



AP[®] Government and Politics: Comparative 1999 Scoring Guidelines

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[®] GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS: COMPARATIVE
1999 SCORING GUIDELINES**

Question 1

6 POINTS total:

- **1 point** for identifying two ways in which the Prime Ministers (PMs) are similar
- **1 point** for identifying two ways in which the Prime Ministers are different
Note: 1 point for identifying one similarity and one difference
- **1 point** for a discussion of each of two similarities and each of two differences (4 total)

Notes:

- Discussion must be more than a re-statement of the similarities and differences
- Discussions must focus on the Prime Minister/legislative relationship
- Answers may refer to Prime Minister/ executive relationship as part of link between legislative and executive

Possible Examples of Similarities	Possible Examples of Differences
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both have votes of confidence • Both are heads of government • Both are accountable to legislature • Both have cabinets • Both can be removed by legislature • Both set agenda • Both develop budget • Both are party leaders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PM in France can't be in Parliament (i.e. PM must resign from Parliament), PM in GB must be • PM in F does not have control of defense and foreign policy • Cohabitation possible in F, not in GB • Power of French PM can vary depending on personal relationship with President • Cabinet development: in GB shadow, F coalition • Constitutional systems: GB allows more flexibility because "unwritten" • Responsibility: GB is responsible to Parliament, in F to Parliament and President

0: Attempt to answer, no points earned

"—": No answer, blank, off task

**AP[®] GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS: COMPARATIVE
1999 SCORING GUIDELINES**

Question 2

6 POINTS total

- a. **1 point** for a description of ethnic conflict in India or Mexico or Nigeria and **1 point** for a description of ethnic conflict in post-1991 Russia (2 points total)
- b. **1 point** for an identification of a method used to resolve ethnic conflict in Russia and 1 point for an identification of a method used in India or Mexico or Nigeria (2 points total)

Some possible examples of methods of dealing with ethnic conflict:

- federal system (including having upper/lower houses; regional governments)
 - use of troops
 - jailing/execution/secret police/exile
 - patron/client system
 - partitioning
 - cultural institutions (schools, religion, associations)
 - legal system
 - co-option/channeling
- c. **1 point** for each assessment of impact on political stability; must go beyond simple assertion of success or failure (2 points total)

Notes:

- In (a), points are awarded for a description of an ethnic-based conflict, rather than for a description that emphasizes ethnic characteristics
- Must describe more than generic naming of conflict, e.g., "tribal" in Nigeria, "religious" in India
- Religion counts, caste does not count

**AP[®] GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS: COMPARATIVE
1999 SCORING GUIDELINES**

Question 2 (cont.)

- Religious institutions, NGOs (nongovernmental organization) are acceptable for (b)
- Answers to (b) and (c) might not be related to conflict identified in (a)
- Discussion must deal with ethnic conflicts within post-1991 Russia, not between Russia and former Soviet republics

0: Attempt to answer, but no points earned

"—": No answer, blank or off-task

**AP[®] GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS: COMPARATIVE
1999 SCORING GUIDELINES**

Question 3

6 POINTS

- a. **1 point** for identifying any two patterns (**1 point total**). Patterns include:
- Percentage of state ownership has declined
 - Percentage of foreign ownership has increased
 - Percentage of collective ownership has increased
 - Percentage of private ownership has appeared
- b. **1 point** for a description of one reform and one point for the explanation of how it has contributed to the pattern (**2 total**). Possible reforms include:
- Privatization
 - Open door policy
 - Responsibility system
 - "Get rich"
 - 4 modernizations
 - Special Economic Zones (SEZ)
- c. **1 point** for a description of one reform and one point for the explanation of how it has contributed to the pattern (**2 points total**).
- d. **1 point** for discussing the political consequence of one pattern (**1 point total**). Some of the possible consequences include:

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• increase/decrease of power of state• income inequality• open information systems• human rights concerns• crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• greater unemployment• hostility against leadership• democratization• international ties• political corruption
--	---

**AP[®] GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS: COMPARATIVE
1999 SCORING GUIDELINES**

Question 3 (cont.)

Notes:

- Reform must be linked to the pattern to receive full credit
- Consequences must be political or linked to political system (e.g., unemployment related to stability of communist regime)
- Reform must relate to industrial ownership, not agricultural
- Generic description of reforms (e.g. "adopting capitalism") is inadequate

0: Attempt to answer, no points earned

" — ": No answer, off task

**AP[®] GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS: COMPARATIVE
1999 SCORING GUIDELINES**

Question 4

7 POINTS

1 point for all of the three factors that contribute in general to legitimacy (Total for all 3: 1 Point)

Examples of factors are listed below:

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Elections (alternation of power)• Economic well being• Foreign recognition and support (investment)• Historical tradition/ longevity• Ideology• Leadership (charismatic, etc.)• Nationalism• National identity(symbols)• Political participation/mobilization	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Peaceful transition of power• Role of Military• Satisfaction with system performance/ responsiveness• Sense of Efficacy• Sense of Representation• Shared mass political culture• Socialization process (schools, media)• Supportive public opinion• Tolerance of opposition• Written constitution (rule of law)
---	--

1 point for each discussion of how each factor contributes to legitimacy (3 points MAX.)

NOTE: Explanation response must go beyond a simple restating of the factor

1 point for discussion of each linkage between factor and country, with correct direction (i.e., factor has or has not affected stability) (1 point for each linkage: MAX: 3 points)

NOTE: Linkage responses should go beyond stereotypical or generic descriptions (e.g., "Mexico is corrupt and therefore not legitimate" is not sufficient for 1 point in the linkage section), i.e., the linkage section must show country-specific knowledge.

0: Attempt to answer, no points earned

" — ": Blank, off task