

Examiners' Report  
June 2013

GCE Government and Politics  
6GP04 4B

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk).

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).



### Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus). Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

### Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2013

Publications Code UA036098

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

## Introduction

The standard of responses in Unit 4B during this examination session was broadly in line with that in previous sessions. As in Unit 3B, none of the questions posed particular problems, and there were very few examples of candidates misunderstanding questions altogether. As ever, however, a major discriminator was the degree to which candidates focused on the specific question set. Where candidates failed to do this, they commonly just provided general information about the ideology in question (presumably in the hope that some of their material would prove to be relevant), or they reproduced an answer to a different question (not unusually, one that had come up in the previous examination series). Candidates who spend time thinking about the question itself, and working out how they can construct a coherent and relevant response, have a major advantage over other candidates. Such time is never wasted. Other important discriminators included the following. Strong responses often demonstrated thorough and confident conceptual knowledge, not just defining terms accurately, but also, where relevant, discussing rival conceptions or meanings of terms; in contrast, weak responses either provided very rudimentary definitions or, more commonly, simply took terms to be self-evident. Strong responses tended to be analytical, arguments and viewpoints being properly explained and, where relevant, evaluated; weak responses tended to be highly descriptive. On essay questions (45 mark questions), strong responses dealt with the demands of synopticity far better than did weaker candidates. It is surprising, in view of the age of the specification, how many candidates still struggle to deal effectively with the synoptic aspect of essay questions, often providing largely one-sided responses, or responses that fail to show a clear awareness of the debate that lies at the heart of the question itself. As in previous years, however, the best responses demonstrated a level of knowledge and understanding and a confidence in deploying intellectual skills that was truly impressive, showing genuine insight into theoretical and ideological issues and providing evidence of good and stimulating teaching.

## Question 1

This was a two-part question. A large proportion of candidates were able to respond to the first part by advancing at least a basic definition of the nation, although accounts of the state sometimes tended to be briefer and more vague. Strong responses were able not only to provide robust single-sentence definitions of the nation and the state, highlighting the contrast between nations as cultural entities and states as political entities, but also recognised that the terms are complex and, especially in the case of the nation, defy a single-sentence definition. Some very good insight into the cultural, psychological and political dimensions of nationhood was sometimes demonstrated. However, the second part of the question, concerning why the terms are often confused, proved to be a more effective discriminator. In weak responses, the confusion between the terms tended to be either ignored, or it was dealt with by a passing, and often unexplained, reference to nation-states. These matters were handled with greater confidence and insight in strong responses, which, beyond noting the significance of the fact that most modern states are nation-states, often also pointed out the extent to which national identity has been shaped by the aspiration to achieve independent statehood.

Nation and state are different, but often confused. A nation is a group of people who share the same history, language, religion, values and often territory, but this is not always the case. For example Switzerland is a nation but has many languages. Because of this, a nation is commonly defined subjectively by the people. By this I mean that if the people ~~think~~ feel like a nation, they are. Examples of nations include England, Switzerland and Iraq.

A state, on the other hand, has sovereign power. It will have strict territorial borders and the citizens of a state ~~will~~ may be from different nations, ~~or~~ have different languages, religions and history. An example of a state is the United Kingdom because it has a sovereign government. It is not a nation state because it is made up of four nations.

The confusion often lies with nation states in particular. A nation state is a nation which is also a state. For example France. France has a sovereign government and citizens who subjectively define themselves as a nation. They generally share a common culture etc but have a clearly defined territory. Because of the existence of nation states, there is a lot of confusion with when a nation or state is actually a nation state.

Another confusion stems from nations who wish to become states. While they may act like states, without a sovereign government, they will not become one. England, for example, ~~is not~~ <sup>is not</sup> a state because the government has devolved some power to Scotland. England may feel like a state, but because of the devolution, it is not.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This is a Level 3 response. It contains a reliable definition of both the nation, which shows an understanding of both its cultural and psychological dimensions, and the state, which demonstrates an awareness of the importance of sovereign power and strict territorial borders. The contrast between the two is emphasised by the recognition that a single state can contain a number of nations. The second part of the question is handled with less assurance, although the nation-state is recognised as the key source of confusion between the two terms. The response becomes less well focused as it develops with the final paragraph being largely confused. The response gained 12 marks.

