

SOCIAL & CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 11	12 - 24	25 - 35	36 - 46	47 - 59	60 - 70	71 - 100

Standard level

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

Higher level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

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

The range and suitability of the work submitted

The trend toward increasingly appropriate and well-focused research topics seen in the last several examination sessions was reversed in the November 2010 session. A number of inappropriate topics were presented, and only a minority of candidates satisfactorily focused their research questions.

Issue-based research issues or questions outnumbered context-based issues by more than three-to-one. Both issue- and context-based approaches almost always concerned issues and research sites familiar to the candidates. For example, there were a number of reports dealing with teaching styles, social groupings, gender issues, *etc.* in schools; there was a study focused on a suburban tennis club, another focused on an obesity clinic. Issues such as one concerning the careers of chefs in Paraguay, Bolivian migrants in Argentina, university students who have jobs, and “burnout” among pre-school teachers are examples of research topics that were issue-based.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A: Identification of an issue or question

As mentioned above, this session reports a reversed trend seen in the last several sessions wherein candidates had more success in finding appropriate research topics and in focusing the scope of their research questions. Unfortunately only a minority of candidates properly focused their research questions.

It continues to be the case that some centres saw all or most of their candidates receive full marks for this criterion, while the candidates of other centres presented mostly unfocused and sometimes inappropriate research questions.

Criterion B: Research techniques

Almost two-thirds of candidates whose work was moderated were not able to justify and clearly describe their research methods. As in the last session (May 2010), while candidates were only required to select one research technique, many candidates employed more than one, including most of the successful reports.

Criterion C: Presentation of data

While the great majority of candidates presented data appropriately, most reports were deficient in detail, and may also have lacked clear organization. It remains the case that data presentation is often interspersed with interpretation and analysis, especially when the data are observational. Candidates tend to describe bits of observation, and then immediately interpret them, making it difficult for the reader to follow either data presentation or interpretation.

Criterion D: Interpretation and analysis of data

Performance under this criterion was markedly less successful than in the May 2010 session. Two-thirds of the candidates moderated did not present an analytical framework.

Criterion E: Ethical Issues

Slightly more than half of the IAs moderated offered little or no discussion of ethical issues. As in the May 2010 session, discussion of ethical issues was often combined (or confused) with a consideration of the effectiveness of research techniques or even interpretation of data. Explicit treatment of ethical issues tended to be limited to issues of gaining permission for research, obtaining consent from respondents and ensuring anonymity. Broader ethical concerns such as issues of representation were rarely if ever considered.

Criterion F: Anthropological insight and imagination

Here once again performance was markedly below that demonstrated in the May 2010 session. Only a quarter of candidates demonstrated “good” or “excellent” insight and imagination. This could be a result of poorly focused research questions, where the approach is generally merely descriptive, and no analytical approach is applied in interpretation of data. Rarely could candidates be rewarded under this criterion for posing interesting research questions even though their performance fell short under other assessment criteria.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

- Choosing topics and focusing research questions.

Guiding candidates toward worthwhile and achievable research goals remains the most important and possibly the most difficult task a teacher faces with regard to the HL IA. If the topic chosen is not worthwhile and well-focused, data presentation is likely to lack detail, and interpretation and analysis of data are likely to lack clarity and to be superficial.

- Interpretation of assessment criteria.

Centres showed a wide variation in their understanding of the criteria. In some centres the criteria was regularly misapplied, in particular criteria B, C, and D. IB coordinators and teachers should read the IA assessment criteria carefully (see pp. 47-48 in the Subject Guide). Teachers should also use the marked IA samples found in the *Teacher Support Material* (TSM) publication, which may be accessed from the general documents list on the subject home page on the Online Curriculum Centre (OCC) website.

- Application of anthropological concepts and theory to the IA.

Criterion D of the new (2010) IA assessment criteria makes explicit the expectation that data generated should be subject to interpretation through the application of an “analytical framework.” While such frameworks proceed from some level of anthropological theory, it is not intended that concepts which provide the backbone of an analytic framework be presented as part of a theoretical exposition. For example, the concept of “rites of passage,” which has often provided an analytic framework for candidates writing HL IA reports, might be part of a structural-functional approach, or might be approached from the perspective of symbolic anthropology. A concept such as “social marginalization” would most likely be defined by its place in Marxist-influenced theory. However, the HL IA assignment has a primarily methodological emphasis, and candidates need not present theoretical expositions or critiques. Rather, they should simply refer the interpretative concepts they choose to a particular source where the concept is defined and placed in a theoretical context.

The poor performance under Criterion D seen in this session and the unrealistic application of the criterion by some centres indicates that candidates are not always being adequately guided in integrating explicitly anthropological concepts, theory or conceptual frameworks into their IAs. Once again, teachers may benefit by consulting marked IAs with examiners’ comments found in the *Teacher Support Material* (TSM) for ideas on how successful research projects integrate analytical frameworks which may be based on concepts and/or theoretical approaches. The OCC subject forum has often seen exchanges between teachers on questions of teaching anthropological concepts and the theories that frame them, and the OCC Teacher Resource Exchange lists many likely sources, both published sources and teaching ideas contributed by teachers for teaching concepts and theory in the IB programme.

- Sensitivity to ethical issues.

The criterion addressing ethical issues (Criterion E) in the new programme addresses only ethical issues and not questions of personal experience in research, which were also covered in the corresponding criterion under the previous programme (2002).

