

Examiners' Report
June 2012

GCE Government & Politics 6GP04 4B

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. 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 or www.btec.co.uk for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson.

Their contact details can be found on this link: www.edexcel.com/teachingservices.

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at www.edexcel.com/ask. You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service. See the ResultsPlus section below on how to get these details if you don't have them already.



Get more from your exam results

...and now your mock results too!

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam and mock performance, helping you to help them more effectively.

- See your students' scores for every exam question
- Spot topics, skills and types of question where they need to improve their learning
- Understand how your students' performance compares with Edexcel national averages
- Track progress against target grades and focus revision more effectively with NEW Mock Analysis

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. To set up your ResultsPlus account, call us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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 raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk.

June 2012

Publications Code UA032366

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2012

Introduction

The general standard of responses in Unit 4B in this examination session was broadly in line with previous sessions. As in Unit 3B, two general issues would nevertheless be worth bearing in mind. In the first place, although there are clear signs that essay performance in relation to synopticity has generally improved, in many cases synopticity marks are still lower than the marks for assessment objectives 1, 2 and 3. A continuing emphasis on ensuring that candidates recognise that each and every essay question is an invitation to debate or discuss a particular political issue would therefore have a beneficial impact. Effective responses in this respect not only highlight the nature of that debate in the introduction to their essays, but also structure their argument around the contending viewpoints or perspectives. Second, in doing this, candidates should not merely provide an account of rival stances or arguments, showing a sometimes largely descriptive awareness of the arguments that other people have put forward. Instead, they should analyse and evaluate these arguments in order to reach a reasoned but clear conclusion, recognising that all questions require answers. How effectively their answer (or conclusion) stands up in the light of the foregoing debate and discussion very largely determines the candidate's marks in terms of synopticity and assessment objectives 2 and 3. As ever, though, a major discriminator in this examination (and possibly all examinations) was the extent to which candidates focused clearly on the question set, rather than on the general issue of the question.

Question 1

This was a popular question. A good proportion of responses demonstrated an ability to recognise at least the basic features of multiculturalism. In some cases, however, multiculturalism is still understood in empirical rather than theoretical or normative terms, meaning that candidates are thinking about the trials and tribulations of multicultural societies rather than the extent to which the politics of recognition is an effective approach to the challenges of cultural difference. This is an important distinction for teachers to bear in mind when delivering the course. The key discriminators in this question were the extent to which liberal criticisms of multiculturalism were clearly explained, and the range of criticisms that were discussed. The most common criticisms highlighted were rooted in liberal fears that cultural recognition threatens the individual and individual rights, but this was explained with very different degrees of coherence.

Indicate your first question choice on this page.
You will be asked to indicate your second question choice on page 6.

Put a cross in the box indicating the first question that you have chosen.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

Question 3

Question 4

Question 5

Multiculturalism is an ideology that endorses diversity in society to some extent, and the preservation of culture. However, liberals have been quick to criticise multiculturalists on the basis that it conflicts with some of liberals' core principles.

Liberals have criticised multiculturalism on the grounds that it can promote intolerant culture. Tolerance in society is very important to liberals because it maintains social cohesion and endorses diversity. However, multiculturalism supports the preservation of all cultures regardless of their particular practices. For example, female circumcision is practised in many cultures. Liberals can simply not accept this on the grounds that it is an intolerant practice which infringes on the rights and freedoms of females in that particular culture. Therefore, liberals criticise multiculturalism for upholding intolerant behaviour.

You should start the answer to your second question choice on page 6

and taking away people's rights in society, for the mere consequence of diversity.

Similarly liberals criticise multiculturalism for the infringement of ^{individual} freedom. Some cultures actively remove the freedoms of others in order to preserve their beliefs. However this could include forced marriage which would conflict with a liberal state because it involves removing the rights and freedoms of some women, therefore liberals would have to support the rights of the women which would oppose the practice of the culture. Liberals criticise multiculturalism for endorsing the preservation of cultures despite the fact they remove the freedom of individuals.

Therefore liberals criticise multiculturalism because it conflicts with their core principles of freedom and tolerance.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response shows a basic understanding of multiculturalism. It draws attention to one central liberal criticism of multiculturalism, even though this involves some repetition, in that the concern about the promotion of an 'intolerant culture' and the concern about the 'infringement of individual freedom' are largely the same point. This criticism is nevertheless clearly explained, even if it lacks theoretical sophistication.

