

2020

AP[®]

CollegeBoard

AP[®] Comparative Government and Politics

Sample Student Responses and Scoring
Commentaries Aligned with the 2020 Rubric

From the 2018 Scoring Pilot

AP Comparative Government and Politics
Free-Response Question 4
(Student Responses from 2018 Pilot)

This packet of student samples labeled A - I includes two copies of each sample.* The first of these two samples is the original version of the student response with no additional marking. The second of these two samples includes annotation that indicates where each point was earned in the response. The below key indicates which annotation correlates to each of the points.

*Sample C contains no annotations, as no points were earned in that response.

Rubric	Description	Annotation Key
Row A	Claim/Thesis Point	Th
Row B	First Evidence Point	E1
Row B	Second Evidence Point	E2
Row C	Reasoning Point	R
Row D	Responds to Alternate Perspectives Point	A

Section II

UK → CL: Most Free (1/7) PR → 1/7
Corruption: #8 (Score 82)

Russia → CL: 6/7 PR → 7/7 (Least free)
Corruption: #135 (29)

Corruption plagues several countries around the world; however, the method of dealing with these issues is different amongst countries. Corruption within a country typically arises from a lack of civil liberties & political rights which condenses all power in one area, the government. With the govt. having complete & absolute power the citizens have no say^{in an authoritarian govt.}. This discrepancy is clearly seen with the UK & Russia. UK, being a highly democratic govt, has a lot of civil liberties & political rights given to the people. As a result, it is not highly corrupt. Russia, on the other hand, has a lack of civil liberties & political rights which allows power to be concentrated & a higher chance

of corruption to occur. Thus, by studying both countries it is evident that democratic regimes are more effective in reducing corruption than authoritarian regimes, as seen through the UK & Russia.

Civil Liberties are crucial for a country to progress, for when citizens are granted freedom of speech and organizing they are allowed to express what change they want. As an authoritarian regime Russia has a lack of these liberties. Although the constitution states these freedoms to exist, Putin's power enables him to disregard the protection of these rights. It is seen that the more authoritarian that Russia becomes the less liberties are given. According to Freedomhouse.org, as of 2017 Russia has a 6/7 on civil liberties making it terrible in terms of freedom. On the other hand, the UK has a 1/7 on civil liberties (most free) in their democracy. UK has always made an effort to protect the human rights that citizens deserve, which allows them to speak out & organize peacefully. In doing so, the govt. can be criticized into making

improvements by the people. This hinders the development of corruption, unlike Russia's govt. which promotes it.

In addition to civil liberties, political rights are crucial to eroding corruption. The UK has several parties & competition during elections. These elections allow people to have a say in who their leader is & prevents too much power in one party. Due to their efficient elections & system, UK is a 1/7 (most free) for political rights in Freedom House. In Russia, although it has several parties, one party has been in rule for a while. Elections haven't been fair & open which results in a lack of rights to the people. Due to the lack of proper voting, one party has consolidated power & can do whatever they want. This results in a score of 7/17 (least free) for Political rights.

To conclude, it is evident through Freedom House scoring that Democratic regimes are more efficient to dealing with corruption than authoritarian regimes. Due to this, Russia is ranked 135/180 & UK is 8/180. For a lack of corruption

Section II

UK → CL: Most Free (1/7) PR → 1/7
Corruption: #8 (Score 82)

Russia → CL: 6/7 PR → 7/7 (least free)
Corruption: #135 (29)

Corruption plagues several countries around the world; however, the method of dealing with these issues is different amongst countries. Corruption within a country typically arises from a lack of civil liberties & political rights which condenses all power in one area, the government. With the govt. having complete & absolute power the citizens have no say^{in an authoritarian govt.}. This discrepancy is clearly seen with the UK & Russia. UK, being a highly democratic govt, has a lot of civil liberties & political rights given to the people. As a result, it is not highly corrupt. Russia, on the other hand, has a lack of civil liberties & political rights which allows power to be concentrated & a higher chance

of corruption to occur. Thus, by studying both countries it is evident that democratic regimes are more effective in reducing corruption than authoritarian regimes, as seen through the UK & Russia.