As indicated above, candidates in some centres did not clearly separate consideration of ethical issues from consideration of problems relating to the application of research techniques, or even from problems in interpreting data.

Both teachers and candidates might begin approaching the question of ethical issues in research by reviewing the expanded list of ethical concerns arising in research presented in the Subject Guide (p. 40 in the English guide, p. 41 in the Spanish *guía*).

Standard level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

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

The range and suitability of the work submitted

The requirements for this component generally now seem to be quite well understood and samples seen met all of the formal requirements in terms of a written report and critique, as well as the word limits (now increased from 1300 to 1500 overall). It was also clear that teachers were aware of the shift in assessment criteria and relative weighting this year, which seems to have helped clarify the assessment process overall, for old as well as new centres. The different public settings and/or events chosen for the observation were all appropriate and most candidates completed this and their written report quite effectively. Most critiques were clearly focused on the written reports and addressed the assessment criteria, however this remains problematic still for some candidates who use the critique to elaborate on the event or setting itself, rather than to evaluate their written report of the observation in terms of the different criteria.

Candidate performance against each criterion

For many candidates, performance on **criterion A – completion of the written report** was strongest, with a good number of the **written reports** both detailed and organized, though teachers should consider why simple chronological notation every five minutes is not sufficient to establish a report as “organized”. Less successful reports were those that presented previous knowledge as much as specific observations, providing rather less specific detail. The other generally strong performance was on **Criterion C – focus, assumptions and bias** which is now worth 6 marks: more successful candidates were quite well able to recognize some assumptions and examples of bias, often on the basis of age and/or gender as well as class, race and/or ethnicity and to link this to their focus and position as an observer.

As in previous years, **Criterion B - the distinction between description and analysis** remains quite problematic for many; some candidates were not able to recognize this in relation to their own reports, particularly where these were as much based on prior knowledge as on specific observations, and only a few candidates developed an informed discussion, supported by examples.

Finally performance on **Criterion D – critical reflection**, which is now worth 5 marks, tended to be correlated quite closely with performance on B and C. Where these criteria had been quite well understood, candidates were able to make clear links between their own work and relevant anthropological concepts and/or methodological issues.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

- Some candidates need to think more critically about what might constitute “organized” and “detailed” in terms of their written reports.
- The distinction between description and analysis should be a part of all classroom practice, not only in relation to Internal Assessment but in terms of developing critical reading of any ethnographic account.
- Candidates continue to need to be helped to examine more self-consciously and explicitly some of the ways in which their own social position and cultural context in terms of age and gender, class, ethnicity and race shape their observations, their assumptions and understandings of cultural relations and social processes.

Higher level paper one

Component grade boundaries

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

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

Some candidates misunderstood key terms in the text and their answers to questions reflected these misunderstandings. In particular, the term “social capital” was sometimes understood in literal monetary terms where “capital” meant financial wealth and nothing else.

In other cases candidates failed to read the questions carefully enough and so did not directly answer the question as set. This happened mostly in question 3 where candidates failed to focus their comparison on how one group presented themselves to a given audience.

Weaker scripts were mostly descriptive, tended to repeat material from the text in the answers to all questions and, in too many cases, heavily quoted from the text itself with some answers composed entirely of quotations from the set text.

In a small number of cases candidates were not able to complete all the questions on the paper. This was a particular issue for question three where the question was either not attempted at all or left unfinished. Occasionally, candidates chose to attempt question 3 before question 2 and then left question 2 either not attempted or incomplete.

Many candidates wrote rather brief answers to the questions and often appeared to be including a theoretical perspective in their answers to question 2 not because it was particularly relevant but because they had no relevant theory or concepts for this question.

These candidates appeared to have been taught to include theory in their answers to question 2 and so felt compelled to use the limited theoretical and/or conceptual knowledge they had regardless of relevance to the question.

The societies chosen for comparison in question 3 were not always fully contextualized, particularly in relation to when the ethnographic data were gathered. In some cases the candidates did not describe the chosen case study fully enough. In other cases no ethnography was cited at all and general references were made to political speeches or what happens in “our country”.

In some scripts the candidates did not manage to carry out the comparison required in question 3. Such answers tended to describe an ethnographic context or aspect of the society in which the candidate lived with no direct comparison to the kayakers in the text and often with no explicit relevance to the issue of “self-presentation” as required by the question.

The levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

The very best examination scripts demonstrated excellent comprehension skills, critical thinking, and the ability to interweave materials / ethnography / anthropological concepts relevantly in order to make strong and well developed points.

Some of the stronger scripts showed an ability to bring in relevant anthropological concepts and theorists in question 2, a few even mentioning Bourdieu explicitly and several others reasoning from the script to produce excellent answers on social capital without ever mentioning Bourdieu. There were some very good, anthropologically insightful and reflective answers, using relevant, fully contextualized ethnographies. Some responses to question 3 were imaginative and took the idea of self-presentation beyond that in the text to produce creative yet reasoned answers to the question.

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

Question 1

In question one, weak answers relied heavily upon the text and quoted their answers rather than summarize and write answers in their own words. There was also considerable overlap or repetition between question one and two in some weaker scripts. In some cases the entire question was composed of quotations from the text and demonstrated no clear understanding of the passage at all.

Better answers not only listed the three main ways in which kayakers record and communicate their experience stories but were also able to generalize from this to discuss what such recording and communication meant in broader and clearly anthropological terms.

In particular some candidates were able to discuss the physicality of photographic images as “evidence” of experience and many were able to write about the creative capacities of kayakers to embellish their experience for themselves and others in the present and for both the future when recalling the past.