Question 2

Strong responses to this question recognised that it had two parts: the 'why' part sought an understanding of ecological concerns about conventional moral thinking, while the 'how' part sought an awareness of how ecologists have extended, or gone beyond, conventional moral thinking. The first part was best addressed by recognising the anthropocentric character of conventional moral thinking and linking this to environmental degradation. Various ecological ideas and theories were highlighted in relation to the second part of the question, with strong responses often being able to discuss the moral thinking of both 'shallow ecologists' and 'deep ecologists'. Weaker responses sometimes came close to ignoring the 'moral' part of the question altogether, in which case they largely consisted of a generalised account of ecological thinking. Only stronger responses recognised that sustainability is more an economic idea than a moral one, but it has a moral dimension in the form of our (alleged) obligations towards future generations.

Indicate your first question choice on this page.
You will be asked to indicate your second question choice on page 6.

Put a cross in the box indicating the first question that you have chosen.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

Question 3

Question 4

Question 5

Ecologists have challenged, since becoming a major and recognised ideology the traditional moral perspectives of much of the world for being too concerned with human need and wants. Ecologists argue that basic moral teaching from much of philosophy is flawed as it is anthropocentric in nature and does not take into account the needs of the world. Ecologists argue for an ecocentric view of the world where world needs take precedent ~~of~~ over those of the individual or any group of humans within society. Deep ecologists have taken this further arguing for biocentric equality - that all living things are of equal moral worth, the radical group 'Earth First' having been quoted saying that a slug is of the same worth as a human life, for example. This is closely linked to Ecologists view of

You should start the answer to your second question choice on page 6

holism which specifies that all things in nature are part of a huge interconnected and interdependent system. Deep Ecologists, again, pick up on this idea and use the work of James Lovelock and his Gaia theory to justify their extreme beliefs in biocentric equality. Deep Ecologists see the entire world as 'alive' and argue that on each thing shares the same sort of life as it deserves existence as much as human life does. Finally, all ecologists subscribe to the idea of sustainability, that we must ensure a future for ~~our~~ future generations or we have a moral obligation towards them. Boulding's Earth as a Spaceship theory which described the Earth as an enclosed capsule hurtling through space with finite resources to unknown destinations in 1975 is used by Ecologists to explain their view that a sustainable future is a moral obligation above petty anthropocentric needs and desires.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a strong response. It demonstrates a clear awareness of concerns about the anthropocentric bias of conventional moral thinking. In addition, it contains a clear explanation of at least two forms of ecological ethics, one linked to biocentric equality and the other to future generations. Other points are made but without development. The response received 14 marks.

Question 3

Some weaker responses to this question failed to focus sufficiently clearly on the issues of peace and international order, tending instead to write about liberal nationalism generally. Other less successful approaches to the question included a tendency to ignore the liberal aspect of the question and concentrated, unhelpfully, on the incompatibility between nationalism and peace and international order. However, when candidates had a clear grasp of the question, they were often able to provide impressive insight and understanding, sometimes explaining how and why a world of sovereign nation-states tends towards balance or harmony. Post-WWI liberal theorising, often linked to the ideas and aspirations of Woodrow Wilson, was used well by many candidates. The key discriminators in this question were the extent to which liberal arguments about how nationalism (supposedly) promotes peace and international order were clearly explained, and the range of arguments considered.

Indicate your first question choice on this page.
You will be asked to indicate your second question choice on page 6.

Put a cross in the box indicating the first question that you have chosen.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1 Question 2 Question 3
Question 4 Question 5

Liberals have argued that nationalism promotes peace and order because the right to self-determination keeps the nation-states satisfied and as such removes any reason for them to wage war against other nation-states. This argument is specifically affiliated with post-war liberal nationalists and can be explained by Wilson's 14 points (1918). The 14 points granted all states equality, ~~and~~ autonomy and the right to self-determination. This principle proposed fit in with the liberal principle of negative freedom, in the sense that the other nation-states have freedom from constraint as long as they don't wage war/try to harm other nations. Liberals argue that ~~in order to~~ allowing this nationalism to flourish will promote peace and international order because there would no longer be issues of imperialism and colonialism. Further ~~emphasising~~ emphasising the fact that nationalism promotes peace and international is the idea of supranational bodies, which was proposed by Wilson to mediate between different nation-states and come to agreements in a diplomatic manner, rather than

You should start the answer to your second question choice on page 6

resorting to violence. This arguably goes against the classical liberal idea of absolute individual sovereignty; but instead embraces another liberal idea of equality, ensuring that the group rights of states are protected.