Civil Liberties are crucial for a country to progress, for when citizens are granted freedom of speech and organizing they are allowed to express what change they want. As an authoritarian regime Russia has a lack of these liberties. Although the constitution states these freedoms to exist, Putin's power enables him to disregard the protection of these rights. It is seen that the more authoritarian that Russia becomes the less liberties are given. According to Freedomhouse.org, as of 2017 Russia has a 6/7 on civil liberties making it terrible in terms of freedom. On the other hand, the UK has a 1/7 on civil liberties (most free) in their democracy. UK has always made an effort to protect the human rights that citizens deserve, which allows them to speak out & organize peacefully. In doing so, the govt. can be criticized into making

improvements by the people. This hinders the development of corruption, unlike Russia's govt. which promotes it.

In addition to civil liberties, political rights are crucial to eroding corruption. The UK

has several parties & competition during elections. These elections allow people to have a say in who their leader is &

prevents too much power in one party. Due to their efficient elections & system, UK is a 7/7 (most free) for political rights in freedom house. In Russia, although it has several parties, one party has been in rule for a while.

Elections haven't been fair & open which results in a lack of rights to the people.

Due to the lack of proper voting, one party has consolidated power & can do whatever they want. This results in a score of 4/7 (least free) for political rights.

To conclude, it is evident through Freedom house scoring that Democratic regimes are more efficient to dealing with corruption than authoritarian regimes. Due to this, Russia is ranked 135/180 & UK is 8/180. For a lack of corruption

Corruption is a problem in every form of government whether they be democratic or authoritarian. It has toppled empires and regimes and is still prevalent today. However, many regimes have made strides to diminish corruption. The regimes that have most efficiently reduced corruption are democratic countries.

One reason democracies are more effective at reducing corruption is that civil liberties are present. If parts of the government are corrupt, the people seek change and hold the government accountable. Having

the power to vote in elections have also helped in reducing corruption. In democracies, representatives are elected into their jobs, & keep their job, they must please the people. For example, in the United States when people are running for office they try to appeal to the voters. If the individual is corrupt people will not elect them.

Another way corruption is reduced in democratic regimes is through civil society organizations. In countries like the United Kingdom, there are these organizations that are run by the people. The civil society organizations keep the government in check through civil disobedience. Examples include protesting, boycotting, and marches. Protest such as these inform the general populace if the politician they may be voting for is corrupt or not.

While there are examples of compelling evidence on why democracies are better at reducing corruption, there are those who still argue the contrary. They argue that authoritarian regimes can reduce

corruption. However, these governments have the most corruption. Countries such as Russia have been suspected in rigging elections of officials. Authoritarian regimes are also only controlled by a few individuals. If any are corrupt, the people cannot do anything. This is because in these regimes there are no civil liberties or civil society organization. There is nothing that can keep the government in check and corruption free.

These are the reasons why democracies are better at reducing corruption. With concepts like elections they are able to keep the government accountable if they are corrupt.

Corruption is a problem in every form of government whether they be democratic or authoritarian. It has toppled empires and regimes and is still prevalent today. However, many regimes have made strides to diminish corruption. The regimes that have most efficiently reduced corruption are democratic countries.

Th One reason democracies are more effective at reducing corruption is that civil liberties are present. If parts of the government are corrupt, the people seek change and holds the government accountable. Having

the power to vote in elections have also helped in reducing corruption. In democracies, representatives are elected into their jobs. To keep their job, they must please the people. For example, in the United States when people are running for office they try to appeal to the voters. If the individual is corrupt people will not elect them.

Another way corruption is reduced in democratic regimes is through civil society organizations. In countries like the United Kingdom, there are these organizations that are run by the people. The civil society organizations keep the government in check through civil disobedience. Examples include protesting, boycotting, and marches. Protest such as these inform the general populace if the politician they may be voting for is corrupt or not.

While there are examples of compelling evidence on why democracies are better at reducing corruption, there are those who still argue the contrary. They argue that authoritarian regimes can reduce

corruption. However, these governments have the most corruption. Countries such as Russia have been suspected in rigging elections of officials. Authoritarian regimes are also only controlled by a few individuals. If any are corrupt, the people cannot do anything. This is because in these regimes there are no civil liberties or civil society organization. There is nothing that can keep the government in check and corruption free.

These are the reasons why democracies are better at reducing corruption. With concepts like elections they are able to keep the government accountable if they are corrupt.

