

Markscheme

November 2023

Social and cultural anthropology

Higher level

Paper 1

12 pages



© International Baccalaureate Organization 2023

All rights reserved. No part of this product may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without the prior written permission from the IB. Additionally, the license tied with this product prohibits use of any selected files or extracts from this product. Use by third parties, including but not limited to publishers, private teachers, tutoring or study services, preparatory schools, vendors operating curriculum mapping services or teacher resource digital platforms and app developers, whether fee-covered or not, is prohibited and is a criminal offense.

More information on how to request written permission in the form of a license can be obtained from https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/.

© Organisation du Baccalauréat International 2023

Tous droits réservés. Aucune partie de ce produit ne peut être reproduite sous quelque forme ni par quelque moyen que ce soit, électronique ou mécanique, y compris des systèmes de stockage et de récupération d'informations, sans l'autorisation écrite préalable de l'IB. De plus, la licence associée à ce produit interdit toute utilisation de tout fichier ou extrait sélectionné dans ce produit. L'utilisation par des tiers, y compris, sans toutefois s'y limiter, des éditeurs, des professeurs particuliers, des services de tutorat ou d'aide aux études, des établissements de préparation à l'enseignement supérieur, des fournisseurs de services de planification des programmes d'études, des gestionnaires de plateformes pédagogiques en ligne, et des développeurs d'applications, moyennant paiement ou non, est interdite et constitue une infraction pénale.

Pour plus d'informations sur la procédure à suivre pour obtenir une autorisation écrite sous la forme d'une licence, rendez-vous à l'adresse https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/.

© Organización del Bachillerato Internacional, 2023

Todos los derechos reservados. No se podrá reproducir ninguna parte de este producto de ninguna forma ni por ningún medio electrónico o mecánico, incluidos los sistemas de almacenamiento y recuperación de información, sin la previa autorización por escrito del IB. Además, la licencia vinculada a este producto prohíbe el uso de todo archivo o fragmento seleccionado de este producto. El uso por parte de terceros —lo que incluye, a título enunciativo, editoriales, profesores particulares, servicios de apoyo académico o ayuda para el estudio, colegios preparatorios, desarrolladores de aplicaciones y entidades que presten servicios de planificación curricular u ofrezcan recursos para docentes mediante plataformas digitales—, ya sea incluido en tasas o no, está prohibido y constituye un delito.

En este enlace encontrará más información sobre cómo solicitar una autorización por escrito en forma de licencia: https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/ applying-for-a-license/.

[4]

The following interpretation of the markscheme is offered as an example of the types of responses we may expect, however it is not prescriptive or exhaustive, and other possible answers should be appropriately rewarded if relevant.

Section A

1. Define the term **cultural relativism** and describe how it can be understood and applied in the context of the passage.

This question requires candidates to demonstrate conceptual knowledge and understanding of the term **cultural relativism** and apply it in relation to the text. Candidates may write in terms of any of the following guidelines, but other definitions or applications will also be acceptable if made relevant to the context of the passage.

Possible ways of defining the term:

- As the assumption that each culture has its own internal logic
- As the understanding of meaning in context
- Not making value judgments about cultural difference
- Making reference to Franz Boas' notion of cultural relativism.

Other appropriate definitions should be credited.

Possible examples of description and application:

- The ethnographer's acceptance of religious conservatism
- The ethnographer's value judgments regarding marriage offers
- Assumptions regarding ethnicity and language
- The reflexivity of the ethnographer regarding her reactions.

Other appropriate applications should be credited.

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	The response demonstrates a basic knowledge and understanding of the concept.
	There is a partial application of the concept in relation to the text.
3–4	The response demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the concept; the concept is described in detail.
	The concept is clearly applied in relation to the text.

Explain how the key concept of **power** helps you understand the ethnographic data presented in the passage. [6]

This question requires candidates to develop an analysis and explanation of this ethnographic text using the key concept **power** to help make sense of the ethnographic data. In order to do this, candidates are required to demonstrate an understanding of the key concept and use it to illuminate certain issues within the context of the passage, developing an analysis with reference to the ethnographic data of the extract.

