as they once were in the discipline. They also do not equate to the Fundamental Theoretical Issues (FTIs) that were the focus of this question. For example, it is possible to have an “etic” and particularist view. Very few candidates referred to how this question is relevant to contemporary anthropology.

Question 2

This question offered ample choice and opportunity to show one’s theoretical knowledge. It was framed in such a way to allow candidates to keep ethnography at the centre of their response, while showing how the FTIs and theoretical schools related to the way an ethnography was presented. It was also possible to answer this question with a school of thought as the central focus. Unfortunately, very few candidates were able to successfully respond in either of these ways. The majority of the responses consisted of memorized lists of information.

Theoretical schools were often discussed separately from ethnography. For example, there were some candidates who successfully integrated the work of Richard Lee, although many overlooked the cultural neo-evolutionist and structural functionalist influences in his early work. These schools help to explain why Lee initially took a materialist and synchronic approach towards his study of the Dobe Ju/’Hoansi. Within this ethnographic context, these schools (as well as historical particularism) and FTIs could have been linked to a reaction against social evolutionism. It was also possible to show how he used ideas of political economy in his later updates to the ethnography.

Question 3

This was a popular question. Most candidates could identify that functionalism took a synchronic approach and that this school had a heavy influence on early anthropology. Many identified Malinowski as linked to this school, while others also explained the influence of Radcliffe-Brown. However, very few were able to clearly explain WHY the functionalists were synchronic (which could have been connected to a reaction against social evolutionism, ethnocentrism, and positivism). Very few candidates discussed diachronic approaches and methods. These could have included discussions of political economy, among other schools. Many contemporary ethnographies would have been made easily relevant to this question. Included in the hundreds of ethnographies that could be taught as part of the IB program, and that show a strong diachronic approach, are *In Search of Respect*, *Basta!* and *Life and Death on Mount Everest*.

Question 4

Functionalism and “conflict theory” were popular here. In general, functionalism was used in a more detailed manner. However, candidates could have done more to explain how and why this school was linked to structure or cohesion. Conflict was often used too generally. Candidates struggled to specify which conflict theory they were discussing. They should have been specific in terms of detailing the theory and linking it to specific thinkers, such as Gluckman or Coser. Candidates could have discussed the relationship between conflict and political economy, another theoretical school that has had a strong influence in anthropology, and also holds Marxist roots. Some candidates ignored the instruction to focus on two schools and listed (in brief) many schools. Other candidates ignored the instruction to look at conflict OR structure and discussed both. Ethnography was often only loosely linked to the response.

Question 5

Much like Question 4, candidates often had trouble following instructions for this question. Very few successfully focused on one anthropologist. Many listed several schools, ethnographies and anthropologists, seemingly including anything they could think of that could be remotely related to this question. Some defined the relevant issues well, while others struggled to clearly define idealism and materialism, simply stating loosely related and inaccurate points such as, “idealism is about religion” and “materialism is about money”.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

The first recommendation for this session is for teachers to continue to diversify the schools of thought that they teach. One or two centres are still placing a heavy emphasis on functionalism and social evolutionism. These are relevant schools (functionalism had a particularly strong influence during the first half of the twentieth century) but they need to be balanced with more recent theories. Candidates also need to understand how theories are relevant to the ethnographies they study. Theories that are selected by candidates should be clearly linked to the ethnographic materials that make up the course of study. For example, one or two centres discussed Richard Lee and materialism but failed to make the link to cultural neo-evolutionism, cultural ecology, and cultural materialism.

In terms of how theories are taught, emphasis needs to be on learning the relevance of theories to anthropology as a discipline, to ethnography, and ultimately to explaining social and cultural issues present in the world. Centres may wish to consider the forms of assessment that they are using to help foster learning. For example, quizzes that test knowledge points may encourage rote memorization, whereas critical analysis is a more important skill in terms of the IB program. Sufficient attention needs to be given to essay practice, discussion based activities, debates, arts-based learning activities, and other techniques that help candidates to explain links between theory, theoretical issues and ethnography. If full essays are challenging for candidates early in the program, teachers may consider asking candidates to present part of an essay, in the form of paragraphs or a single argument. Teachers could also ask candidates to avoid using the “passive voice”, which forces them to think through the “who, how and why” of their explanations.