Thus, liberals have argued that nationalism promotes peace and international order because all nations, states, nation-states intrinsically want the right to self-determination and independence and nationalism grants them that, thereby ensuring peace internationally.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response makes one point with some clarity, noting the implications of national self-determination and showing some grasp of Wilsonian thinking. Supranational bodies are mentioned but their role, and the idea that liberals do not regard nationalism and internationalism as incompatible principles, are not explained or developed. The response received 9 marks.

Question 4

Most of the responses to this question recognised that the core feature of socialist feminism is the belief that capitalism and patriarchy are interlocking structures of oppression. However, the extent to which this was explained and developed varied greatly. Strong responses were often able to discuss linkages between private property and patriarchal family structures, sometimes focusing on the ideas of Engels and, in other cases, on the thinking of modern socialist feminists, who are generally less willing to see patriarchy simply as a consequence of capitalism. Weaker responses often merely stated that capitalism and patriarchy are linked, failing to explain how and why this is the case. Some weaker responses also lost focus on the question and started to write more about radical feminism than about socialist feminism. The key discriminators in this question were the extent to which the key features of socialist feminism were clearly explained and the range of such features considered.

Indicate your second question choice on this page.
You will be asked to indicate your third question choice on page 9.

Put a cross in the box indicating the second question that you have chosen.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

Question 3

Question 4

Question 5

Socialist feminism believes that Capitalism and Patriarchy are inter-linked systems of oppression. They see Capitalism as exploitative of the working classes, but also believes that Capitalism upholds patriarchy and sexual inequality in society. Indeed, Engels described private property as being an exclusive way of passing inheritance from father to son. The very nature of Capitalism is such that it emphasises the different gender roles assigned to men and women in society.

Socialist feminists therefore believe that the issue of patriarchy can only be achieved through revolutionary means. They believe in the idea that once capitalism is replaced by socialism, equality of outcome will erode away patriarchal beliefs. Thus, feminists see the dominance of men in high-paid or high-status occupations within capitalism reinforces patriarchy. For this reason, socialist feminists must prioritise the abolition of capitalism over the fight for sexual equality, as they feel that sexual equality is in fact impossible under capitalism. Thus, one

You should start the answer to your third question choice on page 9

key feature of socialist feminism is its desire to overthrow capitalism and replace it with socialism through revolutionary means.

Of course, socialist feminism has been criticised as being mere socialism from a women's perspective. Indeed, it is true that nineteenth century revolutionary socialists such as Karl Marx focused largely on the exploitation of the male proletariat. Indeed, it is questionable whether socialism would ~~not~~ be followed by female emancipation at all. To this, socialist feminists would argue that capitalism has assigned the role of women to be the bearers of the next generation of workers for the system, and that over time women's roles ~~will~~ ^{will} change under socialism.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response essentially contains one main point - which explains how capitalism upholds patriarchy and sexual inequality - but the point is made very clearly and with some theoretical sophistication. Although, on this question, level 3 responses will typically address at least two main arguments, the quality of the one presented here justifies a level 3 mark. The response received 12 marks.

Question 5

Strong responses to this question demonstrated a robust understanding of materialism and consumption, usually linking it to the idea that material consumption is the basis for human well-being, implying that the wealthier people are the happier they will be. The 'why' part of the question was then addressed by recognising that material consumption underpins an obsession with economic growth which, in turn, is the main cause of environmental degradation. The 'how' part of the question was answered, in the strongest cases, by reference to ecologism's emphasis on post materialism, which is particularly strong in the case of eco-anarchism and deep ecologism. Weak responses often failed to show a reliable understanding of materialism and consumerism, and also struggled to establish a link between material consumption and environmental problems, often just relying on a generalised account of ecological ideas. The key discriminators in this question were the extent to which ecological criticisms of materialism and consumerism were clearly explained and the range of such criticisms considered.

Indicate your third question choice on this page.

Put a cross in the box indicating the third question that you have chosen.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Why
How

Question 1

Question 2

Question 3

Question 4

Question 5

Materialism & Consumerism are two concepts found in the Capitalist system. They are based on buying 'stuff', from which happiness is derived and contribution is made to the economy. Modern states base their quality of life & prosperity or wealth on the amount of Materialism & Consumerism that takes place, through the measure of GDP and the life

Ecologists criticise this measure, because they see it as a false sense of happiness or utility. True happiness they argue should be derived from family or nature or 'the simple things in life'. Shallow & Deep Ecologists are most in favour of this concept of Natural quality of life, where environmentalists only placed more focus on it. Deep ecologists go even further as to say the welfare of nature in itself & should be a measure of happiness.