When it all boils down to it, corruption is a function of where a politician's loyalties lie. They could pass legislation for the whole country, or they could pass it for the rich few who pay them off. Of our 6 AP countries, the one who has made it its goal to crack down on corruption the most is China, arguably the most authoritarian. Conversely, the most corrupt of these states are either pre-2000 Mexico or Nigeria—both of which are democracies. An authoritarian regime type is more effective at reducing corruption than a democracy because there are no elections of any consequence that ~~are~~ provide legitimacy to their leaders, forcing them to search for it by other means. This leads to some authoritarian states—like China—to reduce corruption to be

most.

Russia considers itself a democracy, but the United Russia party has been accused of ballot stuffing in every election. Mexico has been getting better at reducing corruption, but there remains a massive spot in its history where PRI won for almost one hundred years through solely corruption and a patronage system. Nigeria, like Mexico, has been getting better. But they have had many hiccups along the way (almost with every election). The only state that has had any form of success with reducing corruption is ~~the~~ China, with the actions that the CCP takes to provide legitimacy ~~because~~ in their lack of elections.

People like to believe that a democratic regime type is the best at everything. This is incorrect. While they are certainly the best for most things, corruption just isn't one of them. The fact that they have elections opens the door to the highest bidder to come in and "own" the winner. Most democracies have been trying to work on this, but there is simply no way to know for sure if the last corrupt politician is taken care of.

COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

Section II

When it all boils down to it, corruption is a function of where a politician's loyalties lie. They could pass legislation for the whole country, or they could pass it for the rich few who pay them off. Of our 6 AP countries, the one who has made it its goal to crack down on corruption the most is China, arguably the most authoritarian. Conversely, the most corrupt of these states are either pre-2000 Mexico or Nigeria—both of which are democracies. An authoritarian regime type is more effective at reducing corruption than a democracy because there are no elections of any consequence that ~~are~~ provide legitimacy to their leaders, forcing them to search for it by other means. This leads to some authoritarian states—like China—to reduce corruption to

most.

Russia considers itself a democracy, but the United Russia party has been accused of ballot stuffing in every election. Mexico has been getting better at reducing corruption, but there remains a massive spot in its history where PRI won for almost one hundred years through solely corruption and a patronage system. Nigeria, like Mexico, has been getting better. But they have had many hiccups along the way (almost with every election). The only state that has had any form of success with reducing corruption is ~~the~~ China, with the actions that the CCP takes to provide legitimacy ~~because~~ in their lack of elections.

People like to believe that a democratic regime type is the best at every thing. This is incorrect. While they are certainly the best for most things, corruption just isn't one of them. The fact that they have elections opens the door to the highest bidder to come in and "own" the winner. Most democracies have been trying to work on this, but there is simply no way to know for sure if the last corrupt politician is taken care of.

Braunstorm

- Accountability in elections
- transparency b/c of civil liberties

Corruption is very prevalent in many countries regardless of the type of government. In general, however, democratic regimes are more effective at reducing corruption due to increased accountability in elections and more transparency that is due to greater civil liberties.

Civil liberties such as freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom to assemble all contribute to increased transparency. The press isn't forced to print what the regime wants it to print. Through investigative journalism and reporting, the press is able to alert the public to instances of corruption. In Nigeria, →

a democratic state, the press has continued to gain more freedom in recent years. They have begun to report more and more on the government, policies, officials, ~~and~~ etc.

Some news platforms have reported about specific cases of corruption, and because of this, corruption is slowly becoming less common in Nigeria. While the increased reporting of it sometimes portrays the opposite idea since more stories are published, in general freedom of the press discourages corruption among government officials. On top of that, the right to organize and freely speak allows the Nigerian people to place public pressure and voice their opposition to corruption on the government. Only a democratic society that values these civil liberties has the possibility of becoming truly transparent. As we have seen in many democratic countries across the world, transparency reduces corruption.

Secondly, the accountability that is present in free and fair elections continues to effectively reduce corruption. In the United Kingdom, free and fair elections ensure that
→

a person's place in government is not guaranteed. If an official is suspected of corruption or has not satisfactorily represented their constituents, they will likely be voted out of office in the next election.

