

Revision

International Baccalaureate · IB Diploma · Social and Cultural
Anthropology · HL

1 Concepts, culture and reflexivity

- emic
- reflexivity

U1-Q1

Which evidence most directly supports an emic interpretation?

Available marks: 2.

Worked answer

Participants' accounts of what the exchange means to them.

U1-Q2

Explain the mechanism or reasoning in this original case: Two visitors describe the same shared meal as generosity and social obligation. Their descriptions may reveal different positions, not a simple factual contradiction.

Available marks: 4.

Worked answer

A participant says taking food creates a duty to help later. An observer initially records only the food exchange. The participant's explanation changes the interpretation from an isolated gift to a relationship of reciprocity.

- Accurate relevant concept (1)
- Specific evidence from the case (1)
- Connected reasoning (2)

Do not treat one participant as the voice of an entire community. / Distinguish what was observed, what was said and what you infer before using theory to explain the case.

2 Reading and comparing ethnographies

- ethnography
- reciprocity

U2-Q1

What makes the comparison anthropological rather than a list of similarities?

Available marks: 2.

Worked answer

Using a concept to explain contextual evidence and differences in social relationships.

U2-Q2

Explain the mechanism or reasoning in this original case: A village study and an urban workplace study both discuss belonging. A shared concept permits comparison without making their social relations identical.

Available marks: 4.

Worked answer

Compare how membership is recognized in each setting: invitations, language or duties may matter differently. Identify the source, fieldwork setting and method before arguing that one pattern explains both cases.

- Accurate relevant concept (1)
- Specific evidence from the case (1)
- Connected reasoning (2)

SL studies one area per group; HL studies a fourth. The map does not replace the teacher's selected ethnographies. / Avoid comparison by loose similarity: explain a relationship and a meaningful contrast supported by specific evidence.

3 Ethical fieldwork and analysis

- fieldwork
- informed consent

U3-Q1

Which conclusion fits one short observation?

Available marks: 2.

Worked answer

It suggests a seating pattern worth investigating further, rather than proving a general rule about friendship.

U3-Q2

Explain the mechanism or reasoning in this original case: You want to study how students choose seats in a club. The research question must be narrow enough to investigate without exposing classmates.

Available marks: 4.

Worked answer

Ask how seating relates to existing friendship groups in a consenting club. Record anonymized positions and voluntary explanations. Compare the first interpretation with a second collection, then reflect on how your membership of the club affected access.

- Accurate relevant concept (1)
- Specific evidence from the case (1)
- Connected reasoning (2)

Do not covertly observe sensitive settings or infer friendship from one seat choice. / The school approves the method and retains the actual fieldwork evidence; a simulated worksheet cannot replace IA fieldwork.

4 Theory and competing interpretations

- theory
- power

U4-Q1

Which evidence helps evaluate a power-focused interpretation?

Available marks: 2.

Worked answer

Who controls the exchange, who may refuse, and how obligations differ.

U4-Q2

Explain the mechanism or reasoning in this original case: A gift can be explained as a symbol of belonging or as a way of maintaining unequal power. Different theoretical lenses direct attention to different evidence.

Available marks: 4.

Worked answer

A symbolic interpretation studies the meanings attached to the gift. A power-focused interpretation studies who may refuse it and who gains status. Look for participant accounts and patterns of obligation before deciding whether the lenses compete or complement each other.

- Accurate relevant concept (1)
- Specific evidence from the case (1)
- Connected reasoning (2)

Do not use theories as interchangeable labels after an example. / HL analysis must make the theory's mechanism and limitations clear in relation to particular evidence.