



MARKSCHEME

May 2012

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Higher Level

Paper 1

7 pages

*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 tourists and locals jointly create an image of the past. [6 marks]

This question requires a primarily descriptive answer and much of the material can be found in the text itself. The question asks candidates to demonstrate how villagers and tourists collectively construct their understanding of the past through their interactions. The interests of tourists and locals converge to recreate an idealized past, functional to both parties.

A key point to note is that tourists and locals, through different practices and performances shape, tailor, and reinterpret facts and objects in order to create a representation of Botiza as a desired idealized past. This is illustrated by the quotation of the American tourist where it is clear that travelling to Botiza is not just travelling through space, but also through time. Also tourists imagine this past as their own past, relating the lifestyle to that of their ancestors.

In the example from the text, by taking photographs, a social identity is enacted in a story that is created by and for the tourist. In the visits to the craft workshops, tourists try on costumes, pretend to weave at the loom, and in this way, perform the narrative they have created. To facilitate this, villagers construct and decorate their workshops with costumes that are no longer used by villagers themselves.

Another descriptive example to choose from the passage is from the presentation artisans make of their work. They claim their rugs embody knowledge from a distant past, thus acquiring their value as authentic manifestations of the past. In the words of the French tourist, it is heritage and authenticity that adds value to the objects. In the tourist experience, the aesthetic value of the goods is often subordinate to its symbolic meaning, and drawing a strong link between an artifact and its producer allows the tourist to associate it with a local person and thus to give it a distinct history shared by tourist and artisan.

It is also possible to identify how meanings are recreated in the ways in which tourists assign new uses to the objects they purchase, altering their contexts and purposes, like the cloth traditionally used to decorate icons and used by the tourists as scarves.

The past is fundamentally constructed in the interactions between tourists who have clear expectations and locals willing to fulfill these. This interaction finally assumes the form of an economic exchange, where the object purchased is the embodiment of the jointly created meanings. The commodity is the tangible manifestation of that past.

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 <i>and/or</i> limited generalizations are offered.
3–4	The response is organized, identifies and explains some 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 the relationship between modernity and tradition, with reference to the tourist experience in Botiza.** *[6 marks]*

The passage shows that tourists arriving at Botiza perceive tradition and modernity as clearly distinct. The past embodies all positive values such as purity, health and authenticity, in contrast to the negative values associated with modernity. In this sense, the tourist experience acquires a moral dimension as the tourist connects with the past, and is immersed in its positive values.

It is clear from the passage that the concept of a traditional village is an ideological construction, because, as the very tourist site confirms, it is untenable to speak about traditional and modern societies in an empirical sense.

Some candidates may refer to the construction of place in global times; how this becomes a project in this tourist encounter, a project of cultural identity. The over communication of cultural distinctiveness can be understood as a localizing strategy. The interesting point is not whether an authentic tradition exists, but how the presentation of Botiza, a rural village, and its traditional dress, activities and environment is a process of commodification. Having made of “the past” a commodity, the encounter takes place as a modern economic exchange. Tourists and villagers together succeed in communicating and promoting the experience of “traditional” and authentic identity, each fulfilling their interests and needs.

A valid way of approaching this question may be focusing on agency, since the viewpoint of the author seems to imply that the past is not an empirical object, a given content, but a process of agency creation. Locals are not victims with no agency, but active constructors of the tourist experience. Other approaches may also show awareness of the viewpoint of the anthropologist.

Candidates may draw from different theories such as political economy, postmodernism, symbolic theories, globalization and modernity studies, in order to frame their analysis.

The relationship between tradition and modernity is a key point in discerning between *[3 marks]* and *[4 marks]* or higher. Those responses which clearly identify that the two (re)create each other (and are not mutually exclusive) should be awarded *[4 marks]* or more, providing of course that this is in accordance with other level descriptors in the assessment criteria below.

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 relevant anthropological issues and concepts.
3–4	The response demonstrates some understanding of relevant 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 relevant anthropological issues, concepts and theory, and recognizes the viewpoint of the anthropologist.

3. **Compare and contrast the way in which Botiza villagers present the past with the ways in which people relate to the past in *one* society that you have studied in detail.** **[8 marks]**

Candidates may choose any social group in order to develop a comparison. The question requires candidates to demonstrate an understanding of how relations with the past are conceptualized in or between societies, groups and institutions. Some comparisons can be made on the ideological uses of the past. These can potentially help agents make sense of the present, legitimate or contest the political order, provide group identity or justify particular views of the present.

Candidates are required to use theory and concepts (ideally introduced in their question 2 response) to frame their comparison.

Regarding identification of comparative ethnography (necessary to achieve more than **[4 marks]**); while the ethnographic present/ historical context is more desirable, the year of publication of the given ethnography is acceptable.

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.