Question 2

Question two answers sometimes repeated points from question one rather than develop their understandings of “social capital” as required by the question. On this question also, weaker scripts simply lifted quote after quote from the text to make up the bulk of the answer.

A key difference between this paper and previous paper 1s (from the previous course) is the requirement for candidates specifically to address the viewpoint of the anthropologist in order to gain more than 4 marks for question 2. It became apparent that while some centres had clearly impressed the need to discuss the viewpoint of the anthropologist not all had. Those candidates who wrote otherwise very good answers to this question but did not mention the viewpoint of the anthropologist were unable to gain full marks for the question.

It also appears that many centres are impressing on candidates the need to bring in anthropological concepts and/or theory in their answer to question two. While this is a positive step it is unfortunate that so many candidates do not appear to have any knowledge of anthropological theory beyond the 1950s and many cited “cultural ecology” or “structural functionalism” as the most appropriate theoretical schools to make sense of this question.

In this case the candidates who tried to reason for themselves and discussed social capital in terms that were logical, coherent and clear were able to do rather better than some of those who tried to force the concept into their understanding of cultural ecology or who made comparisons with ethnographic work from the early to mid-twentieth century.

In some cases candidates understood the term “capital” to refer to money and produced answers which discussed how kayakers used their experiences to enrich themselves financially. These candidates showed that they had only partially understood the term “social capital” and were focusing too heavily on “capital” without realizing that the term was not being used literally. Stronger scripts were able to demonstrate understanding that the social capital had more to do with prestige among peers and others rather than any direct financial gain on the part of the kayakers. While it was not required to gain full marks, it was pleasing to note that some candidates recognized the term “social capital” as Bourdieu’s and that they were able to discuss the term in a relevant and detailed fashion.

Question 3

Candidates who did particularly well on question three often did so because they chose well contextualized and well justified comparative ethnographies. Those who did not do so well often appeared to have ignored the focus of the question which was on self presentation to a defined audience. Better answers compared the kayakers to other social groups who invested in their self-presentation for particular strategic ends and in this respect the very strongest answers showed how the same group presented themselves differently to different other groups just as the kayakers themselves do. Often this meant that candidates compared sub-groups within a society to other sub-groups rather than making generalizations across societies as a whole. The issues of marginalization, racism and cultural misunderstanding were some of those raised in the comparisons when discussing how one group presented itself to another. These were all valid approaches to answering the question.

Candidates who were able to demonstrate an understanding of the fluid and contextual nature of self presentation in varied social situations and to demonstrate how “self” is contextually defined and changeable did particularly well.

While more and more candidates now understand the need to contextualize the comparative ethnography, there were still some candidates who did not adequately historically contextualize their work. In some cases no comparative ethnography at all was offered and in other cases where an ethnography was presented it was not compared to the passage in the examination in any way.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

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

In particular, while most candidates do reasonably well on the more descriptive question one (although too many fail to move beyond simply repeating material from the text and do not generalize from this basis), some do not, as noted in last year's report, move beyond description in question two and this limits the marks they can achieve on this particular question which also requires the demonstration of analytical skills and generalization.

This year for the first time candidates were also required to recognize the viewpoint of the anthropologist and those who did were rewarded for this while those who did not found their marks capped at 4 for question 2. Unfortunately, some candidates who tried to bring theory into question two were hampered by what appeared to be a limited range of theoretical knowledge that they could bring to bear on the question.

In question 3 the most significant failings were poor choice of comparative ethnography, no comparative ethnography and failing to produce a systematic comparison. In order to achieve the latter the candidates need to do more than to make a brief passing reference to the ethnography on the examination paper. Some candidates simply wrote everything they could remember about their chosen ethnography without any link to the question or the examination text. Candidates should be encouraged to be selective in their choice of what to write about for question three. In this case, while many candidates demonstrated detailed knowledge of their chosen comparative ethnography, too many failed to discuss self presentation specifically in relation to a particular audience and so did not address the question on the examination paper.

Higher level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 6	7 - 12	13 - 16	17 - 21	22 - 26	27 - 31	32 - 44

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

This was the first November examination session of the new curriculum and with changes both to the examination paper and some of the assessment criteria. It was pleasing to note that many centres had prepared candidates for the new assessment criteria D and E which are assessed over both essays.

However, a significant proportion of candidates appeared unaware of the requirements of these criteria or chose to ignore them and so lost up to 6 marks over the paper as a whole. These 6 marks out of 44 are ones that should not be difficult for candidates to gain with relative ease and so it was disappointing to find that so many were failing to do so. The difference of 6 marks is often enough either to raise or lower a candidate's performance on this paper by two grades.

As ever the same key areas of the programme continue to prove difficult for some candidates and these relate to the definitions of central concepts and terms in questions; the ability to apply this knowledge to ethnographic data and to the question in a relevant manner; and the interweaving of relevant theory and ethnography.

In addition, the newer style of question on the paper resulted in many candidates failing to answer all parts of a question. In some questions candidates misunderstood key terms in a question and so failed to answer appropriately. This happened, for example, in question 5 where some candidates wrote on biological reproduction when the question called for a response on "social reproduction".

In a very few cases essays were unfinished but in one case the script had notes in bullet point form to show what would have been included in the essay had it been completed.

