

**CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS**

Pre-U Certificate

[www.XtremePapers.com](http://www.XtremePapers.com)

## **MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 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 2014 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 2014</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 2014</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 &amp;/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 &amp; 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 2014</b>	<b>9770</b>	<b>04</b>

**1 ‘There is too much focus on human rights in the world today.’ 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**

Responses will address the concept of human rights, and whether there is too much of a ‘focus’ on them in the world today. This question allows candidates to explore key ideas and set out the main arguments.

Candidates would be expected to know some context of human rights, perhaps including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948. 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 these rights are inalienable or that they are ‘natural’, thereby stressing the need to focus on rights. Candidates may argue that all humans have these rights by nature of their being and they are an ideal which most states have striven to uphold, fearing the consequences of not doing so. This question can be answered by discussing domestic and international events and politics.

Alternatively, candidates may suggest that the only rights that exist are legal rights given by states to citizens. Human rights are too abstract and the only rights that exist are those that are guaranteed by law and therefore enforceable, therefore it could be argued that there is too much focus on them. There are numerous examples around the world where human rights have been breached. Examples may include human rights in Syria, Israel/Palestine, Burma, Iran, etc.

Candidates might also explore the idea of there being too much focus on human rights at the expense of other matters – e.g. international security, freedom, competition, etc.

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9770</b>	<b>04</b>

- 2 **‘Democracy faces too many threats to be a success globally.’ Assess this view on the durability of democracy. [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 will need to address the issue of what is meant by democracy as it is a very broad term. Candidates may argue that democracy is inevitable in some way due to the spread of liberal ideology. Candidates may address some the important features of democracy like accountability, protection of minority rights, tolerance, free speech, etc. and examine some of the specific threats. Likewise, candidates may focus on wider threats such as globalization, the growth in power of non-democratic states, competition for resources, extremist religious movements, security threats, etc.

Candidates may well address what is meant by the term ‘success’. Does the fact that more and more states are becoming democratic constitute success or is it the quality of the democracy that counts? Examples of discussion may include the Arab Spring countries such as Egypt and Tunisia. What would it mean for democracy to be a success globally? Does that mean every region of the world? Every culture? A similar form of democracy or localised versions? What about illiberal democracies like Russia; where do they fit in?

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9770</b>	<b>04</b>

- 3 'The threat of environmental disaster makes the need for global government inevitable.'**  
**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 will need to discuss what 'environmental disaster' means and what makes an environmental disaster. Examples may of course include global warming and rising sea levels, but may also include changes in weather conditions leading to more extreme weather like flooding, droughts, etc.

Candidates may well argue that as the international system is anarchic, there is no higher authority to control the exploitation of natural resources and no one state would see an advantage in unilaterally altering their actions. There may be a need for a higher authority or government to ration or control the use of the resource. Knowledge of the tragedy of the commons may be brought in: the exploitation and depletion of a shared resource, particularly a natural resource such as fish, by individuals or states who are acting rationally and logically, even though they understand that the over use of the resource is damaging to all.

Candidates may argue that global government is inevitable but not because of environmental disaster. Perhaps globalisation or ideology make the transition to global government inevitable. On the other hand, candidates may argue that despite the self-destructive tendencies of states and humans, they will not co-ordinate or agree to a global government for a variety of reasons.

<b>Page 7</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9770</b>	<b>04</b>

**4 'The main cause of war today is nationalism.' How true is this statement? [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 need to debate whether nationalism, or a devotion to the interests of one's nation, is the main cause of war. Some evidence exists that nationalism is still a key ideology and self-determination a key concept in the modern era. Candidates may argue that there are any number of other reasons for conflict, including conflict over resources, over other ideologies, over religion, over mistakes, over rights and morality, due to the lessons from realist theory, because authoritarian leaders 'don't care', 'it's good for business', 'to protect their people', etc. Candidates may attempt to reduce all the above reasons back down to nationalism and can be rewarded for doing so.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9770	04

5 'Sovereignty is an outdated concept'. 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 requirement is unlikely to attain a mark above Level 1.

**Specific**

Candidates will need to define sovereignty and post-sovereignty. Sovereignty at its most simple is ultimate unhindered power. Post-sovereignty is the idea that states no longer have ultimate unhindered power as envisaged by the Westphalian system. Both concepts of sovereignty and post-sovereignty are open to some interpretation. The argument that states are still sovereign is essentially a realist argument based on the importance of states in the international order. The argument is that nothing has changed the role and power of the state; states are still, theoretically and *de jure*, sovereign.

The argument that states are now post-sovereign is based around the idea that states are now practically and *de facto* no longer sovereign. Reasons for this are very broad but can take a number of directions. Of particular significance is the importance of globalisation and the interconnectedness of the modern world. Globalisation can be discussed in terms of political, economic and cultural. The interconnectedness and interdependencies of state economies can be seen in the 2007/8 economic crash, and the problems states have in growing their economies again is an example of the loss of (economic) sovereignty.

Another argument that may be brought up is the relatively new principle of 'responsibility to protect' which may mean that states are now post-sovereign. Not necessarily separate to the previous arguments is that the number of international treaties and organisations that states today have signed has a practical impact on sovereignty as states limit their own freedom of action to gain such limits from others. For example, the UK is a signatory to 14,000 international, multi-lateral or bi-lateral treaties. A discussion of the EU as an example would be relevant in the context of this essay.

Candidates might consider subsidiarity over the pooling of sovereignties for mutual benefit/need, particularly to tackle global problems like environmental protection. For the highest marks, candidates will need to address 'outdated'.