Candidates also need to be aware that the connections between different FTIs are not automatic. For example, diachronic approaches are not always material.

Teachers and candidates should familiarise themselves with the new assessment criteria from 2010 for this paper (Subject Guide pages 36–37).

Finally, candidates need to be able to think independently about anthropology and follow instructions. In one or two cases, almost all of the responses from a given centre had the same response, regardless of the question to which each candidate was responding. There were also instances of candidates not following basic instructions, such as clearly focusing on one or two schools of thought when asked.

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

Overall performance on this component was weaker than in previous years, as well as in comparison to other components in this session, which were more often quite well done. Although most responses demonstrated some general understanding of the text in terms of the effect of the civil war in El Salvador on children and their later experience as adults, rather few were successfully framed in terms of relevant anthropological concepts and approaches. Instead most answers tended to be very descriptive and literal or rather general making little reference to relevant materials given in the text. This was especially the case in questions 2 and 3. And although most candidates were able to identify a relevant comparative case, many found it difficult to develop a systematic comparison and/or to provide complete identification of the materials.

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

As already suggested, candidates seemed to find it difficult to work closely with the materials and examples given in the text and to recognize relevant patterns and processes that could be discussed in analytical terms (most obviously, socialization, roles, age and gender but also larger political, economic and social issues at the national level). It quite often seemed that the wording of the question too was mostly ignored, particularly with question 2 where answers very often more or less repeated materials that had already been presented in question 1. In some cases there was also a tendency to write in very general terms about the assumed impact of war on children, sometimes with value judgments, with almost no reference to the relevant and detailed examples given in the text. This rather general and limited work with the text itself was quite often also evident in question 3, and many candidates found it difficult to develop a systematic comparison that was organized in terms of relevant anthropological concepts. In several cases there was no comparison to the effects and experience of the civil war in El Salvador at all.

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

The one area where more candidates were more successful was in discussion of the process of socialization in answer to question 1 where it was obviously directly relevant. The better answers here were also able to link their discussion to specific materials or examples in the text, but even here this was not always the case; instead candidates described socialization in general terms with little recognition of variation in motivation and circumstances. Most candidates were also able to identify a relevant comparative case for question 3 but many struggled to develop effective and sustained comparisons, or to provide complete context and identification of the comparative materials.

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

Question 1

As already suggested, most candidates recognized that children's roles had been reversed by the war, with many children taking on roles that are normally those of adults. Better answers were able to link their description of this to a more general discussion of socialization, to recognize different motivations and/or circumstances, as in the cases of Samuel and Lucas and/or to give examples of norms and roles not learned because of the war. However virtually no candidate recognized the rather different account and perspective of many parents, and this contrast was left consistently unexplored. A good number of answers dealt rather briefly with the reversal of child-adult roles, and spent more time on the difficulties of reintegration as young adults, often repeating materials presented in the next question where it was more directly relevant.

Question 2

Answers here were often limited by lack of conceptualization, because they did not really address the question and/or made little use of the examples and details given in the text. In particular only a few candidates really tried to distinguish between the effects of the war and continuing economic, political and social issues facing the country (which may of course be a consequence of the war), or to link the individual difficulties described in the examples of Jose and Elva to the larger context. A few answers did begin to suggest that problems of reintegration may be differently affected by culturally held ideas about gender – as in the case of Elva, but more misinterpreted this example and saw her “infidelity” as a consequence of the war. Given the details of the text, it was also surprising that so many answers presented a very negative picture overall, perhaps influenced as much by their own assumptions as by evidence in the text that indicates both resilience and determination despite the difficult circumstances in the examples of Jose and Elva.

Question 3

Better answers here seemed to reflect both the depth of knowledge and understanding of the comparative materials, as well as understanding of, and closer attention to, the text itself. Although most candidates were able to identify a relevant comparative case, many found it difficult to develop a systematic comparison and/or to provide sufficient context or identification for their materials.