Free and fair elections allow citizens to hold their representatives accountable. In the UK, the continued transition of power from conservatives to the Labour Party proves that officials are being held accountable for their policies and actions. It is much harder to be corrupt in such a transparent, accountable system.

Although some may suggest that the lack of civil liberties breeds fear of corruption in government officials in authoritarian regimes, this is simply not the case. In Russia, Putin has created fear in his government by showcasing what happens to corrupt officials, yet corruption is still very prevalent in Russia. Putin, himself, is incredibly corrupt, so this reasoning does not make sense. Overall, democratic regimes are much more effective at reducing corruption. →

ADDITIONAL ANSWER PAGE

primarily due to free + fair, accountable elections,
as well as civil liberties that breed
transparency.

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.

Section II

Brainstorm

- Accountability in elections
- transparency b/c of civil liberties

Th Corruption is very prevalent in many countries regardless of the type of government. In general, however, democratic regimes are more effective at reducing corruption due to increased accountability in elections and more transparency that is due to greater civil liberties.

Civil liberties such as freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom to assemble all contribute to increased transparency. The press isn't forced to print what the regime wants it to print. Through investigative journalism and reporting, the press is able to alert the public to instances of corruption. In Nigeria, →

E1

a democratic state, the press has continued to gain more freedom in recent years. They have begun to report more and more on the government, policies, officials, ~~and~~ etc.

R

Some news platforms have reported about specific cases of corruption, and because of this, corruption is slowly becoming less common in Nigeria. While the increased reporting of it sometimes portrays the opposite idea since more stories are published, in general freedom of the press discourages corruption among government officials. On top of that, the right to organize and freely speak allows the

E2

Nigerian people to place public pressure and voice their opposition to corruption on the government. Only a democratic society that values these civil liberties has the possibility of becoming truly transparent. As we have seen in many democratic countries across the world, transparency reduces corruption.

Secondly, the accountability that is present in free and fair elections continues to effectively reduce corruption. In the United Kingdom, free and fair elections ensure that →

a person's place in government is not guaranteed. If an official is suspected of corruption or has not satisfactorily represented their constituents, they will likely be voted out of office in the next election.

Free and fair elections allow citizens to hold their representatives accountable. In the UK, the continued transition of power from conservatives to the Labour Party proves that officials are being held accountable for their policies and actions. It is much harder to be corrupt in such a transparent, accountable system.

Although some may suggest that the lack of civil liberties breeds fear of corruption in government officials in authoritarian regimes, this is simply not the case. In Russia, Putin has created fear in his government by showcasing what happens to corrupt officials, yet corruption is still very prevalent in Russia. Putin, himself, is incredibly corrupt, so this reasoning does not make sense. Overall, democratic regimes are much more effective at reducing corruption.

primarily due to free + fair, accountable elections,
as well as civil liberties that breed
transparency.

Throughout time, many countries have alternated between authoritarian and democratic regimes, often with mixed results. However, democratic regimes tend to be more effective at reducing corruption than authoritarian regimes, due to a higher rate of political transparency.

In democratic ^{states} ~~examples~~, like the United Kingdom, elections are free, open, ~~very~~ fair, and competitive. Because of the publicity elections receive, it is difficult to fake results or buy votes, which is common in authoritarian regimes. Authoritarian

governments will do whatever is necessary to maintain power, which often leads to corrupt elections. In China, where a strong authoritarian government is in place, citizens are not even able to elect higher officials like the president. This makes secret deals and trades for support much easier, which can lead to corruption. In democracies, activity in civil society organizations is encouraged, and civil society flourishes. In ~~some~~ states like the UK, activity in organizations like QUANGOS encourages political thought, and gives a voice to the people who may have policy concerns. However, in an authoritarian state like China, civil society is almost nonexistent, and when it is, it is heavily controlled. This makes it difficult for citizens to voice discontent, leading to corruption, as citizens may bribe officials to get what is needed. This can also be seen in Russia, who has a procedural democracy.

leaning towards an authoritarian state. civil society, like china, is minimal and heavily controlled, and is often dangerous. political dissenters risk their lives, as unpopular opinions are often silenced with violence or imprisonment.

