

Markscheme

May 2017

Social and cultural anthropology

Standard level

Paper 1

This markscheme is **confidential** and for the exclusive use of examiners in this examination session.

It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of the IB Global Centre.

The following are the annotations available to use when marking responses.

Annotation	Explanation	Associated shortcut
	Caret - Omission	Alt+3
	CKS - Clear knowledge shown	
	DES - Descriptive	
	diff - Difference	
	EE - Effective evaluation	Alt+9
	GA - Good analysis	
	GD - Good definition	
GEN	GEN – Generalisation	
	GEXA - Good example	
	GEXP - Good explanation	Alt+5
GP	GP - Good point	Alt+4
	Highlight - Highlight tool	Alt+0
	IR - Irrelevant	
	IU - Inappropriate use	
	ND - No definition	
NEX	NEX - No explanation given	Alt+7

	NExa - No examples	Alt+6
	On Page Comment - On page comment tool	Alt+1
	SEEN_Small - Seen	
	sim - Similarity	
	Good Response/Good Point	Alt+2
	U - Understanding	Alt+8
	WARG - Well argued	

You **must** make sure you have looked at all pages. Please put the  annotation on any blank page, to indicate that you have seen it.

1. Describe how women in rural India use microcredit in everyday life. [6]

This primarily descriptive question requires candidates to give an account of the different uses of microcredit by women in rural India. Candidates may refer to any of the following:

- repay more expensive debts
- avoid sexual harassment
- avoid kin conflict
- set up businesses, although many fail
- invest in jewellery
- avoid socially degrading debts
- negotiate a better position within their social relations
- protect reputation.

More sophisticated responses will identify that the uses of microcredit by these women do not necessarily coincide with the intentions of microcredit as a project.

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	There is an attempt to organize the response and identify relevant points or examples, but the response relies too heavily on quotations from the text and/or limited generalizations are offered.
3–4	The response is organized, identifies and explains relevant points or examples, and offers generalizations.
5–6	The response is organized, identifies and explains detailed relevant points or examples, and links them to generalizations, demonstrating good anthropological understanding.

2. Explain why microcredit is not achieving its intended purposes. [6]

There are several points in the text which can be drawn on to answer this question, but stronger answers will incorporate concepts and knowledge from social and cultural anthropology that are relevant to the analysis and interpretation of the passage.

This response requires that candidates make explicit the limits and the creative strategic uses of agency given social structural constraints. The abstract goals of microcredit are transformed when embedded within the context of rural India. Candidates may refer to caste, gender, kinship, client and patron, political structures and patriarchy to illustrate their response with examples taken from the text.

Concepts such as gender, hierarchy, resistance, structural violence, capital, reciprocity and development can be drawn upon to discuss this question. Candidates can draw from relevant theories, including feminism or world systems/dependency theory, to answer this question. More sophisticated responses may identify that the viewpoint of the anthropologist is critical of economic projects that do not take cultural context into account. The anthropologist illustrates how women’s decisions and practices are rational given their social, cultural and economic context. However, these decisions and practices may not appear rational from the perspective of those who have set up microcredit schemes. Alternative relevant discussions on the viewpoint of the anthropologist are also acceptable.

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	The response is mainly descriptive and relies on quotations, but may demonstrate limited understanding of relevant anthropological issues and concepts.
3–4	The response demonstrates some understanding of relevant anthropological issues and concepts, or the response recognizes the viewpoint of the anthropologist, but not all of these.
5–6	The response demonstrates a critical understanding of relevant anthropological issues and concepts, and recognizes the viewpoint of the anthropologist.

3. Compare the agency of women in rural India with the agency of *one other* group you have studied. [8]

The target societies for this comparative question are varied and many. The question requires candidates to demonstrate an understanding of agency as inherent to the decision making and practices of individuals or groups in any given society. Agency can take many forms and may be limited by the particular social structures of the society in which people live.

Responses need not revolve around gender or kinship but the agency of other individuals or groups can be considered in order to develop the comparison. The measure of this response lies in the way in which candidates compare and harness ethnographic knowledge, rather than it being a test of knowledge of a similar case study.

In order to obtain full marks responses must be organized in a clear manner, highlighting similarities, differences and generalizations. Candidates must situate the comparative case in terms of group, place, author and historical context to gain more than 4 marks.

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	Comparative ethnography is presented in limited detail and its relevance is only partly established. It is not identified in terms of place, author or historical context. The response may not be structured as a comparison.
3–4	Comparative ethnography is presented in limited detail but its relevance is established. The comparative ethnography is identified in terms of place, author and historical context, or the response is clearly structured as a comparison.
5–6	Comparative ethnography is presented and its relevance is successfully established. The comparative ethnography is identified in terms of place, author and historical context, and the response is clearly structured as a comparison. Either similarities or differences are discussed in detail, but not both.
7–8	Comparative ethnography is presented and its relevance is successfully established. The comparative ethnography is identified in terms of place, author and historical context, and the response is clearly structured as a comparison. Similarities and differences are discussed in detail. The response demonstrates good anthropological understanding.