

Anthropology: evidence, concepts and practice

Supported preparation only; actual school choices and assessed work remain separate

Meaning and researcher position: method

Meaning and researcher position: method

An **emic account** describes participants' meanings; an **etic account** uses an analyst's categories. Start by distinguishing an observed action, a participant's statement and your interpretation.

Then test which account the evidence supports. Reflexivity asks how your access, language and expectations shape that evidence.

Concepts, culture and reflexivity: source representation

Original source / task evidence

Original source A: a club member says, "I accept food because next week I will help prepare it." Source B: a visiting observer records, "Food was distributed to members." Compare the claims and explain a useful follow-up.

Separate what is stated from the interpretation.
Meaning and researcher position

Original fictional task source; not an authentic selected work.

Meaning and researcher position: worked case

Meaning and researcher position: worked case

Original source A: a club member says, "I accept food because next week I will help prepare it." Source B: a visiting observer records, "Food was distributed to members." Compare the claims and explain a useful follow-up.

Identify the evidence before reading the model.

Meaning and researcher position: reasoning

Meaning and researcher position: reasoning

A links acceptance to reciprocal obligation; B records distribution without establishing its meaning. They need not contradict each other. The statement is one member's account, not a community-wide rule. Ask consenting members about differing experiences and compare what actually happens later.

A visitor may miss relationships that a member takes for granted; a member may also present an idealized account. Neither position is automatically superior.

Meaning and researcher position: your transfer

Meaning and researcher position: your transfer

A club officer says everybody welcomes the meal obligation, but a newcomer reports feeling unable to refuse. Explain how to use both accounts.

Pause and give an individual answer with reasons.

Meaning and researcher position: transfer review

Meaning and researcher position: transfer review

The officer may describe a public ideal while the newcomer describes an experienced constraint. Compare roles, context and voluntary accounts rather than averaging them or treating one as the whole community.

Observe how refusal is handled where approved. Explain how the researcher's access might favour officeholders.

Comparison through a concept: method

Comparison through a concept: method

Use a concept to explain a relationship, then compare its operation across contexts.
Do not equate similar objects with identical social functions.

A classroom comparison rehearses the method; the school's selected ethnographies supply the authentic evidence.

Reading and comparing ethnographies: source representation

Original source / task evidence

Original cases: club A invites all newcomers to a shared meal; club B invites them only after a period of service. Explain belonging through both arrangements and challenge a simple ranking of inclusion.

Separate what is stated from the interpretation.
Comparison through a concept

Original fictional task source; not an authentic selected work.

Comparison through a concept: worked case

Comparison through a concept: worked case

Original cases: club A invites all newcomers to a shared meal; club B invites them only after a period of service. Explain belonging through both arrangements and challenge a simple ranking of inclusion.

Identify the evidence before reading the model.

Comparison through a concept: reasoning

Comparison through a concept: reasoning

A may establish membership through immediate sharing; B may recognize membership through demonstrated contribution. Invitation timing provides a contrast, but does not show how welcomed members feel. Examine refusal, obligations and participants' interpretations. Immediate access could still involve unequal duties; delayed access could be experienced differently by different members.

Transfer check: explain what an interview with only committee members would miss, then specify a contrasting consenting sample.

Comparison through a concept: your transfer

Comparison through a concept: your transfer

Committee-only interviews support a claim that the invitation rule creates belonging. What is missing and how should the claim change?

Pause and give an individual answer with reasons.

Comparison through a concept: transfer review

Comparison through a concept: transfer review

Those excluded, new members and members who left may experience the rule differently. Restrict the claim to committee accounts, then seek approved contrasting recruitment and actual participation evidence.

A large number of committee interviews does not remove this selection limit.

Fieldwork rehearsal and reflection: method

Fieldwork rehearsal and reflection: method

Before observation, state a focused question, a recording unit, a sampling period and approved consent/privacy arrangements.

Separate description from interpretation. Actual fieldwork and school approval cannot be supplied by a model answer.

Ethical fieldwork and analysis: source representation

Original source / task evidence

Original notes: "At 12:10, four members sat near the door. The observer knew three of them." Interpret cautiously and improve a plan about seating and belonging.

Separate what is stated from the interpretation.
Fieldwork rehearsal and reflection

Original fictional task source; not an authentic selected work.

Fieldwork rehearsal and reflection: worked case

Fieldwork rehearsal and reflection: worked case

Original notes: "At 12:10, four members sat near the door. The observer knew three of them." Interpret cautiously and improve a plan about seating and belonging.

Identify the evidence before reading the model.

Fieldwork rehearsal and reflection: reasoning

Fieldwork rehearsal and reflection: reasoning

The description records a location and count. Friendship, status and exclusion are hypotheses. Repeat observations at comparable times and ask voluntary, non-leading questions where approved.

Record how the observer's friendships influence access and interpretation. Do not label identifiable people or assume consent from silence.

Fieldwork rehearsal and reflection: your transfer

Fieldwork rehearsal and reflection: your transfer

The second seating observation breaks the initial pattern. How should the analysis respond?

Pause and give an individual answer with reasons.

Fieldwork rehearsal and reflection: transfer review

Fieldwork rehearsal and reflection: transfer review

Retain the exception and compare timing, activity and participants. Revise a general friendship claim to a bounded observed pattern unless further evidence supports it.

A discrepant observation can test the interpretation; deleting it would conceal evidence.

HL competing theoretical explanations: method

HL competing theoretical explanations: method

A symbolic lens asks how meanings organize action; a power lens asks who controls resources and obligations.

Explain the mechanism before applying its name.

Theory and competing interpretations: source representation

Original source / task evidence

Task: a giver chooses recipients while recipients describe the exchange as friendship. Are the lenses mutually exclusive?

Separate what is stated from the interpretation.
HL competing theoretical explanations

Original fictional task source; not an authentic selected work.

HL competing theoretical explanations: worked case

HL competing theoretical explanations: worked case

Task: a giver chooses recipients while recipients describe the exchange as friendship.
Are the lenses mutually exclusive?

Identify the evidence before reading the model.

HL competing theoretical explanations: reasoning

HL competing theoretical explanations: reasoning

Friendship meanings may organize participation while control of allocation creates unequal influence. Test whether recipients can refuse and whether obligations vary. Neither lens is established by one quotation; compare participant accounts with observed consequences.

The school's actual ethnographies and selected theories remain required.

HL competing theoretical explanations: your transfer

HL competing theoretical explanations: your transfer

Recipients successfully change the allocation rule. How does this affect a power-focused account?

Pause and give an individual answer with reasons.

HL competing theoretical explanations: transfer review

HL competing theoretical explanations: transfer review

It weakens a claim that the giver controls all outcomes and suggests negotiated or distributed power. Examine whose proposals succeed and whether refusal has consequences.

Formal opportunity to speak is weaker evidence than actual influence over decisions.

Check yourself

Independent retrieval

Two accounts of the same ritual disagree. How would positionality and contextual observation guide your next inquiry?

Write your reasoning before comparing it with the methods and limits taught in this lesson.