Possible ways of defining the key concept:

- Power is an essential part of social relations and can be considered as a person's or group's capacity to influence, manipulate or control others and resources
- In its broadest sense, power can be understood as involving distinctions and inequalities between members of a social group
- Some approaches to power focus on structural power or the capacity of power to produce subjectivities.

Other appropriate definitions should be credited.

Possible examples and ways of analyzing:

- State power
- Structural violence
- Resistance
- Power dynamics in the field
- The (western) researcher transcending local gender norms
- Religious authority

Other appropriate examples and ways of analyzing should be credited.

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	The response offers a common-sense or superficial understanding of the key concept.
	There is an attempt to relate the key concept to the text, and some ethnographic examples are presented but these are only partially relevant.
3–4	The response demonstrates an understanding of the key concept and establishes its relevance to the text.There is an analysis of the text using the key concept, although there are some inconsistencies.Relevant ethnographic examples from the text are presented to support the analysis.
5–6	 The response demonstrates a clear understanding of the key concept, discussing this in the context of the text. There is a clearly explained analysis of the text using the key concept and a detailed interpretation of the ethnographic data. Clear and explicit ethnographic examples from the text support the analysis.

[10]

3. Compare and contrast the way in which the key concept of **social relations** or **identity** is evident in this passage with how it is evident in **one** other ethnographic example you have studied. Make reference to theory in your answer.

Candidates are expected to show an ability to think about the text in relation to other contexts and to draw explicit comparisons. In order to do this, responses must demonstrate an understanding of how either the key concept of **social relations** or **identity** relates to this ethnographic context. Either of the key concepts on which such comparison may be drawn should be made explicit and clearly linked to any anthropological issues raised by the text.

The target societies for this comparative question are varied and many. Candidates should be able to establish a relevant comparison with any other group or society based on either of these concepts. The response should be structured as a comparison, highlighting similarities and differences. Candidates must situate the comparative case in terms of place, author, and fieldwork context.

For social relations, possible ways of defining the key concept include the following:

- Any relationship between two or more individuals in a network of relationships
- Social relations involve an element of individual agency as well as group expectations and form the basis of social organization and social structure
- They pervade every aspect of human life and are extensive, complex, and diverse.

Other appropriate definitions should be credited.

Possible examples from the text about social relations may include the following:

- Social relations and religious groups
- Marriage and kinship
- Field relations
- Socialization/acculturation into social groups

Any other relevant point of comparison used from the text should be credited.

For identity, possible ways of defining the key concept include the following:

- Identity can refer either to the individual's private and personal view of the self—this is sometimes referred to as the "*moi*"—or the view of an individual in the eyes of the social group.
- Identity also refers to group identity, which may take the form of religious identity, ethnic identity, or national identity for example.

Other appropriate definitions should be credited.

Possible examples from the text about identity may include:

- Religious identity
- Secular identity
- National identity
- Gender
- Insider/outsider
- Fieldworker identity and how it is conceptualized by participants

Any other relevant point of comparison used from the text should be credited.

Possible examples of theory in relation to identity may include:

At HL candidates need to use theory in the response in order to achieve more than [4] marks.

- Post-structuralism
- Practice theory
- Feminist theory
- Post-colonial theories

Any other relevant theory.

OR

4. Compare and contrast the approaches to research adopted by the anthropologist in this passage with the approaches to research used by **one** other anthropologist you have studied. Make reference to concepts, ethnographic material and theory in your answer.

[10]

Here, candidates are expected to show an ability to think about the text with emphasis on the methodological and theoretical perspectives of the ethnographer as the focus on which such comparisons should be established.

By "approaches to research" the question essentially refers to the research methods used by the anthropologist to gather data. However, as theory is required for level 5–6 and above, it is expected that candidates will also discuss theory with reference to approaches.