Defining terms

The central concepts appearing in questions were often undefined, poorly defined or only partially defined. These terms, such as "power relations", "consumption", "social reproduction" and "agency" were often not clearly defined and this left candidates struggling to make their answers relevant to the question. Often the terms are used in over-general and commonsense ways, or simply misunderstood and misapplied, rather than in the more specialized ways in which they are used by anthropologists.

Application of theory

Centres varied widely in the ability shown by their candidates to carry out theoretically informed discussions. Some candidates struggled to include any relevant concepts or anthropological theories in their work and so did not meet the requirements of criterion A. Others attempted to use anthropological concepts, theoretical perspectives and core terms but sometimes chose inappropriate ones with which to answer the questions.

Use of ethnographic materials

Somewhat worryingly candidates from some centres appeared to be referencing fictional films as ethnographic data in their essays. While it is often pedagogically sound to use many resources – including YouTube, novels and other materials to convey the distinctiveness of other cultures and points of view, all candidates should be clear about the different types of resources used in teaching and the limitations inherent in each genre. Candidates should also be very clear that for the examinations they are expected to cite ethnographic sources and not fictional movies in their essays.

In other cases candidates cited the work of a journalist and travel writer, Joe Kane, as their ethnographic source on the Huaorani Indians. This is not ethnography by an anthropologist and perhaps goes some way to explaining why some candidates lack the necessary conceptual and theoretical apparatus fully to answer questions on a social and cultural anthropology examination paper.

If candidates are not reading ethnographies they are not in a strong position to meet all the assessment criteria and objectives of the programme of study.

Comparison

While many candidates did meet the requirements of this criterion not all appeared to realize that some form of ethnographically or theoretically informed comparison is needed to do well on criterion C.

Ability to answer all parts of a question

Too often candidates ignored key words in a question or focused on one part of the question to the detriment of the rest. For example, in question 2, kinship may have been written about but social change and kinship were rarely covered in the same answer. Again, in question 4 candidates wrote about consumption (though mostly they wrote about production) in relation to either material practice or symbolic practice but not in relation to both as the question required.

The levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

As stated in previous reports, centres varied widely in the ability of their candidates to present and properly apply theoretical perspectives. Some candidates produced extremely good work demonstrating detailed levels of knowledge and skill in answering the questions. These candidates had a sound range and knowledge of anthropological theory, a keen ability to select and use relevant concepts and detailed knowledge of several ethnographies which they are able to draw on to produce detailed, reasoned, sound and thoughtful essays. At the other extreme, however, some candidates were only able to show very elementary, and occasionally no knowledge of anthropological theory and sometimes there was little evidence of having studied the requisite number of ethnographies in sufficient detail to do well in the examination.

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

Question 1

This was a relatively popular question with both political and economic organization equally chosen as options in relation to ritual. While a fair proportion of candidates did attempt working definitions of ritual, relatively fewer considered that they needed to explain what they meant by economic or political organization.

A variety of rituals were chosen and particularly strong on ethnographic detail were those describing the Incwala ceremony in Swaziland. Candidates citing this material had a good grasp of the ritual and the political implications of a first fruit ritual and kingship. It is a pity therefore that so few candidates cited any ethnographers of divine kingship in Africa and relatively few mentioned the work of Kuper with regard to this ritual.

The other popular example for a ritual with economic implications (though also political) was the Trobriand Kula.

In general this question was well answered at the level of ethnographic material but rather less so from a theoretical/conceptual perspective.

Question 2

This question was attempted by a fair minority of candidates and here the options tended to show either that a change in economic conditions had altered kinship systems or, conversely, to show that a change in economic conditions had had no impact on kinship systems. Both approaches are possible depending on the choice of ethnographic materials.

In some cases candidates explained what they understood by kinship but when this was limited to those one is connected to by “blood” the definition was limiting as affinal kin were automatically excluded (although this did not appear to have any impact on later discussions of marriage).

In one case the concept of “system” was poorly understood as it was assumed that every time there was a marriage, birth or death the “kinship system” had altered.

In general the candidates did make reasonable attempts to answer this question but often produced answers that focused more on either economic conditions or kinship systems, or which wrote on both but did not link the two together to produce an ordered response to the question.

Question 3

On this popular question, candidates almost all defined globalization and this was done well in some cases and a little less well in others. However, no candidate cited any contemporary anthropologist working on globalization and this was a pity. The difficulty for many appeared to be finding ethnographies that appropriately covered global phenomena. Some candidates made a case for colonialism as an early form of globalization and where this was explicit it was accepted. However, candidates very rarely selected just one aspect of globalization for their essay and even fewer managed successfully to link this one aspect of globalization to power relations. The latter term itself was rarely problematized or discussed.

Some often quite strong essays focused on tourism as an aspect of globalization and the power relations between the hosts and guests and more often between the hosts who controlled those who performed for the guests. Often the ethnographic material drew on former hunter-gatherer groups or the Masaai as performers for western tourists. Here the “invention of tradition” was an aspect of globalization which was not often enough made explicit.

Candidates did not all appear to have studied power relations as a concept and this limited their ability to produce essays that went significantly beyond the description of events drawn from ethnographies or all too often Hollywood movies and the work of adventure writers.

In some cases candidates cited “a past paper one on globalization and McDonald’s” as their comparative ethnography or more general material for this essay. Such citation was generally very poor as the author and historical context were not mentioned and candidates did not appear to have read more than the 700 words on the past paper one to develop their ideas on how globalization in Beijing might have taken form.