As already noted, lack of conceptualization, including the context in which the changes occurred, was a large part of the problems here as elsewhere. In several cases the comparative case was presented alone with no reference to the text, thus not addressing the question at all, and one or two candidates presented more than one comparative case. Comparative materials based only on videos seemed particularly weak here.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- **Reminder:** the new programme will have **first examinations in 2010**. For SL Paper 1, this involves no change in format or weighting as part of the overall grade (this remains at 30%, see new Subject Guide page 26), but in addition to the usual markschemes made available after each examination, there are **new assessment criteria** for each kind of question (see new Subject Guide page 30), which clarify how marks are awarded and should be in the hands of both teachers and candidates. These criteria are independent of any particular text, and thus can be used with any previous Paper 1 text in regular classroom practice.
- In terms of practice, as said in previous years and cannot be said too often or too strongly, it is essential that teachers work with candidates to help them **recognize how relevant anthropological concepts and frameworks can be linked to materials presented in a given text**. This should become a part of everyday classroom practice. It is strongly recommended that teachers develop sets of more and less effective answers for different topics/texts for classroom use.
- This is also the case for the teaching and learning of **comparative skills** (question 3) which are essential for both Paper 1 and Paper 2. Here again, the new assessment criteria should be helpful in guiding instruction. Teachers may also need to remind candidates that comparative ethnography is not expected in answers to questions 1 or 2.
- Teachers also need to help candidates **clarify key question terms**, to make sure that answers are relevant and closely focused; again, practice with previous texts should be helpful here.
- In **terms of ethnographic materials**, it is important that teachers try to ensure that candidates are familiar with some contemporary materials (some were perhaps disadvantaged this year by older materials), and understand why it is essential to give full identification and context for the chosen case.
- Finally, in the new programme as in the old, **careful identification and contextualization of ethnographic materials used for the comparative question continues to be critical**. Candidates need to be aware that this requires more than the date of publication.

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

Overall there was an improvement in this component in comparison to previous years which is encouraging, with all candidates performing at the satisfactory, good to very good range of achievement. However in losing the low tail of previous years we also lost the very top end of excellent performance. It is not easy to generalize as there continues to be quite a variation in performance on different criteria, however explicit knowledge of relevant conceptual frameworks continues to distinguish the best responses. While an encouraging number of candidates demonstrated quite detailed ethnographic knowledge, lack of careful identification, clear focus in terms of the question or comparison quite often limited achievement overall.

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

As suggested above, explicit identification and discussion of relevant concepts, which may also provide a useful framework for comparison, continues to be the area which seems to limit the achievement of a good many candidates across most topics/questions. In other cases some candidates appeared limited by their knowledge of relevant ethnography either because it is outdated or of rather narrow range in terms of region. Some also continue to provide very incomplete identification and/or context for their ethnographic materials.

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

In specific centres it was apparent that most candidates had developed an informed understanding of the function of myths, rituals and symbols and were able to use this to address different questions – for example questions 1, 5 and 6 in section A. In other cases, processes of change, including commodification as part of the impact of capitalism, appeared quite well understood if not always as well illustrated in terms of ethnographic materials (evident in questions 8, 10 and sometimes 12). Some centres tend to be stronger on general discussion of concepts, and others more successful in the presentation of detailed ethnography. So the challenge for both teachers and candidates would seem to be to bring these key components together.

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

Section A

Question 1

There were very few responses to this question, each focused more or less effectively on myths, rituals and symbols as repositories of tradition, however how or why this was the case was less directly addressed. Candidates were generally able to present relevant ethnographic materials though power structures were not always clarified sufficiently.

Question 2

This was quite a popular question, with the most successful answers focused on ethnicity (often using Bourgois), and/or age or gender (often using Mead's Samoa). Answers in terms of class were less successful, as class was often conflated with rank. Although most candidates were able to provide quite detailed ethnographic materials they were less successful in providing anthropologically informed accounts of each phenomena and/or specific analysis of how these were evident in social relations, which were left largely taken for granted.

Question 3

Only two candidates chose this question. Where one was stronger on generalizations with rather limited comparative ethnography, the other offered limited generalizations and was more descriptive in terms of quite well detailed comparative ethnography.

