



Markscheme

November 2015

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 issues South Korean adoptees face when returning to South Korea. [6]

This primarily descriptive question requires candidates to give an account of the complex situation of returning South Korean adoptees. On the one hand, the South Korean state encourages them to return and, superficially at least, they appear to blend into South Korean society but, on the other hand, being raised in cultures different from South Korea makes them aliens.

Returning adoptees are acutely aware of this situation and reflect on the degree to which they are racially unremarkable but shortfalls in language and cultural knowledge frustrate their ability to engage fully with South Korean life. Craig's experience with the aggressive man on the subway provides an example of this, and returning adoptees feel that such encounters are unfair because they themselves are not to blame for their lack of linguistic and cultural knowledge.

Some adoptees are given jobs as English-language teachers, in a context in which the ability to speak English is highly valued. However, prejudice amongst parents means that white (*eg* Caucasian American) teachers are perceived as more culturally authentic and hence desirable for this role. Other parents prefer their children to be taught by native South Koreans. Some of these adoptees recognize that while the forces of globalization have facilitated the return to their birth country, and configured them as a desirable asset in a vision of South Korea's future, the promotion of the English language is potentially diluting "Koreanness" and reproducing class inequalities.

Better responses will refer to key concepts such as capital, ethnicity, race, social class and globalization.

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 what South Korean adoptees represent for the South Korean state and for South Korean society.** [6]

South Korean state policy has constructed “Koreanness” as a biological entity and uses this construction to include the considerable number of overseas South Koreans in its vision of the country’s future. This transnational South Korean identity is intended to benefit South Korea and South Koreans in the global market, drawing on skills such as English-language competence and capitalizing on social networks for economic gain.

As a subset of the category “overseas Korean”, adoptees challenge this construction, as they are likely to identify more strongly with their adopted culture than with that of their birth country, where their cultural capital is found wanting. As Craig’s example illustrates, some members of South Korean society react negatively to fellow South Koreans who in their eyes are not South Korean enough.

Candidates may draw on a range of concepts, perspectives and theories, such as practice, globalization, identity, transnationalism, political economy and world systems.

Candidates may argue for a number of different valid anthropologist’s points of view, including structure-centred and conflict-centred approaches.

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 the South Korean adoptees' position in South Korean society with the position of *one* group in a society you have studied in detail.** [8]

Many different target societies can be used for this comparative question. The question requires candidates to demonstrate an understanding of the complexities of such notions as race, ethnicity and identity in general, which the state, society and individuals can construct in different and possibly conflicting ways.

The success of this answer depends on how candidates compare and incorporate ethnographic knowledge, rather than it being a test of knowledge of a similar case study.

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.