Some may claim that an authoritarian regime, with a strong leader, may root out corruption with its great influence, but often corruption is woven too deeply into the system to be taken out. corruption is common in bureaucracies, where bribes will get you favorable treatment, and bureaucracies are both massive and powerful. Bureaucrats are most often not voted into their positions, which disconnects them from public scrutiny. Bureaucratic positions themselves can be used as a bribe, giving favorable positions to those who are loyal to the leader and the state.

Democracies are more fit to fight corruption than authoritarian

governments. Democracies are more open to citizens, and responsible to citizens, leading to a greater transparency. This transparency makes corruption more visible, and thus easier to fight.

Authoritarian regimes rely on support from loyal officials and bureaucrats, which makes corruption both important and difficult to solve. Oftentimes, a leader cannot afford to crack down on corruption, as they would lose an important loyal base from which their strong power is linked to. Authoritarian regimes rely on corruption, while democratic regimes would crumble with prevalent corruption.

COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

Section II

E 1 of 4

Throughout time, many countries have alternated between authoritarian and democratic regimes, often with mixed results. However, democratic regimes tend to be more effective at reducing corruption than authoritarian regimes, due to a higher rate of political transparency.

Th In democratic ^{states} ~~countries~~, like the United Kingdom, elections are free, open, ~~new~~ fair, and competitive. Because of the publicity elections receive, it is difficult to fake results or buy votes, which is common in authoritarian regimes. Authoritarian

governments will do whatever is

⌈ necessary to maintain power, which often leads to corrupt elections. In China, where a strong authoritarian government is in place, citizens are not even able to elect higher officials like the president. ⌈ This makes secret deals and trades for support much easier, which can lead to corruption.

⌈ In democracies, activity in civil society organizations is encouraged, and civil society flourishes. In ~~some~~ states like the UK, activity in organizations like QUANGOS encourages political thought, and gives a voice to the people who may have policy concerns. However, in an authoritarian state like China, civil society is almost nonexistent, and when it is, it is heavily controlled. This makes it difficult for citizens to voice discontent, leading to corruption, as citizens may bribe officials to get what is needed. This can also be seen in Russia, who has a procedural democracy.

leaning towards an authoritarian state. civil society, like china, is minimal and heavily controlled, and is often dangerous. political dissenters risk their lives, as unpopular opinions are often silenced with violence or imprisonment.

Some may claim that an authoritarian regime, with a strong leader, may root out corruption with its great influence, but often corruption is woven too deeply into the system to be taken out. corruption is common in bureaucracies, where bribes will get you favorable treatment, and bureaucracies are both massive and powerful. Bureaucrats are most often not voted into their positions, which disconnects them from public scrutiny. Bureaucratic positions themselves can be used as a bribe, giving favorable positions to those who are loyal to the leader and the state.

Democracies are more fit to fight corruption than authoritarian

governments. Democracies are more open to citizens, and responsible to citizens, leading to a greater transparency. This transparency makes corruption more visible, and thus easier to fight.

Authoritarian regimes rely on support from loyal officials and bureaucrats, which makes corruption both important and difficult to solve. Oftentimes, a leader cannot afford to crack down on corruption, as they would lose an important loyal base from which their strong power is linked to. Authoritarian regimes rely on corruption, while democratic regimes would crumble with prevalent corruption.

In an authoritarian regime most power is centralized within the federal government and placed in the hands of a few powerful elite. In contrast, in a democratic regime power is shared between the people (the citizens) and the central government. In a democratic regime people's civil liberties are usually more protected than in an authoritarian regime. Also, civil society normally has a strong presence in democratic regimes along with fair and competitive elections. Due to these trends, a democratic regime is more effective in reducing corruption rather than an authoritarian regime.

After delving into the political systems of a myriad of countries, it has been observed that the civil liberties of the people have been more protected in democratic countries, such as the UK, than in authoritarian countries, such as China. In democratic countries like the UK, people are able to practice free speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of the press. The same cannot be said for an authoritarian regime like China. For instance, pro-democracy protesters held a demonstration at Tiananmen Square in which their rights to freedom of speech and assembly were repressed when authorities arrested the protesters and shut down the demonstration. When people are allowed to freely utilize civil liberties, corruption can be battled against and people can attempt to stop it. If people do not have the right to access their civil liberties, they do not have the ability to speak out against corruption which would serve as an obstacle to corruption. Since democratic regimes usually grant citizens their civil liberties, corruption can more effectively be hindered. Also, if there is no freedom of the press, then the government controls what the citizens view through the media, which can hide the true corruption that is occurring. This is frequently occurring in countries with an authoritarian regime.

