

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Pre-U Certificate

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2013 series

9770 COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

9770/04

Paper 4, 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 October/November 2013 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	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, neither of which may 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 AND/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	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9770	04

2 20–10 marks	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW A GENERAL MISMATCH BETWEEN QUESTION AND 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	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9770	04

- 1 'Democracy is the worst government system we know... except all the others.' Discuss. [50]

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 detailed knowledge of the features of a democracy in order to evaluate the system of government. Reward will be given to candidates who display knowledge of different forms of democracy and distinguish between direct and indirect democracy. Analysis and evaluation of these systems would therefore be expected. In order to fully answer the question, candidates are likely to have to compare democracy (in whatever form) with other forms of government, whether it be dictatorship, theocracy, anarchy, etc. These systems will likely have to be evaluated as well. Reward will be given for candidates who challenge the premise or wording of the question.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9770	04

2 To what extent are citizens at greater risk from their own state than from other states? [50]

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

Some understanding of the nature of the state is likely to be shown, particularly that being a citizen is to be a compulsory member of the sovereign political entity. Citizenship suggests certain rights and responsibilities with regard to the state. States are supposed to uphold citizens' rights, most notably human rights. The prime role of the state can be said to be defence of the country and its people. States are not meant to be a threat to their citizens, but in some cases, states consider some of their citizens to be a threat to the state and other citizens. Candidates may argue that in many countries the state *is* a significant threat to its citizens because it fails to uphold the (human) rights of its citizens. Examples of states that don't uphold the rights of their citizens to a greater or lesser degree include Syria, Iran, Russia, etc. Candidates will be rewarded for other arguments that develop states placing their citizens at risk.

Candidates may also be expected to *consider* the threat of other states to citizens other than their own. This essentially may come down to a question over whether war, or other conflict between states, is likely. Candidates may bring in appropriate theories such as Liberalism and Realism. Are states likely to go to war and thus threaten the citizens of other countries? Examples abound. Both Israel and Iran feel threatened by each other. Presumably the people of Iran may feel threatened and genuinely fear an attack by the USA. Any example that suggests international tensions, arms races, border conflict could be rewarded here. Reward will also be given for candidates who discuss state-sponsored violence, including Hezbollah, etc. Likewise, candidates may wish to develop discussion of non-state actors, such as Al-Qaeda and potential state support from Pakistan.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9770	04

- 3 'There are no permanent allies, only permanent interests.' Assess this view of states' behaviour in international relations. [50]**

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

The nature of this question is to debate whether states have permanent interests and/or permanent allies. Both terms are likely to need developing. Candidates may wish to define how permanent a permanent ally or interest is. Candidates may also debate what the nature of state interests are. International relations theories may well be brought in, particularly the basics of Liberalism and Realism. A full discussion of these two theories may well be appropriate, as the quote is a central position of Realism. Liberalism focuses more on state preferences and has a more flexible definition of states interests other than security and survival. Candidates may be rewarded for arguing that states can have permanent interests and permanent allies. Candidates may use a wide range of examples to demonstrate their points.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9770	04

4 'The benefits of globalisation outweigh the costs.' Assess this view. [50]

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

In order to access this question, candidates are likely to need to define globalisation. A definition of globalisation may include economic, political, cultural or other elements. Globalisation can also be seen in a number of ways, as a process, as an ideology, as an aim, etc. A discussion might then ensue on the positives and negatives of globalisation. Political issues such as sovereignty and global governance may well be expected to be at the forefront in a comparative politics examination. It can be argued, for example, that globalisation is reducing the sovereignty of nation-states as they become impotent to compete against the forces of globalisation. On the other hand, this loss of sovereignty and the growth of inter-connectedness and interdependence may prevent war in the future.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9770	04

5 'The shortage of water is the greatest threat to world peace.' Discuss [50]

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

An explanation of why water shortages may lead to conflict and also other causes of conflict may be discussed. This may include linked points like climate change, population growth, population movements, etc. Other causes of conflict such as need for oil, clashes over territory may also be included. Realist theory which suggests war is inevitable as a result of the nature of states' interests and actions may also be an approach.