Question 4

There were very few responses to this question, but all were quite successful, particularly in their recognition of the different ideologies underlying capitalism and systems of reciprocity and/or redistribution. However, ethnographic materials were not always as effective in terms of illustrating this comparison.

Question 5

This was the most popular question overall. In general, responses were more successful in demonstrating their ethnographic knowledge and understanding of myth or ritual in terms of the maintenance of social relations rather their transformation. A good number of answers demonstrated familiarity with relevant conceptual frameworks (for myth, Levi-Strauss and/or Malinowski and for ritual, Turner) however these analytical frameworks were not always applied to the ethnographic materials presented.

Question 6

There was just one answer here, based on clear familiarity with Mead's Samoan materials in relation to gender; however moral systems was only indirectly defined in terms of relevant values which were not sufficiently clarified.

Section B

Question 7

There was just one answer here, using Ainu and Kwakiutl ethnographic material; terms were quite well discussed, demonstrating some general understanding, however comparisons and ethnographic detail were more limited.

Question 8

This was quite a popular question and generally quite well done especially in terms of conceptualization; most responses demonstrated general knowledge and understanding of the differences between reciprocity/redistribution and a capitalist market economy though not all were as successful in demonstrating these differences in terms of ethnographic materials.

Question 9

There were a few responses to this question. One response demonstrated both clear conceptualization and relevant ethnographic support. However others were less successful, either because ethnographic support was quite limited and/or poorly identified or because the issue of change implied in the question was ignored.

Question 10

This was chosen by almost a quarter of the candidates and produced the single best answer in this paper (on migration). Most candidates were able to present some relevant ethnographic knowledge, particularly in relation to migration using Bourgois' text "In Search of Respect" (although there was also some curious misrepresentation of this material). Otherwise answers were more descriptive than analytical and with rather little reference to the context in which change occurred.

Question 11

There were two answers to this question, both of which demonstrated some understanding of what it means to say that minority or indigenous identity case is political using Kayapo, Toraja and Mashpee (USA) experience.

Question 12

This was the most popular question in section B and was sometimes quite well done. However a good many responses while demonstrating knowledge of potentially relevant ethnography were quite limited in terms of conceptualization, with key terms more or less taken for granted. In several cases the ethnographic materials were not made explicitly relevant to the question.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- **Reminder:** the new programme will have **first examinations in 2010**. For SL paper 2 this involves a **change in both format and assessment criteria**, although weighting as part of the overall grade remains at 50%. Details are on pages 29, 30-31 of the new Subject Guide. In terms of **format**, candidates will now choose any 2 essay questions out of 10, based on the 8 themes in part 2 of the syllabus (social and

cultural organization - see pages 17-20 of the new Subject Guide), with no Sections A and B. In terms of assessment criteria, there are several key changes: old criteria A and B have been combined into **new criteria A (Conceptual knowledge and analysis)** now worth 6 marks; **use of ethnographic materials** remains at 8 marks (**criteria B** in the new programme), marks for **Comparison – now criteria C** - has been increased from 4 to 5; and two new criteria have been added to be **marked across both essays**, focusing on knowledge of processes of **change and transformation** (criteria D) and on the **breadth of ethnographic knowledge** presented (criteria E) which will now reward candidates for their ability to demonstrate knowledge of two or more societies. **It is obviously essential that both teachers and candidates become very familiar with these changes and new assessment criteria.**

- **Explicit knowledge and application of relevant anthropological concepts and arguments** remains key to successful performance in the new format as in the old, and this is perhaps the key factor that will continue to distinguish successful candidates. Candidates need to be able to recognize and define key concepts in anthropological terms and to use them to develop or frame an argument supported by relevant ethnographic materials.
- **Knowledge of relevant ethnographic materials is also key:** rather often this year it seemed that some candidates were limited by the ethnographic materials they had studied, either because they were somewhat outdated, did not reflect contemporary anthropological issues, or were limited in term of regional coverage.
- Finally, in the new programme as in the old, **careful identification and contextualization of ethnographic materials** continues to be critical. Candidates need to be aware that this requires more than the date of publication.