## Question 2

Many candidates who attempted this question ignored the 'how' and 'why' parts of this question, and instead took the two parts of the question to be a 'job lot', writing generally about the idea of future generations. In strong responses that addressed the 'why' issue explicitly and clearly an emphasis was often based on the notion of sustainability and the implication for finite natural resources of unrestrained self-interest. However, in only a minority of cases was sustainability properly defined or explained in a way that linked it to obligations towards future generations. Very few responses made reference to the idea that future generations are entitled to living standards, and therefore an access to resources, that is at least comparable to what the present generation currently enjoys. When the 'how' part of the question was well addressed, notions such as natural duty and ecological stewardship tended to feature prominently. In many cases, these ideas were, quite reasonably, seen to have links to conservative thinking about the environment.

Ecologists have shown a concern for future generations often in the name of environmental ethics & sustainability. This concern is expressed through an idea of ecological stewardship where we as the present generation are the custodians of the ~~env~~ ecosystem so that it can be passed down to the next generation. This is often expressed as a form of "natural duty" for our children & their children's children etc.

Nature is preserved on the grounds that it is the supreme source of "moral good" and has an inherent ability to benefit all organisms not just humans.

Ecologists have also shown concerns for future generations through sustainability. This is where the relentless growth & <sup>capitalism</sup> ~~as~~ expressed by most conventional ideologies has led to industrialisation, which is not sustainable as it is using up all the stock of resources available to us without replenishing them. This was expressed by Kenneth Boulding in "Spaceship Earth" who likened earth to a spaceship with no external input & therefore the resources available to

us are limited & exhaustible & as currently we operate in a similar manner to a cowboy economy, where we believe resources are endless, we have acted recklessly

and reduced our natural resource stock possibly to the extent that future generations ability to meet their own needs is reduced. \*

Ecologists believe this will lead to entropy as the loss of economical resources will lead to social degradation, something occurring currently in the fossil fuel crisis.

this expresses their concern for future generations as in the words of Burke "society is the living, the dead & those yet to be born" and ~~in a <sup>(deep)</sup> look~~ ecologists take a holistic approach they believe <sup>"the whole is greater than the sum of its parts"</sup> ~~everything needs to be understood in relation to other things~~ and therefore we must look after one part of society being those "yet to be born".

In addition as expressed in Biocentrism equality all organisms are morally equal, to which Peter Singer extended all those capable of suffering are morally equal & therefore arguably those yet to be born, who will have the capacity to suffer should be treated equally to those currently alive, showing a compassion to future generations.

However this approach is criticised as sacrifices are not reciprocal. It is therefore often said that as we do not gain anything from future generations we should not make sacrifices for them. Furthermore it is believed that sacrifices may not be enough or unnecessary for instance

if past generations left coal to us it would be almost useless as we use oil as our main energy source. Finally it is often said that technological advances occur when we are in dire need and therefore these advances may not occur if we have a plentiful energy source.

\* This is also seen in the tragedy of the commons, whereby

Common resources are used in self-interest and thus degrade  
however ecologists believe that they can maintain these common  
resources <sup>for future generations</sup> through co-operation and relationships.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This is a Level 3 response. It draws attention to ideas such as sustainability, natural duty and ecological stewardship, although these tend not to be discussed in a developed way. Of particular help is the use made of Boulding thinking to highlight the dangers of an unrestrained use of finite resources in 'spaceship earth'. Both the how and the why parts of the question are addressed, in the latter case by, amongst other things, an account of the Burkean notion of society as a partnership between generations. The final section of the response is often confused and lacks relevance to the question.

### Question 3

This question was generally answered well, and many responses to it were either very good or better. Very few candidates were unable to advance at least a basic definition of sex and gender, highlighting the difference between biological and cultural differences between women and men. In many cases, the distinction was explained very fully and with significant theoretical insight. Performance varied more widely, however, when it came to explaining why the distinction is crucial to feminist analysis. Some weaker responses tended to provide an account of contrasting feminist traditions, with little clear relevance to the question set. Another weakness, found, sometimes, in otherwise impressive responses, was to spend time discussing why some feminists reject the distinction altogether. However well this point was made, it was irrelevant to the question itself. Nevertheless, many candidates coped well with this part of the question, explaining both how and why the distinction enables feminists to explode the myth that biology is destiny.