Question 4

For this question candidates mostly, though not always (there were some very notable exceptions), took cultural knowledge as a given that required no discussion. In terms of production candidates tended to be clear about how goods and materials were made but they did not as readily deal with issues of consumption.

Some candidates chose to write on exchange systems including hxaro and when this was done well the essays were very good indeed. Others focused on Trobriand forms of production and exchange.

No candidates used any ethnographies which dealt with contemporary societies to discuss culture, production and consumption which was a pity and again, as with the other essays on this paper while some scripts were descriptively strong and detailed there was a tendency to avoid any close engagement with anthropological concepts and theoretical perspectives.

Question 5

Candidates were able to describe the beliefs of the peoples in the societies they had studied but were often less clear about what social reproduction meant. All too often the essays ended up discussing biological reproduction and local ideas of conception, birth and death. While biological reproduction may well be included in social reproduction the latter term is far broader and required a different approach.

Again, the Trobrianders were a popular source of ethnographic information on conception and while some candidates linked these ideas to matrilineality few were able to make explicit the connections between the social order (matrilineal lineages) and the belief system which does not require a father for conception to occur. Those candidates who did manage this were able to make clear the aspect of social reproduction and belief which informs local ideas of conception.

Question 6

Candidates were often able to write quite well about gender but the problem with these essays sometimes appeared to be that candidates were reproducing class essays on gendered differences or gendered divisions of labour rather than linking gender to moral systems.

Hunter-gatherers, Native American and Trobriand societies were the most popular for discussing gender. In some cases candidates referred to their own societies to discuss women working in paid employment but this was not always done well as there were typically no ethnographic references and candidates tended to write about “our society” without making clear to the examiner where, who or what “our society” referred to.

Relatively few candidates were able to define moral systems appropriately and even for those who did, the term, once defined, was mostly ignored while the candidate wrote more generally on gender.

Question 7

Agency was very rarely well understood as a concept and it was not always linked to identity and one script referred back to this year’s paper one on kayaker agency and self-presentation as an aspect of identity. The strongest essays were those which showed how a marginal group was understood, and more often misunderstood, by a dominant group or how group identity was the product of complex interactions between structure and agency. For such essays popular ethnographies were Bourgois’ work on the descendents of migrants from Puerto Rico in El Barrio or work on travellers / gypsies in the United Kingdom (UK).

Some candidates took the approach of discussing how an individual identity developed through rites of passage and so again linked structure (the social ritual) and agency (the choice to participate in a rite of passage in some societies) with identity formation.

Question 8

A small number of candidates each wrote on each option given for this question. Those who chose tourism as their ethnographic case tended to use the same materials as in question five (on former hunter-gatherers or the Masaai and tourism), but refocused to show how a local power structure had impacted on these groups.

Those who chose to write on work often produced material on the gendered division of labour (as in question six) and added the social justifications for why men did some forms of work and women others. Sometimes this approach simply produced lists of who did what in a society so that the examiners were informed that among the Trobrianders women could not become chiefs who wield political power *etc.*.

There were very few essays focused on development and these tended to be rather weak. Development was sometimes misunderstood as a concept and ethnographic material linking development and political organization was very limited.

Again, as with many of the questions on this paper candidates tended to have ethnographic material on tourism, development and work but were less confident in how to link this information to political organization.

Question 9

Migration was viewed mainly in terms of a host population receiving migrants or as descendents of migrants and in both cases the Puerto Ricans in New York proved to be a popular choice of ethnography. Political economy perspectives were well used in this case and this question produced some of the strongest answers on the examination paper.

Some candidates demonstrated an awareness of different types of population movement including forced migration but did not often develop these insights in the main body of their essays.

Question 10

This question was not often well conceptualized by candidates who appeared to have no way of dealing with resistance other than to list examples and to attempt to compare different ethnographic cases. Some began with a comparison of physical versus non-physical forms of resistance but those who took too long on this distinction used up valuable examination time writing at a tangent to the actual question. No essay was able to cite any theoretician on resistance and the work virtually always remained at the level of description and common sense.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Candidates should be reminded that key terms used in questions must be defined, and applied to the ethnographies discussed in the essay. Commonsense understandings of terms such as “cultural knowledge” or “agency” are not sufficient.
- Teachers need to help candidates achieve a balance between conceptual development and theoretical exposition and analysis. Candidates who simply describe ethnographic material cannot achieve very good marks on the assessment criteria.

- Candidates should be strongly encouraged to answer all parts of a question (where required) and to relate the different parts of the question together to produce a coherent unified essay. 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.
- Candidates need to be introduced to a broad range of anthropological theories and concepts as well as to ethnographies which serve to link with or exemplify the theories candidates are taught. In particular, centres should endeavour to ensure that candidates are given sufficient time during the course of their studies to become familiar with some more contemporary ethnographies and some of the more recent theoretical developments in the discipline. In this paper candidates would have benefited from recent work on consumption, globalization and agency.
- Candidates lost marks in the new programme if they were not able to show detailed knowledge of three societies. This was a shame as the two marks awarded for knowledge of three societies ought to be two marks that every candidate is able to guarantee on the paper under criterion E (breadth of knowledge of societies).
- Candidates should be strongly discouraged from using fiction films or the work of journalists and travel writers as ethnography. If such material is used it should be critically evaluated as the work of non-anthropologists and ideally compared to the work of ethnographers on the same societies as those discussed in the fiction film or journalism.
- All candidates should be made aware of the new criterion D (processes of change and transformation within and across cultures and societies) as, again, the possible 4 marks available on this criterion are really ones that all candidates should be able to achieve.

