

2.1 Comparison through a concept: supported rehearsal

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____ **Total: 6 marks**

Objective

Supported preparation: Connect a key concept, inquiry area and contemporary issue; Compare ethnographic arguments with attention to context, method and ethics. This is original rehearsal, not completion of the assessed task.

1 Key knowledge and worked examples

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.

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 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.

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.

2 Practice

2.1 For the worked case, identify the evidence and a conclusion it can support. Explain one material limit. [3]

3 Exam-style questions

3.1 Committee-only interviews support a claim that the invitation rule creates belonging. What is missing and how should the claim change? Give a reasoned answer, evidence or method, and a relevant qualification. [3]

Solutions

2.1 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. Authored points for identifying relevant evidence, explaining a supported inference and a material limit.

3.1 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. Authored points for a relevant judgement, reason tied to the case and justified qualification or method. Accept a supported alternative.