

# **Markscheme**

**May 2024**

**Social and cultural anthropology**

**Standard level**

**Paper 1**

© International Baccalaureate Organization 2024

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 2024

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, 2024

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/>.

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.

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

[4]

This question requires candidates to demonstrate conceptual knowledge and understanding of the term **personhood** 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:**

- Culturally constructed concept of the individual human being, the “self”
- The assignment of individuality to a moral and institutional framework
- person as a subject of rights, legal position, and status
- In relation to dignity and respect
- Drawing from Mauss’ explanation, with reference to the notions of *personne* and *moi*.
- In terms of individual consciousness
- As the embodiment of a set of social relationships
- As a culturally and historically constituted notion and subject to change
- Regarding what constitutes a “person” (as opposed to a non-person) / or types of persons (human, non-human) / or degrees of personhood (disabilities, impaired personhoods).

Other appropriate definitions should be credited.

**Possible examples of description and application:**

- The violation of civil rights of vulnerable groups
- Experiences of violence, suffering and humiliation (e.g., Cleonice’s punishment)
- With reference to the concept of ‘discursive exclusion’ (e.g., Luis’ quotes)
- Cultural exclusion (e.g., educational levels among incarcerated people)
- With reference to social relations (e.g., visits as sacred)
- Incarcerated people and their claims for social justice
- ‘Being heard’ and citizenship rights.

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.

2. Analyse the ethnographic data presented in the passage using the concept of **power**.

[6]

This question requires candidates to develop an analysis and explanation of this ethnographic text using the key concept of **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:**

- As an essential part of social relations, as a person's or group's capacity to influence, manipulate or control others and resources
- Involving distinctions and inequalities between members of a social group
- In relation to its capacity to produce subjectivities
- In relation to hegemony and resistance
- In relation to authority and legitimacy
- In relation to race, class, and social positions
- Terms such as discourse, ideology, social control, structural power, symbolic power, discipline, symbolic violence, habitus, agency, may come into play.

Other appropriate definitions should be credited.

**Possible examples and ways of analyzing:**

- Structural power and violence of the prison system (e.g., systematic torture, lack of access to means of communication, information, education)
- Personal experiences of suffering and social injustice (Luis' and Cleonice's quotes)
- Racist and classist biases of criminal profiling
- Tension between agency and structure (e.g., difficulties incarcerated people have in communicating their claims)
- Power and resistance (e.g., Cleonice's quote)
- Knowledge and power
- Structural inequality in Brazilian society (e.g., processes of cultural exclusion, unequal access to justice)
- 'Discursive exclusion' and symbolic violence

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.

3. Compare and contrast the ways in which the key concept of **materiality** or **society** is evident in this passage with how it is evident in **one** other ethnographic example you have studied.

[10]

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 **materiality** or **society** 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 materiality, possible ways of defining the key concept include:**

- objects, resources and belongings with cultural meaning
- described by Appadurai as 'the social life of things'
- material aspects of existence embedded within all kinds of social relations and practices
- social constitution of the object world
- exploration of situated experiences of material life.

Other appropriate definitions should be credited.

**Possible examples and ways of analysing:**

- Books and 'discursive exclusion' (e.g., the lack of tolerance to law books, manuals, and reference books, Luis' quote about the book bought by his mother)
- Censorship of letters
- The importance of visits and the items brought by visitors
- Spoiled prison food
- Materiality of power (the prison system, systematic torture, solitary confinement)

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

**For society, possible ways of defining the key concept include:**

- The way in which humans organize themselves in groups and networks
- Created and sustained by social relationships and institutions
- A human group that exhibits some internal coherence and distinguishes itself from other such groups
- Terms such as norms, values, statuses, roles, social control, conflict, conformity, consensus may come into play.

Other appropriate definitions should be credited.

**Possible examples from the text about society may include:**

- Brazil as an unequal society (e.g., race and class inequalities, cultural exclusion)
- Institutional violence against vulnerable populations (e.g., systematic torture, racist and classist criminal profiling)
- The prison system and its institutional practices of discursive exclusion
- The prison as a ‘total institution’
- Liminality of incarcerated people and suspension of rights
- A focus on the Brazilian state, citizenship, and violation of human rights
- The importance of social relations (e.g., visits as sacred)
- Mechanisms of social control (e.g., the institutional processes of discursive exclusion)
- Discrimination and biases.

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

**OR**

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

**Possible comparative examples regarding approaches may include:**

- Observation
- Interviews
- Narratives
- The nature of field research in restricted/controlled environments (e.g., ethnographic research in a prison)
- Secondary sources (e.g., the use of official statistics)
- Ethical issues (e.g., privacy, anonymity, power dynamics)
- Discussion of structure-centered approaches

**Candidates may also make mention of other relevant methodological terms. For example:**

- qualitative methods
- insider/outsider; emic/etic; local categories/analytical categories
- access to the field
- positionality
- representation.

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

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	Comparative ethnography <b>or</b> 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 <b>or</b> 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 <b>or</b> approaches are presented; relevance is established and explained. The response is clearly structured as a compare and contrast; however, <b>either</b> comparison (similarities) <b>or</b> contrasts (differences) are explained in detail, but not both. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete.
7–8	Comparative ethnography <b>or</b> 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. 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 <b>or</b> 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. The response demonstrates anthropological understanding. The identification of the ethnographic material is complete.

5. Why does anthropology matter? 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”: **Why does anthropology matter?** 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.

**Possible issues to develop an argument may be:**

There are many different ways that candidates can approach this question, and any valid discussion of the strengths and limitations of anthropological endeavour is acceptable. While it is not possible to predict how they will use any additional ethnographies, in relation to the passage they may focus on:

- Subaltern, marginalized groups
- Activist/advocacy anthropology
- Processes of exclusion and integration
- Production and reproduction of inequalities
- Ethical and political concerns
- Human rights issues.

Other appropriate discussion and arguments should be credited.



Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	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 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 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. Analysis and interpretation supports the development of an argument; however minor inconsistencies hinder the strength of the overall argument. The identification of ethnographic material is mostly complete.
Capped marks	If fieldwork location(s), fieldwork context, group(s) studied and ethnographer(s) have not been fully identified, no more than 8 marks will be awarded.
9–10	There is a 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. Analysis and interpretation supports the development of a reasoned argument; any minor inconsistencies do not hinder the strength of the overall argument. The identification of ethnographic material is complete.