



## AP<sup>®</sup> Government & Politics: Comparative 2000 Scoring Commentary

**The materials included in these files are intended for non-commercial use by AP teachers for course and exam preparation; permission for any other use must be sought from the Advanced Placement Program. Teachers may reproduce them, in whole or in part, in limited quantities, for face-to-face teaching purposes but may not mass distribute the materials, electronically or otherwise. These materials and any copies made of them may not be resold, and the copyright notices must be retained as they appear here. This permission does not apply to any third-party copyrights contained herein.**

These materials were produced by Educational Testing Service (ETS), which develops and administers the examinations of the Advanced Placement Program for the College Board. The College Board and Educational Testing Service (ETS) are dedicated to the principle of equal opportunity, and their programs, services, and employment policies are guided by that principle.

The College Board is a national nonprofit membership association dedicated to preparing, inspiring, and connecting students to college and opportunity. Founded in 1900, the association is composed of more than 3,900 schools, colleges, universities, and other educational organizations. Each year, the College Board serves over three million students and their parents, 22,000 high schools, and 3,500 colleges, through major programs and services in college admission, guidance, assessment, financial aid, enrollment, and teaching and learning. Among its best-known programs are the SAT<sup>®</sup>, the PSAT/NMSQT<sup>™</sup>, the Advanced Placement Program<sup>®</sup> (AP<sup>®</sup>), and Pacesetter<sup>®</sup>. The College Board is committed to the principles of equity and excellence, and that commitment is embodied in all of its programs, services, activities, and concerns.

Copyright © 2001 by College Entrance Examination Board. All rights reserved. College Board, Advanced Placement Program, AP, and the acorn logo are registered trademarks of the College Entrance Examination Board.

**AP<sup>®</sup> GOVERNMENT & POLITICS: COMPARATIVE  
2000 SCORING COMMENTARY**

**Question 1**

**Sample C**

This candidate received 5 of 7 possible points. The identification of two goals is present (1 point) and each is discussed (2 points). The candidate's explanation of the party consolidation goal in the French context was accepted (1 point), but no credit was given for the goal as applied to Russia. In the explanation of the Russian case, the legitimacy goal was well-defined (1 point), but the explanation of legitimacy in the French case was weak.

**Sample KK**

This candidate received all 7 possible points. Two goals are identified (1 point) - legitimacy and coalition-building - and each is discussed (2 points). Legitimacy, the student points out, is enhanced by the "true" national majority that the absolute majority electoral system provides. The majority electoral system also encourages coalition building which is critical in the faction-ridden Russian situation. The student then explains each of these goals in the context of modern French (2 points) and Russian politics (2 points). This essay demonstrates an exceptional command of the subject matter and an ability to link conceptual and empirical material.

**Sample T**

This candidate received 2 of 7 possible points. The candidate identifies two goals (1 point) - legitimacy and accountability - but only the discussion of the goal of accountability is credited for a discussion (1 point). The explanation of these goals in France and Russia are not linked to the presidential electoral system but are more general statements on legitimacy and accountability that may be achieved in any type of regular and fair democratic electoral system; no credit is earned.

**Question 2**

**Sample D**

This candidate received all 6 possible points. The student identifies education and loyalty to the political party as two factors that affect elite recruitment (1 point). The discussion of education is generic but enough to earn credit (1 point). The discussion of loyalty is country specific but earns credit (1 point). A thesis explicitly comparing ease of entry into the political elite in China and India is present (1 point). In Part B the student brings in additional knowledge of the two political systems using party system and government structure to present an explanation of the two factors with respect to elite recruitment (2 points).

**AP<sup>®</sup> GOVERNMENT & POLITICS: COMPARATIVE  
2000 SCORING COMMENTARY**

**Question 2 (cont.)**

**Sample I**

This candidate received 1 of 6 possible points. The student does not identify any accurate factors pertaining to elite recruitment. A thesis comparing ease of entry is present at the very end of the essay (1 point). The bulk of the information on Mexico that is presented is dated and lacks a proper analytical starting point. The material on China is too generic to earn credit.

**Sample H**

This candidate received all 6 possible points. This essay contains an explicit comparison of personality and party as two factors that affect elite recruitment (1 point). Party is discussed as a factor that affects elite recruitment (1 point) and the discussion of personality as a factor affecting recruitment gains clarity as the essay develops (1 point). There is a thesis statement comparing the ease of entry into the elite in China and Mexico (1 point). The discussion of party is detailed for both countries and demonstrates an understanding of elite recruitment (2 points).

**Question 3**

**Sample B**

This candidate received 2 of 7 possible points. No point for identification is earned; the essay only discusses features of the British constitution. However, the description of the proposal to compile a constitution into a single written document earns credit (1 point). The student also discusses problems encountered by the Constitution being unwritten (1 point).

**Sample Q**

This candidate received all 7 possible points. The House of Lords, devolution, and the Bill of Rights are listed as possible constitutional reforms (1 point). For the House of Lords, the candidate discusses the problem as the undemocratic nature by which seats are obtained (1 point) and the proposal is to outlaw hereditary peers is described (1 point). A good description of devolution is presented (1 point) and the problem associated with this proposal is discussed (1 point). Finally, the candidate describes the proposal that a Bill of Rights be a written part of the law (1 point) and discusses the problem of a lack of guarantees on individual rights as the problem caused by not having a Bill of Rights (1 point). Minor factual errors may be present in the essay.

**Sample G**

This candidate received 5 of 7 possible points. The candidate identifies three proposals - devolution, dissolution of the House of Lords and the removal of the monarchy (1 point). The proposal for devolution is described (1 point); however, the problem is not discussed. The description of the proposal for the House of Lords is present (1 point), and the candidate discusses the undemocratic nature of the House of Lords (1 point). The candidate discusses the undemocratic nature of the monarchy (1 point), but there is little description of the proposal.

**AP<sup>®</sup> GOVERNMENT & POLITICS: COMPARATIVE  
2000 SCORING COMMENTARY**

**Question 4**

**Sample A**

This candidate received 4 of 5 possible points. This essay explains how sustained and recurring national elections contribute to democracy well (1 point). The explanation of how competitive political parties contribute to democracy does not earn credit. The writer does take strong positions on sustained and recurring national elections and on competitive political parties in Nigeria (1 point). The essay provides good explanations for the positions taken on Nigerian elections and political parties (2 points).

**Sample PP**

This candidate received 2 of 5 possible points. In this essay, the explanation of how the sustained and recurring national elections and an independent judiciary contribute to democracy earn credit (2 points). There is no explicit position taken with respect to Nigeria. The explanation of each characteristic in Nigeria is too weak to earn credit.

**Sample U**

This candidate received all 5 possible points. This essay presents an excellent explanation of how competitive political parties and an independent judiciary contribute to democracy (2 points). A position on each characteristic is taken with respect to Nigeria (1 point). There are explanations of each of the positions taken; these are strong and show strong knowledge of pre-1993 Nigerian politics (2 points).