

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2011 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 2011 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 2011	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
<p>5</p> <p>50–41 marks</p>	<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. • The answer is fluent and the grammar, punctuation and spelling are all precise.
<p>4</p> <p>40–31 marks</p>	<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. • For the most part, the answer is fluent and shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
<p>3</p> <p>30–21 marks</p>	<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. • The writing lacks some fluency, but on the whole shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9770	04

<p>2</p> <p>20–10 marks</p>	<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. • The answer shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling, but contains frequent errors.
<p>1</p> <p>9–0 marks</p>	<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. • The answer shows significant weaknesses in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

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 2011	9770	04

1 How far do you agree that the only role for a state is to provide for the security of its citizens?

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

A discussion is expected of the role of the state, perhaps focussed on a left-right debate. Candidates may argue that the primary role of the state is to protect its citizens through defence on the nation and through the provision of law and order. However, there may well be a focus on whether it should be the **only** role of the state. The Right critiques other roles for the state because they unnecessarily deprive individuals of their earned income, thus liberty, any other role is inefficient and they breed a dependency culture, etc.

Candidates may well draw attention to the notion of the welfare state and the social role of the state, thus expanding the role of the state into other areas. This can be perhaps seen as 'big government' as opposed to 'small government'. This particular view can perhaps be seen in the European Social Model. Some answers may point to other roles for the state such as educating its citizens, providing healthcare, providing jobs, etc. Candidates would also be justified in arguing that a social role for the state is also to look after the security of the citizen.

Some answers may question the ability of some states to even guarantee the security of its citizens, drawing on examples of failed states like Somalia, or point to poorer countries that cannot afford any form of welfare provision.

Candidates may well answer this question in terms of a focus on the national interest of the state and therefore the security of its citizens. This type of answer may delve into some International Relations theory about the best way of conducting international affairs.

Page 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9770	04

2 'No state should ever intervene in the internal affairs of another state.' 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 show awareness of the Westphalian system, a feature of which is the concept of internal sovereignty and principle of non-intervention of one state in the affairs of others. One issue that may be drawn out is what is meant by 'intervention'? Does it mean only military force, subversive activities, supporting subversive activities, encouraging movements? There may also be a discussion of whether states acting in concert together may be more legitimate in intervening. Can states intervene using the vehicle of the UN? Candidates may also discuss what is meant by legitimacy, is humanitarian intervention legitimate? Other issues that may be pertinent are: what constitutes intervention and what can be considered the internal affairs of a state?

There may well be a focus on the principle of intervening without having been invited to do so by the government of that country e.g. Afghanistan or Sierra Leone. Answers may focus on this approach and argue that the 'coalition of the willing' should not have involved themselves in Iraq, have left Somalia to its own devices, allowed the Serbs free-reign in Kosovo, etc. Candidates may appreciate the complexity of the situation with discussion of de jure and de facto governments. Can a displaced government call for international intervention?

There may well be arguments for humanitarian intervention on moral or ethical grounds in times of civil war, crimes against humanity or humanitarian crises like in Kosovo. There may also be a discussion of Liberal values and the role of other states in aiding democracy movements in places like Myanmar or Iran. The West's attitude to human rights abuses around the world, like in China or Saudi Arabia, etc. Sophisticated responses may examine the political contexts of intervention, maybe examining when states do intervene. Perhaps intervene when they can or when it is in their national interest to do so. A theoretical debate centred around Liberalism and Realism may take place.

The examples of Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Palestine may all be mentioned.

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9770	04

3 'Interdependence makes conflict between nation-states less likely.' 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

Candidates may well start by attempting to define the concepts of interdependence and conflict, as well as clarifying what a nation-state is. Interdependence can be seen as states being mutually dependent on each other. Conflict could be seen to take a number of forms including war, economic sanctions, diplomatic action, trade and economic disputes, etc. Candidates may base their answer around what exactly is meant by interdependence and what exactly is meant by conflict. Candidates may argue that what may be perceived as interdependence is actually one state having a dominant position in the trade (or other) relationship. Also, candidates may conclude that war may be avoided due to interdependence but other conflicts are present.

The candidates may discuss a number of views on this issue. They may argue that indeed interdependence does seem to limit war. This is a liberal perspective that sees globalisation, free-trade and interdependence as a barrier to war. Liberals argue that states can expand power and resources through trade rather than through other means as Realists might suggest. Liberals see trade as a non zero-sum game where two trading nations can both increase their wealth and meet their national interest through trade rather than competing. Liberals also argue that trade generates requirements that can only be met by international trade, and indeed a web of interconnectedness makes war impossible and inconceivable. A further argument is that communication between states and cultures fosters improved relations thus averting conflict. The growth of the EEC/EU may be used as an example of all these arguments in action.

Candidates may argue that trade can lead to conflict as states have more to fall-out over. Also trade is not necessarily equal so therefore can shift relations and power. Indeed, some states have more to lose than others and be more vulnerable to conflict. States might actually see the need to minimise their reliance on foreign trade through military means to reduce their vulnerability. Some states may actually see dominant position in a trade relationship as way of increasing power. Examples here may include the close relationship of the Russian state and its energy industry and the strength of the Chinese economy in manufacturing.

Candidates may argue that other factors prevent conflict. Example of these could be collective security organisations such as the UN and NATO. Candidates may argue that economic relations have no impact upon international relations that the decision-makers within a state may ignore or not consider the economic interests of the state when making decisions. There were close economic ties between the UK and Germany prior to World War One but these did not prevent conflict.

Knowledge of democratic peace theory and complex interdependence theory will be rewarded.

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9770	04

4 'There is no such thing as universal human rights.' 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 might be expected to define the term universal human rights, perhaps within the context of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948, particularly noting the inalienability of these rights or that they are 'natural'. Of relevance here could also be the European Convention on Human Rights which gives citizens of most European states access to the ECHR in Strasbourg. Candidates may argue that all humans have these rights by nature of their being and they are an ideal which most states have strived to uphold.

Candidates may argue with the proposition that there are no universal human rights by suggesting that the only rights that exist are legal rights. Human Rights are too abstract and the only rights that exist are those that are guaranteed by law and therefore enforceable. There are numerous examples around the world where human rights have been breached.

A further critique of human rights may be that it is a phenomenon that comes from a Western and Liberal view that is not applicable to all cultures of the world, so that in some ways human rights are not universally accepted or applicable.

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9770	04

5 To what extent does globalisation show the need for global government?

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 address what globalisation is, which is of course contested and open to debate. Common definitions refer to the increasing interconnectedness of things, the shrinking world or the global village. Aspects of globalisation might include political, economic and cultural aspects.

Candidates may point to problems of globalisation that might include climate change, economic recession, destruction of culture, American imperialism, exploitation, etc. Candidates may suggest that there is a need for a global response to these problems that might lead to global government. On the other hand, candidates may argue that globalisation does need a coordinated response and therefore global government is unnecessary, or indeed that globalisation aside, there is a need for global government because of poverty, environmental change, war, etc.

Candidates may want to define global government, perhaps seeing it as based on the UN, another supranational set of institutions on the model of the EU, or intergovernmental agreements between states, like through G20, WTO, IMF, etc. Candidates may however, see the latter as sufficient to deal with problems brought about by globalisation and consider they fall short of global government.