Higher level paper three

Component grade boundaries

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

General comments

Most candidates demonstrated that they had been exposed to relevant theory, perspectives and ethnography. In some cases, candidates conveyed a good understanding of the field of anthropology and could critically discuss theoretical developments within this discipline. However, many candidates offered responses that described a limited set of knowledge, which was not discussed in a critical manner. Future emphasis of teachers should be placed on developing critical understanding of a strong breadth of theory. Candidates should be developing the skills that allow them to present analysis that demonstrates independent thinking.

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

While candidates seem to have been exposed to relevant knowledge, many responses were largely descriptive and lacked a critical perspective. More emphasis needs to be placed on explaining and analysing the “how” and the “why” of a question, rather than simply describing potentially relevant schools of thought and perspectives. Linked to this was a dearth of explanation of how a theory or perspective fit with the overall discipline of anthropology. Candidates needed to convey a stronger sense of the way that anthropological thinkers are influenced by, and react to, one another. In a few cases, candidates did not fully identify ethnography in terms of place, group studied, anthropologist and historical context. A minority of candidates also provided information that was simply incorrect. In the case of one centre almost all of the candidates responded to the same question, drawing on the same theories. This indicated that candidates had learned to respond in a particular, memorized manner, rather than having learned to think critically and independently – skills that are central to an IB education.

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

Overall, most candidates conveyed that they had been exposed to relevant ethnography, theory and theoretical perspectives. This is a good indication that teachers are aiming to use the Subject Guide to direct their approaches to student learning. While up-to-date theories still remain in the minority, there clearly has been an effort to help candidates learn about a wide range of anthropological theory. This includes more recent developments in the discipline. Structure-centred perspectives tended to dominate in terms of student learning around Part 4 of the Subject Guide. Most candidates understood that perspectives were just that – an approach taken by an anthropologist, and not inherent in a society.

In a few cases, candidates were able to place a perspective or theory within the broader context of methodological and theoretical approaches that have existed throughout the history of anthropology.

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

Question 1

This was not a popular question. The responses provided by candidates did not convey a clear understanding of agency. Much more time was spent discussing structure, which was loosely linked to ethnography and theory.

Question 2

In general, candidates found this question challenging. Most candidates conveyed some understanding of the perspective of structure and could link it to theory. However, they were unable to link perspectives and theory to development, migration or gender. Most candidates who responded to this question selected development as their focus. However, almost none of these candidates identified relevant ethnography to discuss this issue. Further, candidates were poorly prepared to discuss “development” in theoretical terms.

Candidates needed to convey an understanding of what development is and link this to relevant anthropological discussions – both in terms of ethnography and theory (for example, world systems theory might have provided a relevant basis for discussion).

Question 3

Candidates demonstrated basic awareness of relevant theories and understanding of perspectives. Conflict theory was discussed in very general terms, as many candidates were unable to link it to specific schools of thought or theorists. There were a few exceptions with candidates who discussed anthropologists such as Gluckman or Bourgois' use of political economy in *In Search of Respect*. Overall, many responses lacked critical perspective.

Question 4

Most candidates identified relevant schools of thought, particularly in terms of synchronic perspectives. However, very few could explain why a theorist would approach his or her thinking from a synchronic or diachronic perspective (for example, functionalists saw a synchronic perspective as being more scientific, while political economists view a diachronic perspective as imperative to understanding how and why the world exists as it currently does). A more detailed and critical understanding was needed by most candidates.

Question 5

This was the most popular question and it solicited a wide range of responses. Most candidates identified relevant theory and ethnography. Anthropologists such as Geertz, Strathern, Harris, Radcliffe-Brown and Wolf were discussed. Many candidates provided relevant contrasts and comparisons and provided some detail in theory discussions. In some cases, responses were superficial and uncritical.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Four key recommendations have emerged from this session:

Critical thinking vs. rote

Teachers should design learning experiences that allow candidates to develop the ability to think crucially and independently about anthropological theory. This means that candidates should move beyond assessment and learning experiences that are descriptive in nature (for example, lectures and quizzes). While some knowledge-based learning is necessary, teachers should also experiment with a wide range of learning experiences such as role-play, debate, reflective blogging, arts-based activities, discussions, and practice essays. The focus of these experiences should be to push candidates to apply and use their knowledge in ways that challenge them to make links and insights beyond providing descriptive information.

Situating

Candidates must include basic identifiers of ethnography or schools of thought in their essays – such as the key anthropologist linked with each study or theory; the time frame in which fieldwork was conducted or a theory published; the group studied in the case of ethnography; and where the study was completed. However, Paper 3 also requires that candidates move beyond these descriptors.

Teachers should provide candidates with learning experiences that allow them to discuss how and why an ethnographer or theoretical school may have taken a particular perspective or theoretical stance. For example, linking a functionalist to a positivist approach helps us to understand why a synchronic perspective was important to this group of theorists. Linking particular political economists to Marxism may help to explain why many of these theorists focus on conflicts of interest in society. The deeper the contextual understanding candidates have of ethnography and theory, the easier it will be for them to provide a critical and analytical response.

Range of material

Teachers should take note that candidates must study at least six theoretical perspectives in depth. Doing so will give them options in terms of which questions to answer in an examination. However, it will also provide them with greater depth of understanding as they compare, contrast and link perspectives together. Similarly, a good range of theoretical schools and ethnography will also help candidates to understand the broader context of the discipline. Teachers should aim to stay current with the discipline so that they can explore contemporary material with their students and compare these to older materials.