Possible comparative examples regarding approaches to research and methodological terms may include:

- Participant observation
- informal/ethnographic interviews
- gender
- tensions between ethnographer and the state
- qualitative methods
- insider/outsider
- access to the field
- local categories/analytical categories
- positionality
- field relationships
- reflexivity
- representation.

Possible examples of theory in relation to approaches may include the following:

- Post-colonial theories
- Feminist theory

Any other relevant theory.

0 The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below. 1-2 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented but in limited detail; relevance is only partially established. The response is not structured as a compare and contrast. The identification of ethnographic material is missing. 3-4 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented and although this is in limited detail, its relevance is established. The response is structured as a compare and contrast, but this is not balanced and lacks detail. The response is structured as a compare and contrast, but this is not balanced and lacks detail. 5-6 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is established and explained. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast; however, either comparison (similarities) or contrasts (differences) are explained in detail, but not both. Anthropological theory has been identified although this may not be relevant or the application is limited. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete. 7-8 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and explained in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) being discussed in detail, although this is not balanced. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the analysis although there are some inconsistencies. <tr< th=""><th>Marks</th><th>Level descriptor</th></tr<>	Marks	Level descriptor
 relevance is only partially established. The response is not structured as a compare and contrast. The identification of ethnographic material is missing. 3-4 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented and although this is in limited detail, its relevance is established. The response is structured as a compare and contrast, but this is not balanced and lacks detail. The identification of ethnographic material is partially complete. 5-6 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is established and explained. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast; however, either comparison (similarities) or contrasts (differences) are explained in detail, but not both. Anthropological theory has been identified although this may not be relevant or the application is limited.	0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
The response is not structured as a compare and contrast. The identification of ethnographic material is missing. 3-4 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented and although this is in limited detail, its relevance is established. The response is structured as a compare and contrast, but this is not balanced and lacks detail. The identification of ethnographic material is partially complete. 5-6 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is established and explained. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast; however, either comparison (similarities) or contrasts (differences) are explained in detail, but not both. Anthropological theory has been identified although this may not be relevant or the application is limited. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete. 7-8 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and explained in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) being discussed in detail, although this is not balanced. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the analysis although there are some inconsistencies. The response demonstrates anthropological understanding. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete. Capped marks If fieldwork location(s), fieldwork context(s), group(s) studied and ethnographer(s) have not been fully identified, no more than 8 marks will be awarded. 9–10 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and discussed in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contr	1–2	Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented but in limited detail;
3-4 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented and although this is in limited detail, its relevance is established. The response is structured as a compare and contrast, but this is not balanced and lacks detail. The identification of ethnographic material is partially complete. 5-6 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is established and explained. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast; however, either comparison (similarities) or contrasts (differences) are explained in detail, but not both. Anthropological theory has been identified although this may not be relevant or the application of ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and explained in detail. 7-8 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and explained in detail. 7-8 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and explained in detail. 7-8 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and explained in detail. 7-8 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and explained in detail. 7-8 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and explained in detail. 7 The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) being discussed in detail, although this is not balanced.		relevance is only partially established.
 3-4 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented and although this is in limited detail, its relevance is established. The response is structured as a compare and contrast, but this is not balanced and lacks detail. The identification of ethnographic material is partially complete. 5-6 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is established and explained. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast; however, either comparison (similarities) or contrasts (differences) are explained in detail, but not both. Anthropological theory has been identified although this may not be relevant or the application of ethnographic material is mostly complete. 7-8 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and explained in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) being discussed in detail, although this is not balanced. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the analysis although there are some inconsistencies. The response demonstrates anthropological understanding. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete. Capped If fieldwork location(s), fieldwork context(s), group(s) studied and ethnographer(s) have not been fully identified, no more than 8 marks will be awarded. 9-10 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and discussed in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) discussed critically. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the analysis although there are some inconsistencies. 		The response is not structured as a compare and contrast.
 in limited detail, its relevance is established. The response is structured as a compare and contrast, but this is not balanced and lacks detail. The identification of ethnographic material is partially complete. 5–6 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is established and explained. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast; however, either comparison (similarities) or contrasts (differences) are explained in detail, but not both. Anthropological theory has been identified although this may not be relevant or the application is limited. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete. 7–8 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and explained in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) being discussed in detail, although this is not balanced. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the analysis although there are some inconsistencies. The response demonstrates anthropological understanding. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete. Capped If fieldwork location(s), fieldwork context(s), group(s) studied and ethnographer(s) have not been fully identified, no more than 8 marks will be awarded. 9–10 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and discussed in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrast(differences) studied and 9–10 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and discussed in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) discussed critically. Relevant anthropological theory has been i		The identification of ethnographic material is missing.