The distinction between sex and gender is at the core of feminism. The most common anti-feminist argument is that <sup>a</sup>women's biological anatomical make up suits their subordinate role, as a housewife for example. In short, they believe that 'biology is destiny'. However, feminists draw a distinction between the two, and argue that sex does not dictate a woman's social destiny. Feminists therefore view this distinction as crucial as it allow them to explain why women should not be confined to the house. Many feminists argue that just because women are ~~able~~ able to become mothers, does not mean that they must accept the duties of motherhood. ~~They~~ They therefore draw a clear distinction between sex and gender, and state that sex is biology and is unalterable, however gender is cultural; it is the stereotypes that society ascribes to women. Therefore, by drawing a distinction between the two, feminists are able to show how they have been oppressed, and why it should stop. Feminists believe that sex should have no economical, political or social significance. They believe that women, and men,

should be judged on their personalities and talents, in other words as 'persons'. ~~There~~ Therefore, many feminists advocate the notion of androgyny, which is the idea that women possess both male and female characteristics. This thus allows society to treat women equally, not simply in the public sphere, but also in the private, as men and women would share domestic duties. However, many feminists, most notably 'difference feminists' do not desire a distinction to be drawn between sex and gender, as they do not want to be equal to men, as this would mean they would have to take on male qualities, such as aggression or competitiveness. They therefore seek to retain their specific gender roles as they believe it is innate. For example, cultural feminists partake in cultural activities such as arts and crafts.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is a Level 3 response. It contains accurate definitions of sex and gender, even though the distinction between the terms does not feature until after its significance has been discussed. It also recognises that the root of the distinction lies in an androgynous view of human nature. The significance of the distinction in demonstrating that sex differences do not dictate a woman's social destiny was also clearly explained. The final section, on difference feminism, is nevertheless irrelevant to the question set. The response gained 13 marks.

## Question 4

The principal discriminators on this question were the extent to which the key features of liberal nationalism were clearly and fully explained and the range of features that were accurately identified. Some weak responses tended to focus more on liberalism rather than liberal nationalism, not uncommonly describing, sometimes in detail, the constitutional and institutional features of political liberalism. While this was not altogether irrelevant - liberal nationalists believe the national self-determination is reflected not just in sovereign independence but also in popular self-government - sound or better responses needed to focus substantially on issues related to nationalism. Strong responses not only discussed the principle of national self-determination but also pointed out, for instance, that liberal nationalists see nations as equal in terms of their rights and entitlements and argue that nationalism is compatible with international peace and cosmopolitanism. Some good responses were also able to explain how and why liberal nationalists view nations as moral entities, and why they reject power politics.

Liberal nationalism developed from the fundamental liberal beliefs of equality, tolerance and individualism. It is regarded to be a peaceful form of nationalism that is rational and promotes toleration and respect.

Liberal nationalism is seen to be a 'liberating force'. This involves the belief in the right to self-government free from external constraint, evidenced in the ideas of Woodrow Wilson, who argued that the USA was the best model of a liberal and self-governing nation. It is also seen as a liberating force in that it upholds the belief of individualism for nations as well as individuals, allowing nations to be tolerated independently.

Liberal nationalism is ultimately the application of liberal views on a larger ~~scale~~ more global scale than just within a society. This can be seen

in the liberal national belief that all nations should have equality and individual rights, much as the individual does. Liberal ~~nationalism~~ nationalism is therefore a respectful and tolerant position.

Liberal nationalism can be seen to extend further, suggesting a belief in internationalism and globalisation, arguing that nations should work together using such respect and toleration, to provide equal rights and opportunities.

