3.1 Anthropological practice

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____ **Total: 26 marks**

KEY WORDS fieldwork • informed consent

Anthropological practice

Objective

Supported preparation: Run a small fieldwork cycle twice with fitted methods; Write the report with ethics, interpretation and critical reflection. This is original rehearsal, not completion of the assessed task.

1 Key knowledge and worked examples

> **Practice toolkit.** The cycle: question, site, methods fitted (observation; counting and mapping; short interviews), fieldnotes, interpretation toward a concept; run twice (initial observation report, then an extension with second data collection and analysis). Ethics: informed consent, anonymity, do-no-harm, school permission first; positionality named in the report. The reflection judges the practice: what the methods missed, what the second pass changed. Worked: the corridor-flows project.

2 Practice

2.1 Name the four stages of the fieldwork cycle. [4]

2.2 Name the three fieldwork methods the toolkit lists. [3]

2.3 Name the three non-negotiable ethics rules, plus the permission that comes first. [4]

2.4 Why run the cycle twice rather than once? [2]

2.5 What does the critical reflection judge? [2]

3 Exam-style questions

3.1 *(Method style.)* The corridor project maps the same minute on five days rather than one observation. Justify the choice, and name what it still cannot see. [4]

3.2 *(Ethics style.)* A student wants to film the corridor anonymously for the project. Draft the ethics verdict. [4]

3.3 *(Interpretation style.)* The count shows door-holding by form and by familiarity. Interpret the finding through a named concept. [3]

Solutions

2.1 Observe (1); collect (1); interpret (1); reflect (1).

2.2 Observation (1); counting and mapping (1); short interviews (1).

2.3 Informed consent (1); anonymity (1); do no harm (1); school permission first (1).

2.4 The second pass tests the first (does the pattern hold?) (1); and the extension adds what the first could not see (1).

2.5 The practice itself: what the methods could and could not see (1); what the second collection changed and what the anthropologist would do next (1).

3.1 Justification: five same-minute maps make the flows comparable (one observation is one morning's accident) (2); limit: the map sees movement, not meaning (why the door is held, what the holding means), so it cannot interpret (2).

3.2 Anonymous filming still fails consent: the studied do not know they are studied (2); verdict: explain the project and get consent, or replace the camera with the hand-drawn map that anonymises individuals into flows (2).

3.3 Power (or social relations): the door is held by position and familiarity (the narrow door's queue holds itself; the regular's door held open), so micro-rules distribute who waits and who passes: the concept named (1); the first evidence used (1); the second evidence used (1).

Local review guidance: (R1) 3.1 argues comparability; 3.2 grounds the verdict in the rules; 3.3 names the concept and uses both evidences. Authored guidance.