The response is structured as a compare and contrast, but this is not balanced and lacks detail. The identification of ethnographic material is partially complete.5-6Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is established and explained. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast; however, either comparison (similarities) or contrasts (differences) are explained in detail, but not both. Anthropological theory has been identified although this may not be relevant or the application is limited. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete.7-8Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and explained in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) being discussed in detail, although this is not balanced. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the analysis although there are some inconsistencies. The response demonstrates anthropological understanding. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete.Capped marksIf fieldwork location(s), fieldwork context(s), group(s) studied and ethnographer(s) have not been fully identified, no more than 8 marks will be awarded.9-10Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and discussed in detail. The response is clearly or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and discussed in detail at mostly complete.Capped marksIf fieldwork location(s), fieldwork context(s), group(s) studied and ethnographer(s) have not been fully identified, no more than 8 marks will be awarded.9-10Comparative ethnography or approaches are pre	3–4	
The identification of ethnographic material is partially complete.5–6Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is established and explained. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast; however, either comparison (similarities) or contrasts (differences) are explained in detail, but not both. Anthropological theory has been identified although this may not be relevant or the application is limited. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete.7–8Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and explained in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) being discussed in detail, although this is not balanced. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the analysis although there are some inconsistencies. The response demonstrates anthropological understanding. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete.Capped marksIf fieldwork location(s), fieldwork context(s), group(s) studied and ethnographer(s) have not been fully identified, no more than 8 marks will be awarded.9–10Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and discussed in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) being discussed in detail, although there are some inconsistencies. The response demonstrates anthropological understanding. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete.Capped marksIf fieldwork location(s), fieldwork context(s), group(s) studied and ethnographer(s) have not been fully identified, no more than 8 marks will be <b< td=""><td></td><td>The response is structured as a compare and contrast, but this is not</td></b<>		The response is structured as a compare and contrast, but this is not
 5–6 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is established and explained. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast; however, either comparison (similarities) or contrasts (differences) are explained in detail, but not both. Anthropological theory has been identified although this may not be relevant or the application is limited. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete. 7–8 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and explained in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) being discussed in detail, although this is not balanced. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the analysis although there are some inconsistencies. The response demonstrates anthropological understanding. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete. Capped If fieldwork location(s), fieldwork context(s), group(s) studied and ethnographer(s) have not been fully identified, no more than 8 marks will be awarded. 9–10 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and discussed in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) discussed critically. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the analysis although there are some inconsistencies. 		
 5–6 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is established and explained. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast; however, either comparison (similarities) or contrasts (differences) are explained in detail, but not both. Anthropological theory has been identified although this may not be relevant or the application is limited. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete. 7–8 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and explained in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) being discussed in detail, although this is not balanced. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the analysis although there are some inconsistencies. The response demonstrates anthropological understanding. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete. Capped If fieldwork location(s), fieldwork context(s), group(s) studied and ethnographer(s) have not been fully identified, no more than 8 marks will be awarded. 9–10 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and discussed in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) discussed critically. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the analysis although there are some inconsistencies. 		The identification of ethnographic material is partially complete.
The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast; however, either comparison (similarities) or contrasts (differences) are explained in detail, but not both. Anthropological theory has been identified although this may not be relevant or the application is limited. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete.7-8Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and explained in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) being discussed in detail, although this is not balanced. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the analysis although there are some inconsistencies. The response demonstrates anthropological understanding. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete.Capped marksIf fieldwork location(s), fieldwork context(s), group(s) studied and ethnographer(s) have not been fully identified, no more than 8 marks will be awarded.9–10Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and discussed in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and discussed in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) discussed critically. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the awarded.	5–6	Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is
either comparison (similarities) or contrasts (differences) are explained in detail, but not both. Anthropological theory has been identified although this may not be relevant or the application is limited. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete.7-8Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and explained in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) being discussed in detail, although this is not balanced. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the analysis although there are some inconsistencies. The response demonstrates anthropological understanding. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete.Capped marksIf fieldwork location(s), fieldwork context(s), group(s) studied and ethnographer(s) have not been fully identified, no more than 8 marks will be awarded.9-10Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and discussed in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and discussed in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and discussed in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) discussed critically. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the		