Liberal nationalism therefore demonstrates a positive position with nationalism, allowing for autonomous freedom for nations free from the domination of another nation.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This is a Level 2 response. It notes that liberal nationalists treat nationalism as a liberating force, linked to freedom from external constraints, that they hold nations to be equal in terms of their rights, and that they recognise that nations can work together, suggesting a belief in internationalism and globalisation. However, the understanding is largely descriptive rather than analytical, and the points are inadequately developed to access the high Level 2 marking band.

## Question 5

Some responses to this question sensibly, at the outset, discussed the nature of minority rights, identifying them as 'special' rights, in the sense that they belong to specific groups rather than to all groups, and discussing the different types of minority rights, often, helpfully, drawing on the work of Kymlicka. In a small number of cases, responses extended beyond this, with the multiculturalist defence of minority rights being substantially ignored. The chief discriminators in this question were the number of grounds on which multiculturalists have supported minority rights that were identified, and the extent to which these arguments were clearly and fully explained. Strong responses often showed an understanding that theorists from different multiculturalist traditions have advanced different justifications for minority rights. The responses to this question provided evidence of a generally improving grasp of issues related to multiculturalism, and many made good use of the ideas of particular multiculturalist theorists.

Minority rights are rights that are applied to certain ~~of~~ ethnic groups or religious minorities in society. They are sometimes called multicultural rights or special rights. These rights are 'special' in two ways. First, they are specific to the group to which they belong and two, they may assign a certain advantages to such groups.

One reason why multiculturalists have supported minority rights is because they advance individual freedom. This has been particularly supported by liberal multiculturalists. Charles Taylor, for example, argued

that individual self-respect is ~~is~~ intrinsically bound up with cultural membership. In other words, culture is a vital tool that

enables minorities to live autonomous lives. Hence, there is a great need to safeguard their culture.

Second, minority rights counter oppression. It is ~~very~~ indeed possible that a state can 'harm' their citizens by ignoring their cultural identity. Charles Taylor referred to this as a 'failure of recognition'. It is ~~that~~ thus vital that measures are put in place to avoid what can be called 'cultural imperialism' by the host country.

Thirdly, minority rights may ~~at~~ redress social injustice. Such examples include the underrepresentation and unfair disadvantage to minority cultures. ~~to the case~~ Such an aim is usually through positive discrimination. The social advancement

of African-Americans in the USA was associated with so-called affirmative action. In the case of ~~of~~ Regents of the University of California vs Bakke (1978), this allowed black students to gain access to universities with lower grades.

Cosmopolitan multiculturalists in

particular may link it the fact that by giving minorities greater recognition, it will allow individuals to gain a wider range of tastes and perspective. Jeremy Waldron said that society would become a 'simmering melting pot'.

Liberals in particular argue that ~~the~~ minority rights would make society more tolerant. ~~the~~ One could therefore argue that 'unity through diversity' is certainly possible.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is a Level 3 response. It contains a very clear understanding of the nature of minority rights. A variety of arguments advanced by multiculturalists in support of minority rights were identified, including their ability to advance individual freedom, to counter oppression, and to redress social injustice. Each point is clearly and fully explained, and links are helpfully made to particular theorists and multiculturalist sub-traditions. The communication is effective and the overall structure is coherent.

## Question 6

Some attempts to answer this question demonstrated only a limited awareness of its synoptic dimension. In these cases, the outright rejection of the goal of gender equality by so-called difference feminists was largely or entirely ignored, although some responses made attempts to discuss the contrasting views of gender equality that have been advanced by liberal feminists, socialist feminists and radical feminists. Strong responses also recognised this dimension of the question - acknowledging differences between constructions of gender equality that focused on political and legal rights, on ownership and socio-economic position, and on personal power - but they focused primarily on tensions between equality feminism and difference feminism. Where differences between androgynous and essentialists views of human nature were addressed, impressive arguments were commonly developed. Similarly, the strongest responses not only highlighted broad contrasts between a feminist focus on equality and a focus on difference, but they were also able to explain how and why the latter provided a foundation for a critique of gender equality in which equality merely encourages women to be more 'like men'.