One reason Ecologists criticise Materialism & Consumerism is the impact it has on the Environment.

You should start the answer to Section B on page 13

Most ~~parts~~ of the green movement acknowledges that materialism & consumerism rely on the constant production of stuff, and therefore use of resources. This contributes to resource depletion & other environmental issues such as pollution or arguably the human cost.

An example of human cost of materialism is the tragedy of the commons. Where everybody takes what resources they need, collectively means that there is not enough for everyone: where countries use resources to make 'stuff' it results in no resources left for others in the world.

Another criticism is that materialism & consumerism are encouraged to improve economic growth of a country. This growth, some argue, is unsustainable & ignores that the Earth is a closed system = that there are limits to its capacity & resources. Many ~~states~~ would therefore advocate zero growth as the ideal aim.

Naess argues, furthermore, that the reason people believe that material goods make them happy is at least partly due to a false consciousness. People have not realised that they are merely part of nature & the Earth's biosphere & therefore their happiness should be linked to the happiness of the world, or Gaia, as Lovelock suggests.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response contains a reasonable, if basic, account of the nature of materialism and consumerism, with an acknowledgement of its link to economic growth through the reference to GDP. The ecological critique of materialism and consumption is squarely addressed in one clearly explained point and by at least two others which are less fully developed. The response received 11 marks.

Question 6

This was, on the face of it, a straightforward question. However, some weaker candidates chose to address it by providing little more than an account of the various sub-traditions of nationalism. These accounts were not only largely descriptive and so lacked an analytical character, but they also failed clearly to address the extent to which nationalist thinking has a political or theoretical core and so fell down in terms of evaluation and synopticity. On the other hand, stronger responses were often able to discuss and debate both where the tensions within nationalism lie and the extent to which each of these tensions weakens the notion that nationalism is a single doctrine. The key discriminators in this question were the extent to which clear explanations were provided of the similarities and differences within nationalism and the degree to which the significance of both were evaluated.

Put a cross in the box indicating the question that you have chosen.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 6

Question 7

Question 8

Nationalism can best be described as a "chameleon ideology". It is "schizophrenic". From this perspective, nationalism is a cross-cutting ideology, lacking coherence. It can be both regressive and progressive, ~~irrational~~ mystical and rationalist, expansionist and isolationist. However, the underlying common ground within the ideology points to a consensus regarding ~~the~~ "the nation" as a ~~polit-~~ the sole political framework, the concept of organicism and the necessity of "identity politics".

It is in this final sense, that nationalism can be perceived as a united and transparent ideology. The nation, for both liberal liberal and or expansionist nationalists, rests on a "general will". In the form of liberal nationalism, this ~~is~~ form of nationalism is voluntaristic and inclusive, as is the case with the "hyperated-nationality" of the USA. The individual is ultimately tied to the nation, ~~through~~ through the concept of the general will. The advantage of the nation state is that it binds political and civic allegiances allegiances with social and cultural cohesion. ~~Despite the~~ exclusive character of ~~expansionist~~ expansionist and fascist nationalism, an organic will is ~~formed~~ formulated, which

instinctively ~~attaches~~ attaches individuals to the nation. For instance, Mussolini described the nation as a "myth", a social construct which all individuals ^{would} ~~would~~ sacrifice for and ~~if~~ aspire to be part of. Hence nationalists, whether liberal, conservative, fascist or postcolonial look to the nation in securing social and political security and stability.

Furthermore, the concept of "identity politics", as multiculturalists would also emphasize, binds social groups to the nation. Ferdinand Tönnies ~~as established~~ established the idea of "Gemeinschaft" or "community." It is in this sense that cultural nationalists, whether they be conservative or postcolonial, look to primordial bonds to preserve ^a national property as an identity or image. For example, German nationalists such as Fichte and Herder stressed the primacy of the German language, influencing a revival of German literature, such as the folktales of the "Brothers Grimm". Similarly, postcolonial post-colonialists such as Nyerere, the first President of Tanzania, stressed primacy of the ^{national concept} "ujamaa" or "family bond" to unite the tribal nation, previously ^{divided} based on ~~tribal~~ ^a tribal basis, ~~on linguistic grounds~~ linguistic grounds. Therefore, nationalists, despite promoting imperialist ^{and conservative} or post colonial doctrines look to cultural nationalism and identity politics.