 Anthropological theory has been identified although this may not be relevant or the application is limited. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete. 7–8 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and explained in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) being discussed in detail, although this is not balanced. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the analysis although there are some inconsistencies. The response demonstrates anthropological understanding. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete. Capped If fieldwork location(s), fieldwork context(s), group(s) studied and ethnographer(s) have not been fully identified, no more than 8 marks will be awarded. 9–10 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and discussed in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) discussed critically. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the awarded. 		
 or the application is limited. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete. 7–8 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and explained in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) being discussed in detail, although this is not balanced. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the analysis although there are some inconsistencies. The response demonstrates anthropological understanding. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete. Capped If fieldwork location(s), fieldwork context(s), group(s) studied and ethnographer(s) have not been fully identified, no more than 8 marks will be awarded. 9–10 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and discussed in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) discussed critically. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the 		detail, but not both.
 The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete. 7–8 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and explained in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) being discussed in detail, although this is not balanced. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the analysis although there are some inconsistencies. The response demonstrates anthropological understanding. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete. Capped If fieldwork location(s), fieldwork context(s), group(s) studied and ethnographer(s) have not been fully identified, no more than 8 marks will be awarded. 9–10 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and discussed in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) discussed critically. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the 		
 7–8 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and explained in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) being discussed in detail, although this is not balanced. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the analysis although there are some inconsistencies. The response demonstrates anthropological understanding. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete. Capped If fieldwork location(s), fieldwork context(s), group(s) studied and ethnographer(s) have not been fully identified, no more than 8 marks will be awarded. 9–10 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and discussed in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) discussed critically. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the 		or the application is limited.
 established and explained in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) being discussed in detail, although this is not balanced. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the analysis although there are some inconsistencies. The response demonstrates anthropological understanding. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete. Capped If fieldwork location(s), fieldwork context(s), group(s) studied and ethnographer(s) have not been fully identified, no more than 8 marks will be awarded. 9–10 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and discussed in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) discussed critically. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the 		The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete.
 comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) being discussed in detail, although this is not balanced. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the analysis although there are some inconsistencies. The response demonstrates anthropological understanding. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete. Capped If fieldwork location(s), fieldwork context(s), group(s) studied and ethnographer(s) have not been fully identified, no more than 8 marks will be awarded. 9–10 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and discussed in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) discussed critically. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the 	7–8	
 detail, although this is not balanced. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the analysis although there are some inconsistencies. The response demonstrates anthropological understanding. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete. Capped marks If fieldwork location(s), fieldwork context(s), group(s) studied and ethnographer(s) have not been fully identified, no more than 8 marks will be awarded. 9–10 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and discussed in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) discussed critically. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the 		The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with
 Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the analysis although there are some inconsistencies. The response demonstrates anthropological understanding. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete. Capped marks If fieldwork location(s), fieldwork context(s), group(s) studied and ethnographer(s) have not been fully identified, no more than 8 marks will be awarded. 9–10 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and discussed in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) discussed critically. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the 		
The response demonstrates anthropological understanding. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete.Capped marksIf fieldwork location(s), fieldwork context(s), group(s) studied and ethnographer(s) have not been fully identified, no more than 8 marks will be awarded.9–10Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and discussed in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) discussed critically. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the		Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the
The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete.Capped marksIf fieldwork location(s), fieldwork context(s), group(s) studied and ethnographer(s) have not been fully identified, no more than 8 marks will be awarded.9–10Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and discussed in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) discussed critically. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the		
Capped marksIf fieldwork location(s), fieldwork context(s), group(s) studied and ethnographer(s) have not been fully identified, no more than 8 marks will be awarded.9–10Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and discussed in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) discussed critically. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the		
 marks ethnographer(s) have not been fully identified, no more than 8 marks will be awarded. 9–10 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and discussed in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) discussed critically. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the 	Capped	
awarded. 9–10 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and discussed in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) discussed critically. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the		
9–10 Comparative ethnography or approaches are presented; relevance is clearly established and discussed in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) discussed critically. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the	marite	
established and discussed in detail. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) discussed critically. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the	9–10	
The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast with comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) discussed critically. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the		
comparisons (similarities) and contrasts (differences) discussed critically. Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the		
Relevant anthropological theory has been identified and used as part of the		
		analysis.
The response demonstrates anthropological understanding.		
The identification of the ethnographic material is complete.		