It is hard to pinpoint exactly where feminism ~~was~~ <sup>initially</sup> was 'born' however ~~it~~ liberal feminism developed as a part of first wave feminism in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. The main goal for first wave feminism was to achieve female suffrage. Once this goal had been achieved it seemed that all other female inequality was ignored and feminism appeared to die down. However, ~~some~~ feminists then recognised that although women had a vote, things were far from equal between men and women which led to the development of second wave feminism from which socialist and radical ideas developed in the quest for equality, so it could indeed be said that feminism is defined by the quest for gender equality. ~~Feminists~~ Firstly, feminists are keen to distinguish between 'sex' and gender. They point out that sex in this sense is defined by our biological make up and is therefore not changeable. However, feminists argue that 'gender' is a made up term used to define between male and female characteristics, so what is seen as feminine and what is seen as masculine. They therefore believe that our gender is socially constructed and thus can be changed. From this feminists argue that gender was constructed ~~by~~ as a tool of oppression over women by men as things

associated with female gender are the caring, nurturing roles i.e. childcare, housework so females have been socialised into being

passive by their labelled gender. Many feminists adopt the idea of androgyny in their thinking. Androgyny meaning for women to be like/equal to men through a 'sexless' society. If we had a sexless society there would be no differences between men and women, apart from the obvious biological differences that cannot be changed, thus eliminating gender divisions in society.

However, difference feminists oppose this and criticise the idea of androgyny as simply 'copying' men. They argue that by creating an androgynous society women would have to copy the behaviour of men which would result in a 'selfish and greedy' society - typically male associated traits. Instead they argue that women should celebrate their differences from men and not see their biological make up as holding them back i.e. ability to give birth, menstruate etc. These things should be embraced and women should not want to become the same as men. However this view has also been criticised as it holds the view of the 'typical' women being celebrated not taking into account women who can't have children or chose not to form relationships with men. Difference feminists can therefore be seen as differing to other feminists in their means of achieving gender equality. On the other hand, feminism can only be defined by its quest for gender equality to a certain extent as other feminists place emphasis on other types of equality.

Firstly, liberal feminists place emphasis on the need for political equality focusing on individual rights for females. Once females have achieved rights then other inequalities will die off. This can be seen in things like the equal pay act and paid maternity leave. This has helped the workplace become more equal. Although this liberal view

can be criticised as there are still massive differences within the workplace eg men hold the most high paid, top roles where as women hold more lower paid jobs. In addition to political equality, liberals also see the need for equality in all other aspects of the public sphere whether it be in education, politics or the workplace.

In contrast to this, Socialist Feminists seek to achieve social equality suggesting that the capitalist system creates gender divides. Socialist feminists take on marxist ideas and develop them to propose the idea that capitalism has separated the sexes and socialised the males into becoming workers and females into becoming carers both benefitting capitalism. Therefore, from a socialist feminist perspective if we get rid of class divides and create social equality this will be followed by gender equality.

On the other hand, radical feminists believe we must achieve equality in the private sphere - home life, as this is the root of gender inequality. Patriarchy (rule of the father) stems from family structure and spreads to wider society in the sense that men rule at home and women are passive so men also rule in society eg in politics, ~~most~~<sup>all</sup> government departments whether it be House of Commons, House of Lords, Cabinet have significant male dominance. Therefore if families adopt a 'symmetrical' family structure whereby housework / emotional work / child care is shared between both mother and father, gender equality will soon spread to the rest of society.

However, the quest for gender equality and the means to achieve it is not always agreed on by feminists with liberals in

particular focusing on the public sphere and radicals wanting to rattle the ~~public~~<sup>private</sup> sphere. It is not decided on where the barriers should end with liberals claiming that breaking down the divide between public and private as intrusive and endangering the individual

liberties of a person and their private life.

As we can see feminism is not a completely coherent ideology so although the main goal for all feminists is female emancipation and gender equality, different types of feminists disagree on the means of achieving the shared ends/goals. Nonetheless it could still be said that feminism is defined by its ~~opponents~~ quest for gender equality to a great extent.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This is a Level 2 response. It demonstrates an accurate but sometimes basic account of how and why liberal feminists and socialist feminists have supported gender equality and why difference feminists have rejected it. In addition, an attempt is made to highlight the contrasting conceptions of gender equality that have been advanced within the different feminist traditions. The knowledge and understanding demonstrated is consistently sound, and an attempt is made to explain points, and not merely describe them. A drawback of the response is its sometimes unclear overall structure.