civil society tends to be more prominent in a democratic regime than in an authoritarian regime. When civil society has a greater presence, people are usually more active in politics. This could mean that more people are joining interest groups, NGOs, or even that just more people are voting. By having more people involved in politics, corruption can be reduced and less power will be concentrated within a few powerful elites. In democratic regimes that entail this greater sense of civil society, people have a greater say in the public policy that is being created within the legislature, leading to more legitimacy in the government and a lower level of corruption. In contrast, in authoritarian regimes, civil society is usually hindered to some extent. For instance, in Russia NGOs have been banned. By reducing civil society, the people's role in government is reduced, placing more power within those controlling the central government, leading to inevitable corruption.

Free, fair, and competitive elections are usually more often seen in countries with a democratic regime than an authoritarian regime. More elections in democratic regimes are direct in comparison with authoritarian regimes. These direct elections give people a greater say in politics and increase legitimacy within the government. Also, candidates are more often vetted or preselected in authoritarian regimes. For example, in China, the CCP chooses one candidate for president and VP that the National People's Congress appoints, but in reality there is only one candidate endorsed by the CCP, so the CCP genuinely got to choose the president & VP. Also there is increased transparency in a democratic regime than in an authoritarian one. If there is less transparency, more corruption can be done behind the scenes, leading an authoritarian regime more susceptible

to corruption.

After exploring the variety of characteristics that define both an authoritarian and democratic regime, it is apparent that a democratic regime would be more efficient in reducing corruption.

However, some could agree that an authoritarian regime could more effectively reduce corruption since it has more power within the country it can more easily stop corruption from continuing.

In an authoritarian regime most power is centralized within the federal government and placed in the hands of a few powerful elite. In contrast, in a democratic regime power is shared between the people (the citizens) and the central government. In a democratic regime people's civil liberties are usually more protected than in an authoritarian regime. Also, civil society normally has a strong presence in democratic regimes along with fair and competitive elections. Due to these trends, a democratic regime is more effective in reducing corruption rather than an authoritarian regime.

After delving into the political systems of a myriad of countries, it has been observed that the civil liberties of the people have been more protected in democratic countries, such as the UK, than in authoritarian countries, such as China. In democratic countries like the UK, people are able to practice free speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of the press. The same cannot be said for an authoritarian regime like China. For instance, prodemocracy protesters held a demonstration at Tiananmen square in which their rights to freedom of speech and assembly were repressed when authorities arrested the protesters and shut down the demonstration. When people are allowed to freely utilize civil liberties, corruption can be battled against and people can attempt to stop it.

If people do not have the right to access their civil liberties, they do not have the ability to speak out against corruption which would serve as an obstacle to corruption. Since democratic regimes usually grant citizens their civil liberties, corruption can more effectively be hindered. Also, if there is no freedom of the press, then the government controls what the citizens view through the media, which can hide the true corruption that is occurring. This is frequently occurring in countries with an authoritarian regime.

civil society tends to be more prominent in a democratic regime than in an authoritarian regime. When civil society has a greater presence, people are usually more active in politics. This could mean that more people are joining interest groups, NGOs, or even that just more people are voting. By having more people involved in politics, corruption can be reduced and less power will be concentrated within a few powerful elites. In democratic regimes that entail this greater sense of civil society, people have a greater say in the public policy that is being created within the legislature, leading to more legitimacy in the government and a lower level of corruption. In contrast, in authoritarian regimes, civil society is usually hindered to some extent. For instance, in Russia NGOs have been banned. By reducing civil society, the people's role in government is reduced, placing more power within those controlling the central government, leading to inevitable corruption.

Free, fair, and competitive elections are usually more often seen in countries with a democratic regime than an authoritarian regime. More elections in democratic regimes are direct in comparison with authoritarian regimes. These direct elections give people a greater say in politics and increase legitimacy within the government. Also, candidates are more often vetted or preselected in authoritarian regimes. For example, in China, the CCP chooses one candidate for president and VP that the National People's Congress appoints, but in reality there is only one candidate endorsed by the CCP, so the CCP genuinely got to choose the president & VP. Also there is increased transparency in a democratic regime than in an authoritarian one. If there is less transparency, more corruption can be done behind the scenes, leading an authoritarian regime more susceptible

to corruption.