5. To what extent is knowing others possible? Discuss with reference to **at least two** sources of ethnographic material and examples from the passage. [10]

This question requires candidates to develop an argument that is built on an understanding of the following "big anthropological question": To what extent is knowing others possible? This response should include argumentative discussion and analysis and should be supported by making reference to the passage and by relevant, detailed ethnographic material that gives evidence of the understanding of this big question in different cultural contexts. This big anthropological question should be the very backbone of the response.

In the development of their response, candidates may make reference to a number of ideas or propositions connected to the question. For this reason, below are some ideas that may appear in candidates' responses. However, any other relevant lines of thought should be rewarded.

Possible issues to develop an argument may be:

There are many different ways that candidates can approach this question, and any valid discussion of similarities and differences underpinned by anthropological knowledge and understanding should be considered.

While it is not possible to predict how candidates will use any additional ethnographies, in relation to the passage they may focus on:

- Gender
- Religion
- Secularization
- Cultural Relativism
- Change
- Power
- Memory and history

Other appropriate discussion and arguments should be credited.

Marks	Loval descriptor
	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.There is limited understanding of the big anthropological question.
	The response refers to ethnographic material; relevance to the question is superficial or not established. There is no reference to the passage.
	The identification of ethnographic material is missing.
3–4	There is partial understanding of the big anthropological question.
	The response presents some ethnographic material and establishes its relevance to the question, but this lacks detail. There is no or limited
	reference to the passage.
	There is an attempt to analyse and interpret the ethnographic material in
	relation to the big anthropological question, but this lacks clarity and coherence.
	The identification of ethnographic material is partially complete.
5–6	There is an understanding of the big anthropological question.
	The response presents a range of relevant ethnographic material and
	establishes its relevance to the question. There is some reference to the
	passage.
	There is some analysis and interpretation of the ethnographic material and
	passage in relation to the big anthropological question but there is a limited
	or an undeveloped argument.
	The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete.
7–8	There is clear understanding of the big anthropological question in different cultural contexts.
	The response presents detailed comparative ethnographic material and
	establishes its relevance to the question. There is clear reference to the passage.
	The analysis and interpretation of the ethnographic material and passage
	support the development of an argument; however minor inconsistencies
	hinder from the strength of the overall argument.
	The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete.
Capped	If fieldwork location(s), fieldwork context(s), group(s) studied and
marks	ethnographer(s) have not been fully identified, no more than 8 marks will be awarded.
9–10	There is clear understanding of the big anthropological question in different cultural contexts.
	The response presents detailed comparative ethnographic material and
	establishes its relevance to the question. There is clear reference to the passage.
	The analysis and interpretation of the ethnographic material and passage in
	relation to the big anthropological question support the development of a
	reasoned argument; any minor inconsistencies do not hinder from the
	strength of the overall argument.
	The identification of ethnographic material is complete.
L	