## Question 7

A large proportion of responses to this question recognised that, at its heart, lies a debate between the ecocentrism that underpins the thinking of deep ecologists and eco-feminists, and the 'enlightened' anthropocentrism that underpins the thinking of modernist ecologists and most social ecologists. In weaker response, these tensions were dealt with in a largely descriptive fashion, with little evidence of theoretical insight being demonstrated. In the weakest cases, candidates tended to provide a generalised account of ecological theories, with an inadequate focus on the issues raised by the question. On the other hand, strong responses were able to explain both why deep ecologists in particular reject the idea that human needs and interests are of overriding importance, and why 'shallow' or humanist ecologists believe that the interests of humankind and nature are interlinked. This latter view may be anthropocentric, but its anthropocentrism is informed by a recognition that long-term human interests will only be secured by respect for the environment and, in particular, restraint in the use of resources.

Ecologists study the relationship between humans and the natural world. It is evident from this study that human behaviour is highly damaging to the natural world. This has been due to the fact that human needs have been placed higher than any other interests. Deep ecologists claim to totally reject the idea that human needs are superior to those of the natural world.

Deep green ecologists take an ecocentric approach rather than an anthropocentric one. They believe in biocentric equality. They therefore believe that all ~~sets~~ natural ~~the~~ species are of equal importance, this idea is also extended to non-living ~~the~~ natural things such as rocks and sediment. They argue that all other ideologies and forms of ecologism are grey ideologies and that they are the only truly green ideology. They believe all other ideologies ~~are~~ are anthropocentric and conform to the ideas of industrialism. They would argue every believe system from the far left to the far right is based upon human needs and advancement.

~~Ecology~~

Ecologists do not believe the natural world can be respected and that humans can stop damaging and exploiting it until there is a total paradigm shift. They believe "the arrogance of humanism" has led to environmental damage. The idea that humans are the masters of the natural world needs to be challenged. Human's instead must realise that they are part of a complex inter connected single web, they are merely one part of it and are not above it.

Deep ecologists therefore do reject the idea that human needs are of higher importance and relevance than the needs of the natural world. Deep ecologists believe ~~in~~ in Holism, they believe the earth is an ecosphere, known as the biosphere and that it is full of interrelations. They believe that each ecosystem (an environment in which non-living and living natural species ~~and~~ maintain harmony and equilibrium via homeostasis) is connected to every other in the biosphere and that each maintains the others contribution and well-being. They therefore believe that humans need to realise this before anything can be done about the environmental crisis.

Deep ecologists would argue that ecologists can only start over anthropocentrism ends. They also consider all other ideologies as anthropocentric even if they do take environmental issues into

consideration this is only to satisfy human needs, growth and development.

Shallow ecologists on the other hand do not agree that

Eco centric ideas can be rather radical and the idea that humans are no more important than any other natural entity is highly controversial. It is not attractive to the mainstream masses because it is so radical. Eg.

Some deep green ecologists believe that because the ~~overpopulated~~ human race is over ~~populated~~ populated and this leads to higher exploitation of the earth.

They would therefore call to decrease the human population size. They suggest ways of bringing this about such as not providing help to the developing world to let them naturally die off. They may also advocate stopping immigration, especially to the developing world. These ideas are highly controversial and are not attractive to the masses of people. This may suggest humans are not prepared to sacrifice their own needs to aid the protection of the environment. This may be a problem with deep ecologists. Because it is not very attractive to the human population it may never gain enough support to make a difference. However, it is argued that it's radical and original ideas may be what makes it appealing to some people as they are

Looking for an alternative to mainstream ideas.

Shallow ecologists on the other hand take an anthropocentric approach. They do care about environmental issues and want to make a change. However, they place this secondary to the needs of humans. They believe that humans are the dominant species and for this reason they are not willing to make such radical changes that ~~radical~~ deep green's would advocate. For example, shallow greens only advocate, limited holism, animal welfare, ~~and~~ sustainable growth ~~and~~ etc. whereas deep's advocate radical holism, animal rights and no growth.

