



AP[®] Comparative Government & Politics 2001 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[®], the PSAT/NMSQT[™], the Advanced Placement Program[®] (AP[®]), and Pacesetter[®]. 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[®] COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT & POLITICS
2001 SCORING COMMENTARY

Question 1

Sample	Score	Commentary
R	7	This outstanding essay contains complete descriptions of the electoral systems used in Great Britain and in Russia in the first paragraph (2 points). The student gives a complete description of how first-past-the-post leads to a two party system (1 point), while the combined single member districts and proportional representation with party list system used in Russia leads to multiple parties (1 point). The comparison between the legislative/executive relations in Great Britain and in Russia is explicit and correct (1 point). The explanations of the legislative/executive relations in both Russia and Great Britain contain good examples that, combined with the material presented in the rest of the essay, help to provide a well-developed answer (2 points).
L	4	The student does not earn a point for a description of the system to elect members to the British House of Commons, because there is no mention of plurality or first-past-the-post. There is no attempt to explain the system to elect members to the Russian Duma. The student earns a point for the minimal description of the effect of the electoral system on the party system in Great Britain (1 point). There is no description of how the electoral system in Russia affects the party system. There is a comparison statement made about the impact of the electoral systems on legislative/executive relations in Great Britain and in Russia (1 point). The student also earns points for explanations of the impact of the electoral systems on legislative/executive relations in both Great Britain and in Russia (2 points).
K	3	The student does not earn any points for part (a), because the essay does not describe how members are elected to the lower houses of parliament in either Great Britain or Russia. The student receives one point for the description of how the electoral system affects the party system in Russia with the description in the third paragraph of how the five percent threshold keeps some parties out of the Duma and that those with more than five percent get representation (1 point). The student minimally explains how the electoral system affects the relationship between the executive and the legislature in Britain by noting that “the Prime Minister comes from the controlling party, and . . . the Prime Minister can work with his party to form good legislation.” (1 point) Finally, the student makes an explicit comparison of legislative/executive relations in Great Britain and in Russia with the statement, “However in Russia, the executive does not have to be from the controlling party, as there is usually no one controlling party” (1 point).

**AP[®] COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT & POLITICS
2001 SCORING COMMENTARY**

Question 2

Sample	Score	Commentary
BB	6	The student identifies affirmative action and the right to protest as two characteristics that promote civil liberties or political freedom (2 points). Affirmative action is explained as a means through which the government becomes more representative, using as an example the case of women in France and “untouchables” in India (2 points). The right to protest is also explained in France and in India by giving an example of the student protest of 1968 and the Sikh protests in India (2 points). The student’s explanation clearly links these characteristics to the promotion of civil liberties or political freedoms in France and in India.
L	4	The student identifies cultural tolerance and civil/military relations as two characteristics that typically promote civil liberties or political freedoms (2 points). The student provides very good explanations for how each of these characteristics promotes civil liberty or political freedom in Nigeria by providing country-specific information and examples (2 points). However, the explanations for France do not relate to country-specific information and so earn no points.
G	2	The student correctly identifies a constitution with a bill of rights and a democratic system as two characteristics promoting civil liberties or political freedoms (2 points). In the remainder of the essay, however, the student does not explain how these two characteristics promote civil liberty or political freedom in either France or Mexico, nor does the student provide a country-specific example. Thus, no additional points were awarded in this essay.

AP[®] COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT & POLITICS
2001 SCORING COMMENTARY

Question 3

Sample	Score	Commentary
R	8	This essay does not answer the four parts of the essay in order; however, the student identifies the growth in per capita income and an increased income differential as two trends shown in the graph (2 points). The student also describes privatization and opening to the international market as two reforms that have led to these trends (2 points). Finally, the student identifies and explains how these trends have led to a challenge of the CCP's Communist ideology and its stress on income equality (2 points) and reduced regime legitimacy due to increased rural discontent (2 points).
Q	5	The student correctly identifies increasing urban incomes and an increasing gap between urban and rural incomes as two trends shown on the graph (2 points). Two reforms — marketization and international investment — are accurately described (2 points). The student is not credited for the identification and explanation of a political cleavage in the CCP, because the cleavage is not linked to the trends in the graph. The student does earn a point, however, for the identification of the loss of the CCP's legitimacy, because individuals want to keep their money rather than have the Party redistribute the wealth.
H	2	The student identifies two trends from the graph — increased urban and rural personal incomes and a widening gap between urban and rural incomes (2 points). Although the student identifies two reforms, these reforms are not described and do not earn credit. Also, the student fails identify or explain any correct consequences of the trends for the CCP. Thus, no additional points are earned in the essay.

**AP[®] COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT & POLITICS
2001 SCORING COMMENTARY**

Question 4

Sample	Score	Commentary
A	5	This essay provides a clear and correct definition of patron-client politics in the sentence “The patron-client relationship is one in which the patron gives the client assistance...in exchange the client gives the patron support . . .” (1 point) . Several advantages for the client are described: money, friends, outlets, etc. (1 point) . Likewise, the disadvantages described focus on the narrowing of options for the client when a patron loses power (1 point) . For part (c), the student explains that this patron-client relationship is one of the few ways to participate in Nigerian politics. Military coups have stifled the system, and patron-client relations allow government some support. This explanation is linked to Nigerian formal structures and earns full credit (2 points) .
Z	5	This example uses India as the country of choice. The student defines patron-client at first rather tentatively, but later in the essay clarifies the definition (1 point) . An advantage of access and interest articulation is described (1 point) ; the disadvantages of conflicting loyalties, lack of follow through and difficulty of contacting the patron are also described (1 point) . For India, the student explains that formal structures including local electoral districts, subgovernments, and religious interests encourage patron-client politics (2 points) .
O	2	This essay uses Nigeria as the country of choice. The student’s definition of patron-client politics is given as an example of “an individual or village will act as the client and turn to a person with some sort of power...to act as the patron.” The student goes on to say that individual or village receives some benefit from the relationship. (1 point) An advantage of getting schooling, roads or other basic needs is described (1 point) . The student does not make any attempt to describe a disadvantage. Further, the student’s explanation of why patron-client politics occurs in Nigeria does not include reference to the formal structures of the Nigerian government and contains no country-specific information so earns no credit.