



AP Government & Politics: Comparative 2000 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.

Question 1 Rubric: Presidential run-off systems in France and Russia

Identify and discuss two goals that a country hopes to achieve by establishing a presidential electoral system based on majority vote that requires run-off elections. Both Russia and France have established such a system. Using specific evidence, explain whether each of these goals has been achieved in the following countries

France since 1962
Russia since 1993

7 POINTS TOTAL

Identification of 2 goals: **1 point**

A list of possible answers is below. This list is not exhaustive.

- Political legitimacy
- Popular mandate
- Prevent electoral/institutional gridlock
- Policy leadership
- Independence from legislature
- Stability
- Strong executive
- Inclusion of wide-range of parties
- National unity
- Building coalitions among the electorate
- Increased political participation (turnout)

*** Note: NO POINT IS AWARDED FOR IDENTIFICATION OF ONLY ONE GOAL**

Discussion of each goal: One point each (**2 points total**)

Explanation of two goals in France: 1 point per explanation (**2 points total**)

Explanation of two goals in Russia: 1 point per explanation (**2 points total**)

* Note: Explanation of the two goals in France and in Russia must link to the presidential run-off system. An explanation must answer *how* and *why* the system achieves the goals.

*Note: Maximum points possible for an answer that identifies and discusses only one goal: 3.

* Note: Maximum points possible for an answer that discusses only one country: 5.

Attempts to answer question but earns no points: scored as zero (0)
Blank or off-task: scored as a dash (-)

Question 2 Comparative: Recruitment of Elites

The recruitment of political elites is important in any political system.

- (a) Identify and discuss two factors that affect elite recruitment in both China and one of the following: India or Mexico or Nigeria.
- (b) Is it easier to gain access into political elite membership in China or in one of the following: India or Mexico or Nigeria? Explain your answer, using the two factors you identified in (a) and your knowledge of the political systems of the countries.

6 points total

- (a) 1 point for identifying two factors
1 point for each discussion of the two identified factors (**2 points total**)
3 points total for (a)

***Note: Both factors must apply to both countries.**

A list of possible answers is below. This list is not exhaustive.

- Ethnicity
- Party (ideological) affiliation
- Region
- Education
- Charisma
- Gender
- Social status (wealth)
- Government/military positions
- Patron-client relationships

- (b) 1 point for a thesis that compares ease of access (easier, harder, the same) into the political elite in the two countries
1 point for each explanation that links the factors identified in part (a) to the thesis (**2 points total**)
3 points total for (b)

Lowest scores:

- 0 attempts to answer question but earns no points
- blank or off task

***Note: Each explanation in part (b) must specifically address recruitment in both countries**

Question 3: Constitutional changes in the UK

Since the late 1980s, there have been several proposals, some of which have been adopted, to change the constitutional structure of the United Kingdom. Identify and describe three of these proposals. For each of these proposals, discuss one problem it was designed to address.

7 points total

- 1 point total for the identification of 3 different proposals
- 1 point each for a description of a proposal (**3 points total**)
- 1 point each for a discussion of a problem linked to a proposal (**3 points total**)

Lowest scores:

- 0 attempts to answer question but earns no points: scored as zero (0)
- blank or off task

A list of possible answers is below. This list is not exhaustive.

<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Problem</u>
Devolution of power in Scotland and Wales	Too much centralization of authority; conflicts due to regional nationalism
Constitution for Northern Ireland	Nationalism; religious violence
Reform of House of Lords: abolition, limits on legislative powers	Ineffective; undemocratic; delay of legislation
Electoral changes: proportional representation, direct election of PM	Small parties not represented according to electoral strength; limited popular participation
European Union: to join or not to join	Isolation from rest of Europe; trade with Europe; loss of autonomy
Direct election of mayors	Local leaders not democratically elected
Access to personal information held by the government	Government secrecy
Changes in monarchy: abolition, taxation of royal family, change in role as head of Church of England	Outdated; undemocratic, too expensive
Changes in the judiciary: judicial review	Checks on legislative action
Written Constitution	Consistency in application of laws and procedures

*Note: The student may refer to more than one problem and proposal for the same institution. For example, the House of Lords may be discussed with reference to changing the process of becoming a member and abolishing the House of Lords.

Question 4: Characteristics of Democracy in I-M-N

The following characteristics are often associated with democracies.

- Sustained and recurring national elections**
- Competitive political parties**
- Civilian control over the military**
- An independent judiciary**

- a. Select two of the above characteristics and for each of these two characteristics explain how it contributes to democracy.**
- b. Has each characteristic you selected in (a) contributed to democracy in either India or Mexico or Nigeria? Explain your answer.**

Rubric: 5 points

Part (a): 1 point for each explanation of how each characteristic contributes to democracy (**2 points total**).

*Note: The description may be generic, with no mention of a specific country.

Part (b): 1 point for taking 2 positions on whether the characteristics contribute to democracy. (**1 point total**)

*Note: Taking only one position earns no credit

1 point for each explanation of the position taken. (**2 points total**)

Attempts to answer question but earns no points: scored as zero (0)

Blank or off-task: scored as a dash (-)