However, nonetheless, in spite of the consensus regarding the organic society and the primary significance of the nation's

as a political formation, the contrast between liberal nationalism and conservative or expansionist nationalism is very much apparent. Liberal nationalists such as Woodrow Wilson or Max Mazzini, look to the equality of nations, as subordinated individuals. Nation-states, based on democracy and self-determination, are of equal moral worth, as the very boundaries which divide separate a common humanity. Wilson's "Fourteen Points" were developed on this basis. Conversely, expansionist nationalism as espoused & epitomised by Nazism, looks to a "hierarchy of nations" on the grounds of racialism. It is in this respect, that cultural nationalism also proves to be chauvinistic. Cultural nationalism may form a component of several brands of nation nationalism, yet it can also prove to subdue nations, who in world affairs otherwise prefer an autonomous ^{nation} "state" under the Woodrow Wilson or Mazzini.

Nationalism can also be treated as an incoherent doctrine when considering how equal the ^{nation} nations of internationalism. Liberal nationalists look to counter expansionist nationalism by countering expansionist and colonial nationalism. In this respect, the nation-state, as a political formation is somewhat diluted, by resting on the concepts of supranationalism or ~~some~~ cosmopolitanism. It is the universalist perspective, where humanity is prioritised over the fervent yet jingoistic nationalism of conservatives and fascists, which only demonstrates how ~~nation~~ ^{not} nationalism is ~~not~~ a

single ideology. For example, the Gaullist's *patrice of grandeur* are chauvinistic and hostile. Charles de Gaulle, led France out of the supranational body of the NATO in 1966. In doing so, French nationalism was considered to be by Gaullist to be superior. It is on such grounds that international conflict can be provoked, as, to an extent, ^{illustrated} proven by Thatcher's perception of "Gaullism", which was demonstrated by the ~~history~~ of Falklands war victory. Conservative and expansionist nationalism is therefore aggressive and antagonistic rather than in addition to ~~help~~ as opposed to being reciprocal and to this end, ~~is~~ supposedly harmless.

In conclusion, nationalism cannot be treated as a single doctrine. The 'race for Africa' at the end of the nineteenth century, immediately conflicts with the anti-colonial movements of Gandhi or Ho Chi Minh. If nationalism adopts an internationalist character, as encouraged by Wilson or Karl Marx, the political and ~~not~~ isolated formation of the nation, as espoused by Charles de Gaulle appears undermined at best, and defeated at worst. The *struggle for ^{colonial} independence*, as conveyed by Frantz Fanon in his cathartic and ~~no~~ violent struggle appears incompatible with the imperialism of the late 19th century and early twentieth ~~century~~ century. Identity, ~~politic~~ politics and organicism may create ^{nationalism} the nationalism, yet it is ultimately ~~of~~ a fractured ~~ide~~ ideology.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response contains some sophisticated features. A clear recognition is demonstrated of the common elements within nationalism, and an attempt is made to evaluate differences between the various nationalist sub-traditions. The knowledge and understanding is wide-ranging and generally accurate. In particular, the discussion is analytical and, at times, evaluative, and the synoptic dimension of the question is well addressed. The response received 10, 11, 11 and 8 marks.

Question 7

This was the most popular essay question. In the case of weaker responses, there was often an over-concentration on the 'gap' between radical feminism and liberal feminism, with little or no awareness of common ground between them. Stronger responses, on the other hand, often acknowledge that although radical feminism had arisen largely out of the belief that liberal feminism had failed to achieve genuine gender equality, it nevertheless shared its overall goals. A particularly important issue was the approach of the two traditions adapted to the public/private divide. An inadequate recognition of major differences over this issue between the two traditions, and a failure to grasp how and why radical feminists believe that 'the personal is the political', were significant weaknesses. The key discriminators in this question were the extent to which responses clearly explained both the similarities and differences between radical and liberal feminism, and the degree to which the significance of each was evaluated.

Put a cross in the box indicating the question that you have chosen.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 6

Question 7

Question 8

Radical feminism, separatist and difference feminism, at first seem totally opposed to the theory of liberal feminism. Radicals suggest an extreme reorganisation of society along totally different lines to the reasonably modest, by comparison, reforms demanded by liberal feminists. However, there remains some agreement between the 2 strands of ideological thought that cannot be discounted.