Section B

6. With reference to **either** stimulus A **or** stimulus B **and** your own knowledge, discuss the defining features of anthropological ethics. [10]

This question requires candidates to develop a response in which they demonstrate an understanding of the anthropological ethical issues raised by the stimulus material, and an ability to engage in a critical discussion applying their own knowledge.

If stimulus A is used:

This extract is based on an academic paper in which an anthropologist comments on ethical issues regarding fieldwork. More specifically, it relates to a researcher obtaining informed consent from a vulnerable participant group; consent which is mediated by third parties.

Candidates are expected to demonstrate –with reference to the passage- their knowledge about informed consent as a key plank in ethnographers conducting research ethically as professional practitioners. These principles dictate that the ethnographer respects the dignity of the members of the group being studied. The stimulus allows for a wide range of responses.

Candidates may develop a discussion based on:

- The nature of interaction between fieldworkers and research participants, in particular regard to honesty and informed consent
- The right of individuals to be given the possibility to accept or refuse to take part in a research study
- The relationship between fieldworkers and gatekeepers
- The importance of giving voice to people such as separated migrant children
- The moral dilemmas associated to the tensions between the responsibility of the anthropologist towards the research participants, to the complexities of parties at play and the difficult decisions to take among competing ethical obligations
- Asymmetries of power
- Anthropologists working with vulnerable groups
- Any relevant principle of anthropological codes of ethics
- Other relevant cases in the history of the discipline.

Other possible relevant lines of thought should be credited.

If stimulus B is used:

This stimulus relates to the ethical issues involved in participant observation. In this case, it is likely candidates will discuss anthropological ethics stressing the importance of field relations.

Candidates may develop a discussion based on the following:

- Issues of representation
- Access to participants
- Power relations
- Collaborative research and inclusion
- Reputation of anthropology as a discipline
- the ways in which fieldwork is conducted and to what end
- the changes of the ethical anthropological practices over time
- How people use anthropological work to understand themselves.

Other possible relevant lines of thought should be credited.

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	The response identifies one or more ethical concerns but their relevance to anthropology is not established. There is little or no reference to the stimulus.
3–4	The response identifies one or more ethical concerns and partially establishes their relevance to anthropology. There is an attempt to engage with the stimulus but understanding of the ethical issue presented is superficial or limited.
5–6	The response develops an analysis of one or more ethical concerns and establishes their relevance to anthropology. There is clear understanding of the ethical issues presented in the stimulus. An argument is presented that indicates the student's perspective on the relative importance of the ethical issue(s) in relation to anthropological practice, but this is only partially developed.
7–8	The response discusses one or more ethical concerns, is anthropologically informed, and incorporates the student's own knowledge of the defining features of anthropological ethics. There is clear and relevant engagement with the stimulus, and the ethical issues presented are explained demonstrating sound understanding. An argument is presented that indicates the student's perspective on the relative importance of the ethical issue(s) in relation to anthropological practice; however, there are inconsistencies that hinder the overall strength of the argument.
9–10	The response critically discusses one or more ethical concerns, is anthropologically informed, and integrates the student's own knowledge of the defining features of anthropological ethics. There is relevant and thorough engagement with the stimulus, and the ethical issue(s) presented are fully explained demonstrating excellent understanding. A reasoned argument is presented that indicates the student's perspective on the relative importance of the ethical issue(s) in relation to anthropological practice; any minor inconsistencies do not hinder the overall strength of the argument.