

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2012 question paper
for the guidance of teachers**

9770 COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

9770/04

Paper 4 (Contemporary International Debates: Contexts and Comparisons), maximum raw mark 100

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- Cambridge will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2012 question papers for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9770	04

Generic marking descriptors

- The full range of marks will be used as a matter of course.
- Examiners will provisionally award the middle mark in the Level and then moderate up/down according to individual qualities within the answer.
- Examiners will look for the 'best fit', not a 'perfect fit' in applying the Levels.
- The ratio of marks per AO will be 2:5.
- The weighting of marks for each AO should be considered, but this is reflected in the descriptor: marking should therefore be done holistically
- Question-specific mark schemes will be neither exhaustive nor prescriptive. Appropriate, substantiated responses will always be rewarded. Answers may develop a novel response to a question. This is to be credited if arguments are fully substantiated.
- NB Answers are required to compare and contrast several countries/regions. The minimum specified is two, at least one of which must not be the UK or the USA. Answers which break that requirement are very unlikely to attain a mark above Level 1.

Level/marks	Descriptors
5 50–41 marks	<p>ANSWERS MAY NOT BE PERFECT, BUT WILL REPRESENT THE VERY BEST THAT MAY BE EXPECTED OF AN 18-YEAR-OLD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent focused comparative analysis that answers the question convincingly. • Excellent comparative arguments sustained throughout with a strong sense of direction. Excellent substantiated comparative conclusions. • Excellent comparative understanding of relevant political knowledge (processes, institutions, concepts, debates and/or theories) supported by a wide range of concepts and examples. • Towards the bottom, may be a little unbalanced in coverage (i.e. may rely more on one aspect of the comparison than the other in order to illustrate the argument) yet the answer is still comprehensively argued. • Candidate is always in firm control of the material.
4 40–31 marks	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW MANY FEATURES OF LEVEL 5, BUT THE QUALITY WILL BE UNEVEN ACROSS THE ANSWER.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A good comparative response to the question with clear analysis across most but not all of the answer. • Strong comparative argument throughout, but parallels/contrasts are not always developed. Strong comparative conclusions adequately substantiated. • Strong but uneven range of relevant political knowledge used to support analysis and argument. Description is avoided.
3 30–21 marks	<p>THE ARGUMENT WILL BE REASONABLY COMPETENT, BUT LEVEL 3 ANSWERS WILL BE LIMITED &/OR UNBALANCED.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engages soundly with the question although comparative analysis is patchy and, at the lower end, of limited quality. • Tries to argue and draw conclusions comparatively, but this breaks down in significant sections of description. • Good but limited and uneven range of relevant political knowledge used to describe rather than support analysis and argument.

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9770	04

2 20–10 marks	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW A GENERAL MISMATCH BETWEEN QUESTION & ANSWER.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited engagement with the question, with some understanding of the issues. Analysis and comparisons are limited/thin. • Limited argument with limited comparative elements within an essentially descriptive response. Conclusions are limited/thin, with limited comparative quality. • Patchy display of relevant political knowledge.
1 9–0 marks	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW A CLEAR SENSE OF THE CANDIDATE HAVING LITTLE IF ANY ENGAGEMENT WITH THE QUESTION.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no engagement with the question. Little or no comparison offered. • Little or no argument. Assertions are unsupported and/or of limited relevance. Any conclusions are very weak. • Little or no relevant political knowledge.

NB

Substantiated examples and critical evaluation must be drawn from various countries/regions of the world, and candidates will be expected to compare and contrast at least two of these in their answers (neither of which may be the UK or the USA, although either or both may be referenced for supplementary context/comparison).

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9770	04

1 The growth of democracy around the world is inevitable. Discuss.

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What is important is the quality of the argument and the comparative analysis. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question. Further, they are required to support their answer with specific examples which are drawn from at least two countries, neither of which may be the UK or the USA (although either or both may be referenced for supplementary context/comparison). Any answer that breaks this paper requirement is unlikely to attain a mark above Level 1 (0 to 9 marks).

Specific

Candidates are expected to focus their debate on the views that democracy will grow throughout the world and also that it will not. However, one key point that higher level answers may argue is that the definition of democracy is very unclear. Candidates may debate different forms of democracy from Liberal Democracies to People's Democracies. Candidates may conclude that democracy will indeed grow throughout the world if all states that claim to be a democracy are considered to be democracies. Alternatively, candidates may examine some of the necessary features of a liberal democracy such as free, fair, regular elections and human rights as necessary elements of a democracy and unlikely to be adopted anytime soon in much of the world.

Candidates may consider some of the internal and external pressures that may act on countries adopting a form of democratic governance. For example, liberalism, free-trade, technology and globalisation might be seen as forces pushing towards democracy but these may stumble in the face of increasing competition for dwindling resources by an ever growing global population, making democratic regimes appear unlikely. Any number of examples of established democracies, new democracies and non-democratic states may be used, such as former Soviet states including Russia, 2004 EU accession states, Iraq, Afghanistan, China, etc.

For a mark in Level 5 (41 to 50 marks), a candidate will need to address 'inevitable' in the context of the question.

Page 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9770	04

2 Are regional bodies, such as the EU, increasingly necessary and desirable?

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What is important is the quality of the argument and the comparative analysis. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question. Further, they are required to support their answer with specific examples which are drawn from at least two countries, neither of which may be the UK or the USA (although either or both may be referenced for supplementary context/comparison). Any answer that breaks this paper requirement is unlikely to attain a mark above Level 1 (0 to 9 marks).