First of all, Radicals and Liberals, in their feminist form, both strive for the same goal, fundamentally. Both Radical and liberal feminists aim to achieve an end to patriarchy in society and some degree of emancipation from its oppression although both disagree over the extent to which patriarchy prevails in society and where it can be found. Both fundamentally and wish to end patriarchy in society and which they both see as illogical and unnatural.

Another area of agreement between the 2 ideologies can be found in their beliefs in the sexual division of labour. Both radical and liberal feminists argue that in society, work is divided on the basis of sex. Men are expected to work in the public sphere of politics, power and employment whilst women are confined to the private sphere of housework and childcare. Both liberal and radical feminists criticise this and argue against conservative claims that this is 'natural' and that 'A is not because 'biology is destiny'. Such ideas are rejected by both strands of feminist beliefs here requested for examination.

~~Especially~~ Both radical and liberal believe in achieving mobility across the public/private divide for women as was done in 1918 when the women finally secured the vote in the United Kingdom and equal pay was secured in the 1960s after the strikes at the Ford car manufacturing plants in Dagenham by women who took industrial action. Both radical and liberal feminists in destroying this social barrier for women.

Another area of agreement between radical and liberals can be found in the feminist

beliefs in sexual equality with men. Although radical difference feminists believe in superiority of women over men, both radical and liberal feminists believe that women are not unequal compared to men and strive to demonstrate their case in ~~multiple ways~~. This is perhaps highlighted in the 2 key feminist maxims to which all feminists (including socialists also) adhere: that women are disadvantaged in society because of societal prejudice against their sex and that this disadvantage can and must be overturned. In this way liberal and radical are in agreement over the treatment of women in society and they both aim to ensure fair treatment for women who are not unequal compared to men.

Finally, one area of agreement can be seen between radical and liberal feminists in their shared beliefs in the difference between sex and gender. Both radical and liberal feminists argue that sex is a biological ~~essence~~ reality, the physical difference between a man and a woman and that gender is the ~~sexist~~ stereotype formed to fit a sexual role but which actually has no bearing on such decisions. Radical and liberal feminists therefore argue in favour of

an androgynous view of innate human nature, seeing each person as capable of having both female and male attributes. Feminists of all persuasions argue that men can take on traditionally 'female' traits such as empathy, creativity and compassion and the same can be true vice versa, for women. Thus gender is seen as somewhat of a misnomer by feminists who see each individual as capable of all gender attributes as human nature is inherited from both parents, male and female, it will be essentially neutral. On this point, both radical and liberal feminists agree.

However, over sex and gender divisions there are some disagreements between liberal and radical feminists. Radicals like Germaine Greer in 'The Female Eunuch' argues that gender is the most significant division in society and what ultimately defines differences between human race. The gender of a definite person is, for radical feminists, the key political & defining attribute in society, it is what defines the nature of society and each individual's experience of it. This is not the case for liberal feminists. Liberals argue that individual personality, the 'content of character'

determine roles within society. Liberals do not see society divided along gender lines, instead viewing all people as persons and being non-prejudicial against anyone. Such ideas are supported by the writings of key liberal feminists such as J.S. Mill and Mary Wollstonecraft who both saw women as reasonable and argued that they should be judged as 'persons' in society, not as 'women' in society, as suggested by radical feminists who argue sex and gender roles define societal roles and social standing.

Radicals also disagree with liberals over the nature of patriarchy. Radicals argue that patriarchy is all pervasive in society, that it infects culture, media, advertising, language and everything else. Radicals believe that women are conditioned from an early age to accept their subordinate role in society by patriarchy, advertising and religious dogma (all prophets, god and descriptions of men etc.). Liberals disagree arguing that patriarchy only exists within the public sphere and that changing 'history' to 'herstory' does nothing to reduce patriarchal oppression. Liberals argue

that with the attainment of legal and political rights, particularly by the vote, or strongly advocated by J.S. Mill, women's oppression will end. Radicals see patriarchy as all encompassing, a representation of society and attitude themselves, liberals see it as only ^{causing opposition} ~~opposition~~ to social progress for women into the public sphere.

Equally, another area of disagreement between liberals and radicals can be seen in the ideological strands' perceptions of the public/private divide. Radicals stress that the 'personal is the political' and that all power relationships, particularly those in the home are political ones. Radicals politicise the ~~public sphere~~ private sphere and argue that the root of women's oppression lies in the political power relationship between men and women. That men are the source of women's oppression. This has led to separatist feminist like Susan Brown Miller in ¹⁹⁷⁵ 'Against Our Will', 1975, arguing that 'all men are potential rapists' and that men use violence to achieve women's subservience. This ~~is rejected by~~ ^{is rejected by} The conclusion of this therefore is that women

should live separately, to men and achieve a 'woman identified' state, possibly engaging in political lesbianism. This is totally rejected by liberal feminists who argue that women's oppression is found in patriarchy and the sexual division of labour. Sexual preference is not seen as any kind of political statement and is a matter simply of personal ~~of~~ inclination. To suggest men themselves are oppressors and that one man rapes on behalf of all men is little more than reverse misogyny.

