

Markscheme

May 2016

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 the IB Assessment Centre.

1. Describe the difference between “play” and “game” on the basis of this passage. [6]

This question requires a primarily descriptive answer. The question asks candidates to demonstrate an understanding of the meanings of “game” and “play” and their distinctions.

The Urarina conceptualize “play” as essential for the well-being of the person, a key positive value related to health and human development. The Urarina express, maintain and reproduce personal and social identity through “playing”. Candidates can cite examples such as the babies’ toys and the way in which soccer (football) is practiced in the village. Here, “play” is not constrained by rules, or strategy. It is a timeless activity, connected to enjoyment and fun. It does not have a goal or ending.

In contrast, soccer as “game” is foreign to Urarina culture and epitomizes rules and roles, competition, strategy, time and regulation.

Some candidates may also note that soccer holds characteristics of both “play”, when it is played at home, and “game”, when it is played in the tournament in the downstream community. Good answers will capture the dual meaning of soccer.

Some candidates may also describe how soccer as “play” is related to an egalitarian society while soccer as “game” to a more hierarchical, state society; the latter being foreign to the Urarina.

Candidates do not need to cover all the points above, but the answer does have to be focused and in the candidate’s own words to obtain full marks.

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. **Using theoretical perspectives, explain how soccer as “game” turns the indigenous Urarina into Peruvian citizens.**

[6]

Soccer as a cultural practice is an instrument by which the state, through the medium of schoolteachers, imposes its power, promoting a new moral and political order. Soccer as “game” reflects and enables the integration and unification promoted by the state and to which the Urarina are being subjected.

Some candidates may focus on the ideological uses of this cultural practice to construct and legitimate the nation state as a political order beyond local kinship structures. It constructs a new national identity through the sport tournament. The fact that soccer tournaments are organized by schools and schoolteachers as Spanish-speaking state agents is significant.

The regulated, discipline- and time-focussed way of playing soccer as “game” is a means by which the Peruvian state tries to incorporate the Urarina as citizens. The Urarina see soccer as “game” as being “civilized” and “full of law”. The way they play in the tournaments is different from the way they play at home, as illustrated by their use of Spanish names rather than Urarina names.

Candidates may discuss the author’s particularistic approach as evidenced in his focus on the specific ways in which the Urarina play soccer at home and at the tournament. Some candidates may also relate this passage to a structure-centred perspective, focusing on school, as a state institution promoting the soccer tournaments, imposing community organization, constraining or creating new subjectivities. Candidates may note that the author adopts a critical viewpoint by contrasting warfare to sport, or anarchic egalitarianism to state control and power. A more developed explanation may recognize that the author interprets soccer in terms of both idealist and materialist 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 relevant anthropological issues and concepts.
- 3–4 The response demonstrates some understanding of relevant anthropological issues and concepts or theory, **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, concepts and theory, **and** recognizes the viewpoint of the anthropologist.

3. **Compare how soccer transforms Urarina society and culture with processes of social *and/or* cultural change in *one* society you have studied in detail.** [8]

The target societies for this comparative question are varied and many. The question requires candidates to demonstrate how sport articulates with social and ideological dynamics. This may vary under different circumstances and thus promote change. While this text focuses on sport as the medium through which this change is brought about, other processes of cultural change can be discussed.

Candidates may choose to use theoretical perspectives (ideally introduced in their question 2 response) to help frame their comparison.

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.