Connecting with resources

Teachers should take advantage of the resources available to them to help develop their own anthropological knowledge and teaching skills. All teachers should keep up to date with the Online Curriculum Centre (OCC) where they can find the Subject Guide, subject reports, and a forum that provides a wealth of information in terms of answering questions and providing resources. It is part of the IB Diploma Programme for principles into practice that centres ensure that their teachers receive professional development. As a part of this, teachers should be involved in online or face-to-face workshops. This is especially usefully when there have been changes to the curriculum of a subject or if a teacher is new to the subject.

Standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

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

General comments

Most candidates were able to demonstrate at least a general understanding of the text, in this case the changing nature of the narratives of the kayakers' tourist experiences for different audiences. Many answers tended to be very descriptive and literal or rather general. It was refreshing, though, to find some answers incorporating anthropological terminology and relevant concepts. Some candidates found it difficult to develop a systematic comparison that was organized in terms of relevant anthropological concepts, and in some cases a well developed comparison was marred by the lack of full identification of the ethnographic material referred to. As usual, the range of achievement was wide with the critical difference being the ability to think and write conceptually and thus analyse rather than describe.

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

The great majority of candidates were able to demonstrate a general understanding of the text, in terms of the interpretation of the main concept used by the authors “social capital” within the context of the passage, and relate this understanding to the process of social negotiation at play in the changing nature of the narratives of the kayakers’ tourist experiences for different audiences.

Although the text itself was quite straightforward and accessible, some candidates found it difficult to develop an analytic approach about the contextual and strategic nature of all self-presentation, suggesting a lack of familiarity with relevant anthropological terms and approaches, limiting overall achievement. This resulted in answers that were in some cases essentially descriptive rather than analytical and in a few cases offering little more than a “common sense” reading.

In terms of the examination, the new criteria for question 2: that candidates recognize the viewpoint of the anthropologist – was clearly problematic for most, with only a few exceptions.

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

Almost all candidates were able to complete all three questions and demonstrate a general understanding of the text. Conceptual thinking and writing marked the main differences between scripts, many showing a descriptive approach and relying on the wording of the text, others though, appeared to have quite strong analytical and comparative skills, evident in their ability to develop informed generalizations, as well as offer more critical discussion of the text and their own comparisons.

Many candidates were able to demonstrate detailed knowledge of their chosen ethnographic materials but a significant number of candidates seemed to be unaware of the specific requirements such as full identification in the presentation of a comparative ethnography.

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

Question 1

In most cases, it was clearly a well understood question, which provided many organized responses that identified and drew on relevant points present in the text. Many candidates could describe the recording and communication of the kayakers’ tourist experiences and how these experience stories may stress or downplay certain elements in order to create the right experience story to gain status and prestige. However, not many answers showed abilities to move beyond specifics and develop generalizations.

Question 2

A significant number of the candidates were capable of understanding the reasons for the kayakers to change their experience stories according to the audiences. However, these processes of social negotiation with reference to the changing nature of the narratives retelling the kayakers’ tourist experiences remained implicit or were not fully analysed.

The concept of “social capital” was mostly used following the logic of the text but rarely conceptually explained, with some exceptions where a conceptual framework was referred to. In terms of the examination, the new criteria for question 2 – that candidates recognize the viewpoint of the anthropologist – was clearly problematic for most.

Question 3

There were some very good answers to this question that provided relevant comparisons. Many candidates could find appropriate ethnographic examples showing how groups fashion their self-presentation for different audiences.

Successful examples included the Mursi interacting with tourists (Turton, 2004), the Traveller Gypsies and their relation with dominant English society (Okely, 1983), the Mashpee and their claims against the state (Clifford, 1988).

Too many candidates marred their answers by not addressing the specific requirement of this question. They failed to fully identify and contextualize their chosen ethnographies, losing marks in answers that would have been otherwise successful. Some found it difficult to develop a systematic comparison that was organized in terms of relevant anthropological concepts.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- This was the first examination based on the new programme for a November session, which for SL Paper 1 involves no change in format or weighting (this remains at 30%, see new Subject Guide page 26). However in addition to the usual markschemes made available after each examination, there are new assessment criteria for each question (see new Subject Guide page 30), which clarify how marks are awarded and should be in the hands of, and familiar to, both teachers and candidates. As these criteria are independent of any particular text, it is strongly recommended that they be used with previous Paper 1 texts in regular classroom practice.
- In particular two criteria should be emphasized. For question 1 it is now explicit that candidates are expected to go beyond simple description, to develop some generalizations that are relevant to the terms of the question and can be linked to relevant points and examples given in the text. For question 2 candidates are now asked to identify the viewpoint of the anthropologist if they are to achieve the highest marks. Candidates will benefit from practising the recognition of the anthropologist's viewpoint as an essential element in any ethnographic work. If candidates are to meet these expectations, they need to become part of everyday classroom practice. It is strongly recommended that teachers work with previous Paper 1 texts with their candidates to develop these skills and understandings.
- In terms of practice, it remains essential that teachers work with candidates to make sure that they are familiar with key anthropological concepts and approaches and to help them recognize how these can be linked to materials presented in a given text. Here again, the new assessment criteria should be helpful in guiding instruction. Teachers may also need to remind candidates that comparative ethnography is not expected in answers to question 1 or question 2.