Finally, liberals and radicals are divided over difference feminists who say that women are innately, essentially superior to men. Difference feminists argue that women are caring, loving and creative whilst men are destructive, aggressive and dominating. The conclusion of this being that women are psychologically superior and deserve to rule over men and lead humanity to a new golden age of cooperation and peace. This is again in contradiction of liberal beliefs in formal equality and equal civil rights. Liberals argue against claims that women (or any group in society) is innately superior to another, instead stressing toleration and mutual recognition of

individual character or a determining factor in formulation of opinion on a person merit. Liberals do not agree that women are superior to men and instead strive for all to have unbiased and equal perceptions of all people or individuals.

Therefore, it is my view that radical feminism does fundamentally oppose liberal feminism and vice versa. The differences we state between them, particularly when additionally considering the role revolution plays in much radical feminist ideology and the opposite of this (parliamentary pressure) proposed by liberal feminists. Although there are some very basic areas of agreement between liberal and radical feminists the differences in their perceptions of human nature, society and their understanding of key political ideas truly show the total depth of division between the 2 ideological traditions. Therefore, it would appear that radicals are more opposed than aligned, in terms of ideological perception, to liberal feminists.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response is effective in highlighting key areas of agreement and disagreement between radical feminism and liberalism, albeit within an overall argument that is rather long-winded and not always clearly focused. The knowledge and understanding is generally accurate, but theoretical positions are sometimes discussed with little sophistication. The response received 10, 9, 10 and 7 marks.

Question 8

There were some strong responses to this question. These generally focused on tensions within multiculturalism between those sub-traditions that view cultural mixing in positive terms (liberal multiculturalism and cosmopolitan multiculturalism) and those that place greater emphasis on cultural separateness (pluralist multiculturalism). Alternatively, cultural mixing was taken to imply integration and cultural separateness was taken to imply social conflict, in line with a conservative nationalist critique of multiculturalism. Providing such approaches were properly and coherently explained, they were taken to be legitimate. However, too many responses were generalised and poorly focused on the question, however its key terms were construed. While many centres have succeeded in inculcating in their candidates a sophisticated grasp of multiculturalism, this remains an area of development for other centres. The key discriminator in this questions was the extent to which the tensions between cultural mixing and cultural separateness were clearly explained, whether this was within multiculturalism itself or between multiculturalists and their critics.

Put a cross in the box indicating the question that you have chosen.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 6

Question 7

Question 8

Multiculturalism is a belief that could be said to have developed out of postcolonialism. It is the belief that is in contrast to nationalism as it advocates having a mixture of different cultures in society as being positive and aiding political cohesion and stability while nationalism and conservatism would argue the opposite stating that in fact it cause social conflict thus leading to separatism. Although nationalism and conservatism seem to be the most obvious objectors to multiculturalism promoting cultural mixing there are other objects to, coming from different directions, namely liberals.

Multiculturalism strongly believes that cultural mixing is multiculturalism promotes cultural mixing rather than cultural separatism. This is because they believe that when people have a sense of identity in a culture and know

where they belong that there is a sense of rootedness on which leads to them being able to mix with other cultures because they all feel secure. ~~However~~ ~~this is~~ however if they are not allowed to express their culture there is a tendency for extremism to appear where people are going to fight back in order to be able to express their culture. Examples of this can be seen in the rise of ~~extrem~~ extreme Islam and other religious groups.

Furthermore multiculturalists argue that diversity in our society is positive for the health of society because people are able to appreciate and learn about other cultures making society more understanding and educated, as well as being more vibrant. This can be seen for example in the rise of people trying cuisines from different countries and taking part in meditative sport such as yoga.

Multiculturalism is also seen to promote cultural mixing because it has allowed different views of how societies should be run to exist. ~~For example~~ There is no more the absolutist belief that western ideas are superior to illiberal and no western beliefs thus people have become freer to say and do as they believe is best.