Specific

Candidates may focus on a number of aspects of this question. A discussion of regional bodies would probably be relevant. As the question mentions the EU, knowledge of the EU may be put forward. There is room, however, for discussion as to what type of regional body the EU is. Clearly the EU is an economic and trade bloc, so other bodies such as NAFTA, ASEAN, Mercosur, etc. could be mentioned in this light. However, the EU is unique in that it has gone beyond inter-governmentalism to make some (important) decisions supranationally. Also, the EU is unique as a result of the developing political elements of its policy. Candidates may refer to the developing Common Foreign and Security Policy and justifiably talk about defence pacts. It would be expected that answers would not wholly deal with defence issues as this is not the only function of the EU.

Other issues that may be addressed include the necessity of regional blocs and the desirability of them. Candidates can make any number of points about them being necessary but undesirable, desirable but not strictly necessary, etc. The contexts of this discussion may be globalisation, environmental change, global pandemics, international terrorism, international crime, etc. Critiques of such organisations may focus on their reduction in national sovereignty, their undemocratic nature, their inefficiency, their damage to non-member states, the advantages of pooling sovereignty, their ability to bring about concerted action on a regional or even global scale.

For a mark in Level 5 (41 to 50 marks), a candidate will need to address 'necessary and desirable' in the context of the question.

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9770	04

3 States will always go to war. Assess this view.

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What is important is the quality of the argument and the comparative analysis. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question. Further, they are required to support their answer with specific examples which are drawn from at least two countries, neither of which may be the UK or the USA (although either or both may be referenced for supplementary context/comparison). Any answer that breaks this paper requirement is unlikely to attain a mark above Level 1 (0 to 9 marks).

Specific

Candidates may first discuss what exactly war is and contrast it with other forms of action, up to and including guerrilla war, insurgencies and cyber-war. Is a global response to terrorism a 'war on terrorism'? Candidates may come to the conclusion that future conflicts may not be state versus state. Drawing on examples such as the situation in Afghanistan, candidates may consider whether the conflict there is war and indeed if the NATO action may herald war not between states but groups of states or other organisations. Examples of the EU Rapid Reaction Force may be used, as can the international naval force against Somali pirates, or the UN in its peace-keeping roles.

Candidates may discuss the likelihood of war in international relations, drawing on theories such as Realism, Liberalism, Democratic Peace Theory, etc. Candidates may also draw on specific global and regional issues such climate change, population growth, water scarcity, etc. to point to the likelihood of war. Likewise, they point to the prevalence of regional organisations like the EU to emphasise the cooperation and inter-dependence that makes war seem less likely.

For a mark in Level 5 (41 to 50 marks), a candidate will need to address 'always' in the context of the question.

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9770	04

4 Apathy is the biggest threat to Liberal Democracies. Discuss.

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What is important is the quality of the argument and the comparative analysis. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question. Further, they are required to support their answer with specific examples which are drawn from at least two countries, neither of which may be the UK or the USA (although either or both may be referenced for supplementary context/comparison). Any answer that breaks this paper requirement is unlikely to attain a mark above Level 1 (0 to 9 marks).

Specific

Candidates might define 'apathy' and a 'Liberal Democracy'. Apathy may be explained as a lack of interest or concern, and in the political sense, a lack of participation in the political process. A Liberal Democracy may be explained as a form of rule of the people bounded by a form of limited government including checks and balances. The crux of this question is whether apathy is the 'biggest' threat to Liberal Democracies. Candidates may be expected to outline the importance of participation in Liberal Democracies, namely participation legitimises the system, provides a form of consent to be governed, allows representation, provides for accountability, etc. Without this participation, are Liberal Democracies in danger of losing their legitimacy?

Candidates may argue that there are other internal threats to Liberal Democracies, whether they may come potentially from the military, from charismatic demagogues and autocrats, from the erosion of civil liberties, from those who deliberately attempt to usurp democracy, from religious fundamentalists, etc. Other threats to Liberal Democracies may be external in nature: from invasion, from global threats and challenges, from international terrorism, from world government, from the European Union and other regional bodies, etc.

For a mark in Level 5 (41 to 50 marks), a candidate will need to address 'apathy' and 'biggest' in the context of the question.

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9770	04

5 Assess the view that there will be a new superpower in the near future.

General

The generic mark scheme is the most important guide for examiners and drives the marking of all answers. Assess which level best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'. Provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer, using the question-specific marking notes below.

No set answer is expected. Candidates may answer the question from a wide variety of different angles, using different emphases, and arguing different points of view. The marking notes here are indicative and not exhaustive. What is important is the quality of the argument and the comparative analysis. That said, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question. Further, they are required to support their answer with specific examples which are drawn from at least two countries, neither of which may be the UK or the USA (although either or both may be referenced for supplementary context/comparison). Any answer that breaks this paper requirement is unlikely to attain a mark above Level 1 (0 to 9 marks).

Specific

Candidates may address what being a hegemon is and what it entails. The question requires candidates to consider the time frame, the near future. Candidates will need to consider scenarios in which such a development might happen, for example whether any state will become the dominant player on the international scene (taking over from the USA as it declines) or whether a bi-polar world is more likely (with the new superpower filling the slot left vacant by the fall of the Soviet Union) or whether the 21st century will more likely see several superpowers. Candidates will need to discuss possible contenders, of which the most likely contenders are probably China and/or India. They might also consider a bloc acting as a superpower, such as the European Union.

Candidates might want to discuss some of the features of the states discussed including; its interests, its military power, use of soft power, economic growth/power, its governmental regime and ideology, its need for resources, population, etc.

For a mark in Level 5 (41 to 50 marks), a candidate will need to address 'near future' in the context of the question. Exactly what constitutes 'near future' is open to debate, and a good candidate will define their terms of reference. Material relating to the rise of a new superpower in the longer term (e.g. Brazil, Canada, Russia) should, however, be kept short.