Some ~~are~~ believe that ecologism as an ideology is compatible with other political branches. Branches of ecologism such as eco-anarchist, eco-socialist, eco-feminist, eco-conservative and eco-fascist. All these sub-branches of the ideology advocate changes to protect and care the environment. Eg. Eco socialist advocate the overthrow of capitalism, they believe damage to the environment is a by-product of capitalism. This view point would be criticised by eco-centric thinkers as they believe eco-socialist main reason for wanting a social revolution is not to protect the environment but to create equality for humankind. This is ~~therefore~~ therefore an anthropocentric approach. Eco-feminist would advocate a sexual

revolution and the creation of a matriachal society as they argue women are more in-tuned with the natural world due to them sharing the same patterns in the form of menstruation and the fact that they can bring life into the natural world via a natural process. They believe the overthrow of patriarchy would stop males from exploiting the planet and therefore lead to the protection of the environment. However, this would again be criticised as the real gain here is not the protection of the natural world but the liberation of women. Yet again, satisfying human needs.

These are some examples of why ~~the~~ Deep green ecologists would argue that they are the only thinkers that truly reject the needs of humans. This is also why they believe that there must be a paradigm shift and a total change in the way of thinking before ecologism can be a main concern. In conclusion, it is clearly evident that human needs and interests are still seen with the most importance by the majority of the ~~the~~ ecologist movement. The only truly ecocentric branch of ecologism is the deep ecologists who totally reject the idea that human needs are of the most importance. Ecologism is ~~not~~ an umbrella term and has so many forms that deep ecologists are only one small part of the ideology. This therefore leads to the conclusion that the majority of ecological thinkers are in fact anthropocentric.

It also leads to the agreement of the idea that there needs to be a total paradigm shift before ecologism can take place. As deep ecologists say, "ecologism can only truly begin when anthropocentrism ends!"



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This is a Level 3 response. It discusses the ideas and assumptions of deep ecology very thoroughly and with insight into their implications for humanism, pointing out the need for a 'paradigm shift' in which anthropocentrism is replaced by ecocentrism. The position of shallow ecology, and its defence, of anthropocentrism, is also carefully analysed. The arguments on both sides are explained clearly, and the knowledge and understanding demonstrated is consistently accurate and shows, at times, theoretical sophistication.

## Question 8

The general standard of responses to this question demonstrates that a growing proportion of candidates are able to deal with multiculturalist issues with confidence and even theoretical sophistication. The key discriminators in this question were the ability to explain the common or unifying themes in multiculturalism and capacity to evaluate whether rivalry between the core sub-traditions of multiculturalism is so deep that it compromises its claim to be a single doctrine. Most candidates showed at least a basic grasp of the characteristic themes of liberal multiculturalism, pluralist multiculturalism and cosmopolitan multiculturalism. However, weaker response tended to provide largely or entirely descriptive accounts of these sub-traditions, and often failed to highlight where, how and the extent to which they disagree with one another. Strong responses picked these differences out much more effectively and explicitly reflected on their significance. A particular stress was often placed on the tension between a liberal tendency to endorse diversity only so long as it does not offend against core liberal values, notable freedom and personal autonomy, and a pluralist belief in cultural and often moral relativism, which allows both liberal and non-liberal views and structures to be regarded as legitimate. Some, further, argued that pluralist multiculturalism may also be viewed as anti-liberal, in the liberal culture has been seen to be tainted by its association with colonialism and racialism.

Multiculturalism is a single doctrine to the extent that all forms of multiculturalism believe in diversity, due to its benefits for the individual and society. However, how and why we should have diversity in society is something that divides multiculturalism. The three main strands of multiculturalism, liberal, cosmopolitan, and pluralist, disagree considerably.

All multiculturalists believe in diversity, as it benefits the individual by encouraging tolerance, thus allowing them to practice whichever cultural beliefs they choose, and benefits society due to the variety of lifestyles. However, within multiculturalism, there are disagreements.