- Finally, in terms of ethnographic materials, it is important that teachers try to ensure that candidates are familiar with some contemporary materials and understand why it is essential to give full identification and context for the chosen case.

Standard level paper two

Component grade boundaries

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

General comments

This was the first November examination based on the new programme which opened up Paper 2, allowing a free choice of two out of ten questions, at the same time as it introduced some new assessment criteria across both essays. With candidate numbers up from last year, including one new centre, in general terms these changes seem to have supported performances ranging from quite satisfactory to very strong. However, the new criteria were problematic for some candidates, clearly limiting their achievement on this component.

As usual, it is difficult to generalize any further as there continues to be a wide variation in performance on different questions and criteria both between and within centres: however it continues to be the case that explicit knowledge and application of relevant conceptual frameworks continues to distinguish the most successful responses. Most candidates were able to demonstrate some knowledge of a range of relevant ethnographic materials, which were sometimes but not always fully identified.

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

Almost all of the questions required candidates to examine or to discuss the relationship between two aspects of social and cultural life, both of which needed some kind of definition or clarification. Quite often candidates found it difficult to keep these two parts in balance; for example in question 6 while gender was quite well discussed, moral systems were more often than not simply taken for granted or in some cases not addressed at all, leaving the answer either somewhat incomplete or not answered. This issue of close focus and balance in terms of the requirements of the question is also linked to the need for explicit knowledge of relevant conceptual frameworks. This was quite often missing, incomplete or vague. Others found it difficult to ground rather general discussions of anthropological ideas and approaches in relations to specific and detailed ethnography that was carefully identified. As noted above, the new criteria D and E marked across both essays were also problematic for some.

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

In terms of assessment criteria, many candidates were able to demonstrate knowledge of a range of ethnographic materials that allowed them to address different questions quite effectively. There was also evidence of some sound skills in terms of clearly focused essay writing which served these candidates well.

In terms of themes, it was encouraging that some of the best answers were about globalization (question 3) where a good number of candidates were able to write from a range of different perspectives; although only a few chose to write about resistance (question 10), this too seemed well understood in terms of both relevant frameworks and specific ethnography. Other themes/questions (question 1 on ritual and question 4 on cultural knowledge and systems of production and consumption) also produced one or two excellent answers suggesting that some strong teaching is in place here.

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

Question 1

This was not often chosen and produced generally rather limited answers, with little discussion of the nature of ritual and rather general ethnographic materials usually describing political organization that were not explicitly linked, limiting both comparison and analysis. There was one excellent answer however, demonstrating a clear understanding of ways in which ritual may be linked to different aspects of economic organization, supported by well detailed ethnographic cases.

Question 2

This too was not a popular question and largely produced rather general responses demonstrating quite limited knowledge of kinship systems, sometimes discussing these in terms of caste or gender, although several responses were more successful. Responses were usually more effective in terms of describing changes in economic conditions, sometimes linked to globalization, and most often focused on the introduction of money, a market economy and a focus on profit.

Question 3

This was the second most popular question and produced a wide range of responses, some of which were anthropologically informed in terms of arguments about globalization and closely focused in terms of the question: these were encouraging to see. However, at least as often, responses ignored the focus on ONE aspect of globalization, and presented very general and more or less common sense ideas, sometimes couched in terms of value judgments, with rather limited ethnographic support.

Question 4

Although rarely answered, this question produced the single best response, in an essay that was theoretically informed, critical and very well supported with ethnographic materials. Other responses were very limited, and largely descriptive.

Question 5

This too was rarely chosen, but produced some more or less satisfactory responses usually focused on beliefs relating to women in terms of their reproductive roles. Only one response recognized that social reproduction might also refer to ways in which social and cultural norms, values and beliefs are reproduced over time.

Question 6

This was the most popular question but not often very well done, most often because moral systems were usually taken as self-evident and not discussed in themselves. The most successful answers recognized gender as a social and cultural construction, which is shaped by values, norms and expectations attached to ideas about women and men sometimes framed in term of a moral good. However men were largely missing from this discussion. Ethnographic materials presented were sometimes quite well detailed and made relevant to the question; however others were rather general and quite often stereotypical. It sometimes seemed that candidates simply presented everything they knew about gender without any direct reference to the question itself.

Question 7

This was rarely chosen and only two of the responses clearly understood and addressed the concept of agency, however all were able to articulate ideas about group identity more or less effectively and in one case to recognize ways in which this may be dynamic.

Question 8

All responses here chose to focus on work, but several struggled to develop any sense of a relationship with political organization leading to unbalanced and/or incomplete answers. Others were more effective in their use of ethnographic materials to demonstrate ways in which power and authority shaped work opportunities in positive and, more often, negative ways.

Question 9

Responses ranged from those that made quite good use of relevant frameworks, for example globalization, to examine this relationship within a larger historical context, to those that treated migration in a very much more limited (and not intended) sense, for example as local movement after marriage, or to clear new land.

Question 10

Although rarely chosen, all responses suggested quite a nuanced understanding of different forms and contexts of resistance, making useful links to anthropological approaches to ethnicity or contested assertions of identity. These were all encouraging and good to read.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- It is essential that all candidates are made aware of the **two new assessment criteria D and E** introduced with the new programme, which are marked across both essays. These evaluate candidates' knowledge and understanding of processes of change and transformation (D: 4 marks) and of a range of different societies (E: 2 marks). While it was evident that many candidates were aware of these new requirements, others seemed not to be.

- 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 continues 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: sometimes this session 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.