

Exercise walk-through

2.1

Comparison through a concept: supported rehearsal

International Baccalaureate · IB Diploma · Social and Cultural Anthropology · HL

1

The method

Method — Worked example

Use a concept to explain a relationship, then compare its operation across contexts. Do not equate similar objects with identical social functions. A classroom comparison rehearses the method; the school's selected ethnographies supply the authentic evidence.

Original cases: club A invites all newcomers to a shared meal; club B invites them only after a period of service. Explain belonging through both arrangements and challenge a simple ranking of inclusion.

A may establish membership through immediate sharing; B may recognize membership through demonstrated contribution. Invitation timing provides a contrast, but does not show how welcomed members feel. Examine refusal, obligations and participants' interpretations. Immediate access could still involve unequal duties; delayed access could be experienced differently by different members. Transfer check: explain what an interview with only committee members would miss, then specify a contrasting consenting sample.

Method — Worked example

Use a concept to explain a relationship, then compare its operation across contexts.

Original source / task evidence

Original cases: club A invites all newcomers to a shared meal; club B invites them only after a period of service. Explain belonging through both arrangements and challenge a simple ranking of inclusion.

Separate what is stated from the interpretation.
Comparison through a concept

Original classroom evidence panel for Comparison through a concept

Exercises 2.1-3.1

2.1 For the worked case, identify the evidence and a conclusion it can support. Explain one material limit. [3]

3.1 Committee-only interviews support a claim that the invitation rule creates belonging. What is missing and how should the claim change? Give a reasoned answer, evidence or method, and a relevant qualification. [3]

Exercises 2.1-3.1

2.1 For the worked case, identify the evidence and a conclusion it can support. Explain one material limit. [3]

2.1 A may establish membership through immediate sharing; B may recognize membership through demonstrated contribution. Invitation timing provides a contrast, but does not show how welcomed members feel. Examine refusal, obligations and participants' interpretations. Immediate access could still involve unequal duties; delayed access could be experienced differently by different members. Transfer check: explain what an interview with only committee members would miss, then specify a contrasting consenting sample. Authored points for identifying relevant evidence, explaining a supported inference and a material limit.

3.1 Committee-only interviews support a claim that the invitation rule creates belonging. What is missing and how should the claim change? Give a reasoned answer, evidence or method, and a relevant qualification. [3]

3.1 Those excluded, new members and members who left may experience the rule differently. Restrict the claim to committee accounts, then seek approved contrasting recruitment and actual participation evidence. A large number of committee interviews does not remove this selection limit. Authored points for a relevant judgement, reason tied to the case and justified qualification or method. Accept a supported alternative.