Liberal multiculturalists believe in 'diversity within a liberal framework'. Liberals are 'difference blind', so are neutral to factors such as race, culture, religion, and judge people on

the context of their distinctive character. However, liberal multiculturalists will only tolerate those

cultures / practices<sup>4</sup> which are themselves tolerable and in line with the liberal commitment to freedom and personal autonomy. Liberal multiculturalists 'absolutise' liberalism. They also believe in a public / private divide; in private people are free to practice any cultures they wish (as long as they are tolerable), but in public they require a ~~shared~~ shared civic allegiance to ensure stability. For example, in the USA, a requirement for citizenship is speaking English. Also, liberal multiculturalists support cultural mixing, as it encourages tolerance and respect, and promotes vigour and dynamism.

While cosmopolitan multiculturalists also support diversity and cultural mixing, they see this as merely a transitional stage in human society. Humans are all united by universal characteristics of love and caring, and will realise this and become global citizens, with a universal identity. Cosmopolitan multiculturalists support diversity, as they believe that the recent spread of culture (globalisation), means people can learn about other cultures and gain self-development from it. However, while liberal multiculturalists support diversity mainly due to its benefits,

cosmopolitan multiculturalists support 'unity over diversity', and eventually want a global, united identity.

In contrast to both liberal and cosmopolitan multiculturalists, pluralist multiculturalists advocate cultural separateness. They see cultural mixing as a way of weakening a person's cultural embedness. An individual gains a historical and social feeling of belonging from their culture, and cultural mixing weakens this, giving people an inauthentic sense of identity. Also, cultural mixing allows dominant cultures to prevail over, and subvert, minority cultures, which have less economic and political advantages. Pluralists feel cultural separateness protects minority cultures from 'westernisation'. Additionally, while pluralist multiculturalists, like all multiculturalists, support diversity, they have criticised cosmopolitan multiculturalists for 'unity over diversity', which they believe, like cultural mixing, weakens cultural identity. Instead, pluralist multiculturalists support 'deep' diversity.

Overall, while multiculturalism is a single

doctrine to the extent that all forms believe in diversity in society, it is divided over how, and why, we should have diversity. While liberals believe in 'diversity within a liberal framework', pluralists believe in 'deep diversity', and have criticised ~~the~~ cosmopolitans for supporting 'unity over diversity'. While liberal and pluralist multiculturalists support diversity in the long run, cosmopolitan multiculturalists see it as merely a transitional stage in society.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This is a Level 3 response. The account of the common themes in multiculturalism is brief and is limited to a tendency to endorse diversity, although similarities between liberal multiculturalism and cosmopolitan multiculturalism are also highlighted; for instance, their joint support for cultural mixing. However, the account of the key multiculturalist sub-traditions is consistently accurate and insightful, with important differences being clearly identified and explicitly evaluated. This applies, for example, over the account of pluralist multiculturalist support for a 'deep' diversity that goes beyond that of 'difference blind' liberalism, and the discussion of how and why pluralist multiculturalists have differed with both liberal and cosmopolitan multiculturalists in endorsing cultural separateness.

## Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

- Before choosing a question, read it carefully, and read it at least twice. Make sure you fully understand the nature and demands of the specific question set. No question will simply want you to write all you know about the ideology in question.
- Make sure that your response focuses consistently on the question set, and does not 'drift away' from the question. Do not just regularly re-use the wording of the question in your response; make sure that you address the issue or issues that the question raises.
- Define and explain concepts clearly and fully. Many short question responses, for example, should start with a definition of the key term in the question. If the meaning of the term is central to the question (as it often is), make sure that you can provide more than just a robust single-sentence definition of a term, recognising that many terms have a number of meanings or conceptions.
- Use the introduction to an answer to highlight the key issues in the question, indicating succinctly what your response is going to focus on. Introductions that only provide an overview of the ideology in question, often focusing on its historical development, are of very little help. Introductions are generally not needed for short questions.
- Make sure that arguments and viewpoints are properly explained (thinking about 'why' people hold the beliefs they do), rather than simply described.
- Make sure that essay questions are carefully planned. The key to formulating and communicating a coherent overall argument is to understanding the synoptic debate that lies at the heart of the question itself.

## **Grade Boundaries**

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government



Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE