



MARKSCHEME

November 2010

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Higher 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 IB Cardiff.*

1. Describe how kayakers record and communicate their experience stories. [6 marks]

In answering this question, candidates will refer to George’s diary and Roberto’s recounting from this text, the former written and personal, and the latter spoken, oral and hence immediate and for an audience. Candidates will use their own words to describe the process of telling, writing, recounting, and narrating an experience. The kayakers transcribe and articulate a social reality through different media. The kayakers intend to record, savour and communicate their experiences – by diary, conversation and photo – for posterity (for George) and to attain “social capital” and status (for Roberto).

Photographs play a part in the narration of experience, as a souvenir (literally “to see again”) or physical evidence of the event. They constitute the proof of the stories told. Unfortunately, here, the photographs were either not very good, or reminded the participants that they had not been so extreme in the reality of their adventures as they wanted to portray themselves.

There is an undercurrent through the piece about the story and its connection with reality and history. A thorough answer will point to the latitude possible in talking to non-kayakers who are more easily impressed because they are less informed about kayaking. The candidates will note that there is also the danger that the stories take on a generic quality of heroism and thrill. The skill following the physicality of the kayaking is to know one’s audience and what to stress or downplay in one’s storytelling. If they create the right experience story they will gain status and prestige.

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 but the response relies too heavily on quotations from the text <i>and/or</i> limited generalizations are offered.
3–4	The response is organized, identifies and explains relevant points, and offers generalizations.
5–6	The response is organized, identifies and explains relevant points and links them to generalizations, demonstrating good anthropological understanding.

2. **Incorporating theoretical perspectives in your answer, explain how the authors use “social capital” to understand why the kayakers change their experience stories for different audiences.** **[6 marks]**

The authors of the piece use the term “social capital” a number of times. Candidates will be expected to demonstrate appropriate comprehension and interpretation of these instances in connection with the overall point of the anthropological piece. “Social capital” is given to those with the most compelling stories. “Social capital” comes from experience of kayaking in prestigious destinations (or access to destinations – by helicopter here), but the experience has to be balanced and appreciated by the audience. They are therefore shaped by and for the audience. Stories have the potential to be overplayed by the teller who wants to recount the dangerousness of their circumstances, but not the recklessness or loss of control in their actions. The “social capital”, then, is a social negotiation with a particular context to its telling – kayaking audiences are more informed and probably harder to impress than the non-kayaking audience, to Roberto’s chagrin.

A full answer to the question would clearly explain the meaning of social capital within the context of this passage and would relate this understanding to examples that refer to multiple audiences. This will be approached in a logical and organized manner.

Candidates may link “social capital” to Bourdieu but are not required to in order to gain full marks.

This knowledge should clearly refer to relevant theoretical works or perspectives.

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 anthropological issues and concepts.
3–4	The response demonstrates some understanding of anthropological issues and concepts or theory, <i>or</i> the response recognizes the viewpoint of the anthropologist, <i>but</i> not all of these.
5–6	The response demonstrates a critical understanding of anthropological issues, concepts and theory, <i>and</i> recognizes the viewpoint of the anthropologist.

3. **Compare and contrast how kayakers present themselves to their audiences with how another group presents itself to its audiences.** **[8 marks]**

Candidates may – **but do not need to** – select societies or groups that directly compare or contrast the recording and recounting of the kayakers’ tourist experiences with very similar records and narratives of tourist experiences. Candidates may choose any ethnographic example that illustrates how individuals and groups fashion their self-presentation for different audiences. Candidates may, for example, present instances of how individuals or groups present themselves to others who are similar or the same (“insiders”) and contrast this with their self-presentation to those who are different (“outsiders”). In other words, a good answer to this question will be one where a candidate is able to produce a strong and convincing comparison and contrast utilizing relevant and suitably contextualized ethnographic material. Better candidates will be able to draw attention to the contextual and strategic nature of all self-presentation.

Candidates must situate the comparative case in terms of group, place, author and ethnographic 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, <i>or</i> 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, <i>and</i> the response is clearly structured as a comparison. Either similarities <i>or</i> differences are discussed in detail, <i>but</i> 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, <i>and</i> the response is clearly structured as a comparison. Similarities <i>and</i> differences are discussed in detail. The response demonstrates good anthropological understanding.
