

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2010 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.

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

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2010 question papers for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</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>Level/marks</b>	<b>Descriptors</b>
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"> <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> <li>• The answer is fluent and the grammar, punctuation and spelling are all precise.</li> </ul>
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"> <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> <li>• For the most part, the answer is fluent and shows an accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> </ul>
3 30–21 marks	<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> <li>• The writing lacks some fluency, but on the whole shows an accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> </ul>

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9770</b>	<b>04</b>

<p>2</p> <p>20–10 marks</p>	<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> <li>• The answer shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling, but contains frequent errors.</li> </ul>
<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"> <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> <li>• The answer shows significant weaknesses in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</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: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9770</b>	<b>04</b>

## 1 Is the nation state becoming obsolete?

[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

Answers will need a clear understanding of the idea of the nation-state, though answers that question the idea of the 'nation' state would also be possible. Answers might start from the position that we are living in an increasingly global world where the traditional nation-state which covers a relatively small territory and serves the interests of a largely ethnically homogenous group of people is no longer relevant or sustainable. The arguments that this is the case may be that environmental concerns need to be dealt with at the global level, as do terrorism, poverty, defence, aids, etc. The European Union may be used as an example of this, with a number of small states, both geographically and in terms of populations feeling the need to bind themselves together, economically and politically in order to have any semblance of sovereignty. The desire of other states, such as Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine etc. may be evidence of the above argument. Likewise, former Eastern Bloc countries joining NATO might also be evidence of the need for collective defence. The United Nations might also be used as evidence of the need for global action, as may the WTO and other international organisations. Put simply, countries individually can not deal with the problems they face by themselves.

On the other hand candidates may argue that we are living in an era when we have seen an increase in nation-states, especially since the collapse of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, and new states are continuing to declare themselves independent. The principle of self-determination is still strong, and is the major argument behind such claims in Tibet, Kurdistan, Palestine, Belgium and Scotland. Furthermore it may be argued that with the growth of intergovernmental and supra-national organisations small nation states are more viable than ever before due to the pooled sovereignty that these organisations offer.

Also, some states are thriving away from global and regional organisations, Norway, Switzerland, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela to name but a few.

Candidates might answer the question from the view that nation-states are obsolete as the notion of nation in the 21<sup>st</sup> century has been watered down due to the globalization of culture and immigration. Such responses should also be rewarded.

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9770</b>	<b>04</b>

## 2 To what extent is multiculturalism a failed policy?

[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 concept of multiculturalism will need to be addressed, and though it is a contested idea, the question clearly talks about a policy of multiculturalism. This is in some respects easier to define, being a policy that acknowledges and celebrates the idea that a state or region has two or more cultures of equal worth. This can therefore be contrasted with a policy of monoculturalism or assimilation. Candidates will be rewarded for debating what exactly a multicultural policy is, asking whether a total multiculturalism can exist, or for that matter total assimilation. Examples that might be expected include the multicultural policies of Western European countries, Canada, Australia, Malaysia, Indonesia, etc., and contrast them with traditionally monocultural countries like Japan, and the possible shift in policy in a number of countries for example Denmark and the Netherlands who have in recent years moved away from multicultural policies, for example requirements of new citizens to speak Dutch.

Candidates will have to argue whether a country has a multicultural policy or not, France would argue it has but others would argue that it is quite assimilatory, and candidates would then need to address the criteria for success or failure of that policy. Criteria might include good race relations, equal rights and opportunities, a lack of racism and xenophobia, social and economic inequalities and popular views towards the issue.

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9770</b>	<b>04</b>

**3 How far do you agree that democracy is necessary for a state to be legitimate? [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**

This question will probably require two debates. A discussion by the candidate of forms of democracy is likely, as may be the extent to which some regimes are in fact democratic. To varying degrees a large number of states claim to be democratic, though candidates might try and make judgements about such countries as Zimbabwe, Russia, Venezuela, Iran etc., on the basis that states have undemocratic elements.

In addition, it is likely that candidates will need to address the idea of legitimacy. Candidates might argue that states in an international context can have external sovereignty and thus be legitimate in the eyes of the international community without necessarily having democratic regimes, examples may include Belarus, Cuba, Burma, etc. A further direction for candidates is to deal with countries that seem to be legitimate, particularly in the eyes of the population, but are not very democratic e.g. China, Saudi Arabia, Cuba, Iran, etc. Of course, candidates may point out that the level of consent in these countries is unknown due to the lack of democracy and freedom in those countries and may not be legitimate in the eyes of the people after all.

<b>Page 7</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9770</b>	<b>04</b>

#### **4 Are we all now global citizens?**

**[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 would be expected to attempt to define what global citizenship, namely a view that we all have rights and responsibilities within a global community, that there is a common bond between all the people of the world and that only through working together can mankind face up to the numerous challenges that we all face. These challenges include environmental disaster, poverty, aids, war, terrorism, etc. It also assumes that there is an ethical connection between all of mankind, a universality of rights, rejecting other more local communities. Bodies that may be seen to embody the aims of global citizenship include the UN and its Fundamental Charter of Human Rights and the Kyoto Protocol.

Criticisms of the approach can take many forms. After all global citizenship is an idealistic approach and can be critiqued as such. There are also competing ethnic, religious and national communities to which people have loyalties and not to the idea of a global community. Furthermore, the reality of over 192 sovereign states with competing national interests makes the idea impossible. Indeed, racism, nationalism and parochialism makes the idea totally untenable.

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9770</b>	<b>04</b>

**5 'Environmental policy is the key policy area of our time'. How far do you agree? [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 are expected to display knowledge and understanding of the arguments that environmental change is so significant and dramatic that all other policy areas pale into insignificance by comparison. Specific concerns include melting ice caps, rising sea levels, changes in weather systems, increasing desertification, extinction of species and the cost of dealing with these changes. Candidates may also make the valid point that environmental change will actually exacerbate the problem of all other policy areas due to food poverty, fuel security concerns, conflict over increasingly scarce water resources, mass migration, conflicting national interests, etc. Specific areas of concern might be water scarcity in the Middle East, migration from Africa to Europe and the conflicts immigration is capable of bringing, severe storms and changes in weather systems in the Caribbean, the Indian sub-continent, and flooding in Europe and the rest of the world.

In response, candidates could emphasise the continuing importance of other policy concerns at the individual, local, regional, national and international level. Economic policy will always be a key policy area, as will national security and international relations, terrorism prevention, aids prevention, poverty, and many other alternatives for which a case can be made. Candidates may argue that the evidence for global warming is not sufficient to warrant it being the key area or may argue that the very nature of climate change, its size and its long-term considerations makes individual action negligible and irrelevant.