

**CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS**

**Pre-U Certificate**

## **MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2013 series**

### **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 should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2013 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9770</b>	<b>04</b>

### 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.

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9770</b>	<b>04</b>

<b>Level/marks</b>	<b>Descriptors</b>
<b>5</b> <b>50–41 marks</b>	<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"> <li>• Excellent focused comparative analysis that answers the question convincingly.</li> <li>• Excellent comparative arguments sustained throughout with a strong sense of direction. Excellent substantiated comparative conclusions.</li> <li>• Excellent comparative understanding of relevant political knowledge (processes, institutions, concepts, debates and/or theories) supported by a wide range of concepts and examples.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Candidate is always in firm control of the material.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b> <b>40–31 marks</b>	<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"> <li>• A good comparative response to the question with clear analysis across most but not all of the answer.</li> <li>• Strong comparative argument throughout, but parallels/contrasts are not always developed. Strong comparative conclusions adequately substantiated.</li> <li>• Strong but uneven range of relevant political knowledge used to support analysis and argument. Description is avoided.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b> <b>30–21 marks</b>	<p>THE ARGUMENT WILL BE REASONABLY COMPETENT, BUT LEVEL 3 ANSWERS WILL BE LIMITED AND/OR UNBALANCED.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engages soundly with the question although comparative analysis is patchy and, at the lower end, of limited quality.</li> <li>• Tries to argue and draw conclusions comparatively, but this breaks down in significant sections of description.</li> <li>• Good but limited and uneven range of relevant political knowledge used to describe rather than support analysis and argument.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b> <b>20–10 marks</b>	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW A GENERAL MISMATCH BETWEEN QUESTION AND ANSWER.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited engagement with the question, with some understanding of the issues. Analysis and comparisons are limited/thin.</li> <li>• Limited argument with limited comparative elements within an essentially descriptive response. Conclusions are limited/thin, with limited comparative quality.</li> <li>• Patchy display of relevant political knowledge.</li> </ul>
<b>1</b> <b>9–0 marks</b>	<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"> <li>• Little or no engagement with the question. Little or no comparison offered.</li> <li>• Little or no argument. Assertions are unsupported and/or of limited relevance. Any conclusions are very weak.</li> <li>• Little or no relevant political knowledge.</li> </ul>

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).

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9770</b>	<b>04</b>

**1 ‘All states should have a separation of powers to prevent tyranny.’ 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.

**Specific**

Candidates may be expected to have knowledge of the principle of separation of powers, perhaps referencing it to Montesquieu. There is a debate about the general principle of a separation of powers to prevent the concentration of power in too few hands. Examples of dictatorships from around the world where legislative, executive and judicial power is concentrated may be used. Candidates may be expected to debate the importance of judicial independence and neutrality from other branches of government. Examples may be brought in from any number of democratic states where the principle is upheld. The dangers of not having an independent and neutral judiciary and thus having tyranny (e.g. Iran, Zimbabwe) might be argued. Another important debate is over separation of the legislature from the executive. Parliamentary systems do not have separation but a fusion of powers compared to Presidential systems yet they do not have tyranny. This should be an important line of argument.

For a mark in Level 5 (41 to 50 marks), a candidate will need to address ‘all’ and ‘prevent’ in the context of the question.

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9770</b>	<b>04</b>

**2 'The full protection of minority rights is the true measure of a democracy.' 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.

**Specific**

Candidates may address how democracy is measured. The focus of the debate may be expected to be about the features of a democracy including various elements such as electoral systems, parliamentary/presidential systems, freedom of speech, freedom of conscience, freedom of assembly, the rule of law, the dispersal of power, etc. The key issue is likely to be whether minority rights are the most important measure of a democracy. Examples from around the world are expected.

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

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9770</b>	<b>04</b>

**3 'Intervention by states in the affairs of others is always imperialist.' How far do you agree?**

**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.

**Specific**

Answers are expected to require a definition of imperialism as it is the key point to hang the essay on. Candidates might be expected to show a clear knowledge of specific interventions in order to debate whether intervention is always imperialist or whether sometimes it can be seen in other terms. Libya would be a good example, as would be Iraq. Candidates may also be expected to have a broad definition of intervention in order to allow discussions of different types of interventions, military, economic, aid, etc. Reward may also be given for discussion of proxy interventions, interventions by defence organisations like NATO, regional organisations (e.g. the EU) and interventions by non-state actors like charities, NGOs, the media, pressure groups, etc. Candidates may need to deal with what the aims of states are in this context. Can states be altruistic or do they always operate in their own national interest?

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

<b>Page 7</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9770</b>	<b>04</b>

**4 Assess the view that nations are no longer the most sensible basis around which to organise political structures.**

**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.

**Specific**

Candidates may well need to define the term ‘nation’ perhaps discussing elements of common community, identity, language, culture, history, territory, etc. Candidates may well link the term to states and discuss the concept of the nation-state, where a political entity is arranged around a nation. Candidates may debate whether states try and develop national identity or whether the principle of self-determination is correct and that nations are entitled to states. There are plenty of examples that could be used in this context, Belgium, Germany, Italy, indeed, any nation or state. A further element of this question is whether nation-states are obsolete in time of globalisation, interconnected markets, supranational institutions and global warming. Candidates could bring supranational and intergovernmental institutions such as the United Nations, the European Union, the Council of Europe, etc. to discuss whether (small) states are obsolete. One thrust of this question is whether states built around small nations are impotent, whether small nation-states can still be effective as sovereign entities or there can be a happy medium that cooperating small states can maintain sovereignty.

For a mark in Level 5 (41 to 50 marks), a candidate will need to address ‘no longer’ in the context of the question.

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9770</b>	<b>04</b>

**5 Assess the view that the desire for liberty will ensure that all states will soon embrace universal human rights.**

**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.

**Specific**

Candidates may be expected to show understanding of the concept of liberty and of universal human rights. Liberty is a broader concept that can be equated to being free. Universal human rights are specific entitlements for all people based on their humanity irrespective of where in the world the individual resides. Candidates must engage with the question to consider whether states will increasingly embrace human rights or not. Candidates could look at competing evidence, particularly of the Arab Spring to suggest that people are rising up against authoritarian and undemocratic leaders to assert their basic rights, that people have a sense of natural justice and understanding of fairness which human rights uphold. This argument may be linked to democracy and the fact that there are more democratic states today than ever before. Even authoritarian regimes such as China say they are working towards strengthening human rights. On the other hand there are many regimes that aren’t respecting human rights and show no signs of implementing them. One particular thread might be that democratic states can be argued to be reducing human rights in the post-September 11<sup>th</sup> world.

For a mark in Level 5 (41 to 50 marks), a candidate will need to address ‘all’, ‘soon’ and ‘universal’ in the context of the question.