~~Multiculturalists believe th~~

Isiah Berlin's value pluralism has promoted cultural mixing because it says that no belief is morally superior than any other belief in society and that they should all be accepted as equal to each other this particularist view has thus promoted cultural mixing allowing there to be a free trail of ideas it rather than ethnocentrism.

However particularists have been seen strongly favor the minorities in giving them rights and privileges as a result of past ~~disadvantages~~^{injustices} and present disadvantage. Although it could be argued that this promotes cultural mixing particularly with the Kymlickas idea of special representative rights in which people are able to gain a 'leg up' in society through 'positive discrimination' it can also be seen to foster cultural separatism because positive discrimination is in itself discriminative against the majority, who would not take to kindly to them being discriminated against. This view is also backed up by liberals who believe that there should be universal rights that applies to everyone no one should get 'special treatment' just because of their

race, color, or religion. Furthermore minorities may see this as being demeaning because they are not seen to be doing something because of their own hard work but that it's just down to what they have been born as. Thus this can promote cultural separatism.

~~Liberal~~ The liberal argument for ~~the~~ the individual can also be used to advocate the fact that ~~out~~ multiculturalism can cause cultural separatism because in multiculturalism people are seen to be collectivist. This means that ~~it~~ people are seen as a group rather than individuals and they also are encouraged to act like a group. This can encourage 'ghettoism' which can be seen around big cities such as London where different areas are inhabited by a large concentration of a particular culture. People very ~~much~~ keep themselves to their own culture so much that they rarely leave it. This causes cultural separatism and can even lead to violence and social instability as seen in the race riots during the 1970's and 80's.

Multiculturalism can also conservatives argue that multiculturalism promotes ~~social~~ cultural separatism based on their belief in human

native and the fact that we are drawn to the safe and familiar, this is also supported by nationalists. We naturally want to be with people who resemble much of what we are like so it is natural to have people being together, changing what is seen to be natural can for communities have devastating results. Social cohesion comes from being the same, Difference causes cultural separation.

The liberal side of multiculturalism can also be seen to cause cultural separation to the extent that the ~~part~~ culture is kept to be in the private sphere while the public sphere is for civic allegiances only. Although this can work to promote cultural mixing as can be seen where people are German-Americans, or Chinese-American. It can also be taken more extremely as seen in France where they have banned all religious symbols in public places such as the hijab, which has caused much controversy and upheaval, thus it can be seen as causing cultural separation.

In conclusion multiculturalism can and does promote cultural mixing, however there is a very fine line

between cultural mixing and cultural separation. One would argue that in conclusion multiculturalism does promote cultural mixing at the moment but there have been cases where it seems that ~~other~~ multiculturalism is receiving a backlash against its policies which could lead to it being seen as promoting cultural separation in the future.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response contains a sound grasp of basic features of multiculturalism, and shows some insight into key multiculturalist sub-traditions, although this knowledge is not consistently reliable. There is some awareness of tensions within multiculturalism over the respective merits of cultural mixing and cultural separateness, but the response tends to focus increasingly, over time, on criticism of multiculturalism, as advanced by liberal and conservatives. Its key weakness is that it fails to develop a coherent overall argument related to a consistent understanding of cultural mixing and cultural separateness. The response received 8, 7, 6 and 6 marks.

Paper Summary

General examination tips on Unit 4B are in line with those outlined for 3B, and include the following:

- Make sure that candidates know that, as far as examinations are concerned, relevance is all. However impressive their knowledge and intellectual skills may be, if they do not address the issues raised by the question, they cannot receive reward.
- Conceptual understanding is vital. Candidates should be able to produce clear and accurate single-sentence definitions of key terms related to the Unit, and, in the case of core concepts, they should be able to discuss these terms with insight and in some depth. Many short question responses, for instance, should start with a discussion of the meaning of the key term used in the question (few of them do so at present).
- The key to success in many short questions is to consider both quality and quantity issues; that is, to make sure that ideological arguments are fully and clearly explained (and not simply or briefly described) and that account is taken of an appropriate range of such arguments.
- Short question responses do not require a generalised introduction in the manner of essay questions. They are not mini essays.
- Performance in essays is strongly affected by candidates' ability to recognise the need to satisfy a variety of requirements. Although they generally understand the need to provide accurate and comprehensive knowledge and understanding (AO1), many candidates place insufficient emphasis on demonstrating the skills of analysis and evaluation (AO2), showing an awareness of contending sides of the argument (synopticity) and the ability to develop a clear and coherent argument (AO3).

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>

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code UA032366 June 2012

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

www.edexcel.com/quals

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

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