After exploring the variety of characteristics that define both an authoritarian and democratic regime, it is apparent that a democratic regime would be more efficient in reducing corruption.

However, some could agree that an authoritarian regime could more effectively reduce corruption since it has more power within the country it can more easily stop corruption from continuing.

Democratic regimes are better than authoritarian regimes at reducing corruption because democracies allow for elections and freedom of the Press. In the UK, for example, there are free and fair elections. This means that the elected officials are accountable to the citizens of the UK. If an official is corrupt, they can easily be removed from office or not voted in for the next election. Also, the UK allows for freedom of the press. This allows the press or media to call out and draw attention to any corruption. Since officials don't want to be called out by the press for corruption, they will be more

likely to not be corrupt. Although, some do argue that ~~that~~ authoritarian states like China limit corruption through consolidation of power. This power allows officials to crack down on corruption by firing anyone that is corrupt. However, this may be true in a few cases, in most cases when a ruler or party has absolute power, it causes even more corruption. This is because there is no one to keep this party/person in check because said party/person holds all the power.

Democratic regimes are better than
Th authoritarian regimes at reducing corruption
because democracies allow for elections
and freedom of the Press. In the UK, for
example, there are free and fair elections.
E1 This means that the elected officials are
accountable to the citizens of the UK. If an
R official is corrupt, they can easily be removed
from office or not voted in for the next election.
Also, the UK allows for freedom of the press.
E2 This allows the press or media to call out
and draw attention to any corruption.
Since officials don't want to be called out
by the press for corruption, they will be more

likely to not be corrupt. Although, some do argue that ~~that~~ authoritarian states like China limit corruption through consolidation of power. This power allows officials to crack down on corruption by firing anyone that is corrupt. However, this may be true in a few cases, in most cases when a ruler or party has absolute power, it causes even more corruption. This is because there is no one to keep this party/person in check because said party/person holds all the power.

Though corruption is a prevailing problem in nearly all governments, certain types of government are better equipped to handle it than others. In an authoritarian govt. like Russia the Corruption Perceptual Index is 29/100 which is higher than a democratic govt. like the United Kingdom with a rank of 82/100. A democratic government is more effective in reducing corruption than an authoritarian one because it is more transparent as a government and treats civil society organizations fairly.

The UK, ^{which} is nearly at the bottom of the list of corrupt countries, treats the civil society organization fairly. Barclay's a bank in the UK was convicted

of a corruption scandal and allegedly wants an independent investigation having paid fines of 8290 million to settle investigations by UK and US regulators. "Transparency" This scandal, though showing cracks in UK's government, shows that the UK is willing to investigate and find out what went wrong in one of their own banks. Also, recently the UK has taken actions secret companies - By being the 'police' of the civil societies, and ensuring the companies are held accountable to their mistakes the UK makes sure that other companies don't try the same thing. Also the UK gov. has transparency in their own gov. by the article 20 of the UNCAC which has ~~made~~ improved the efficiency of their judicial bodies in investigation corruption and allowed the people to understand what the government is doing.

In Russia, who has a very corrupt government they have 'draconian amendments' to laws that govern the NGOs. currently there is a law that if passed would 'singling out organisations that work on legitimate public issues.

and labelling them 'agents of foreign influence' ^(transparency) this shows that by Russia not being equal to all NGOs it is raising its corruption ability by letting corrupt companies work freely and others that are helpful work under rules and regulations. The Russian Govt. is also not transparent in its doing, the Ukrainian Govt, has raided opposition offices, shutting down media outlets and intimidation of civil societies. ^(transparency) This has raised corruption because it has let the govt. do whatever they want without being held accountable for its actions, and silencing the voices of its citizens.

The opposite perspective may be that authoritarian govt. may prevent corruption by having such a strong hold on society. This could be true, but is currently not because in any country that has a strong hold on its government, they are taking actions that are helping corruption because no one can challenge them. Others may say that a Democratic Govt. will foster ~~get~~ corruption.

because they are free. And a democratic
govt. keeps corruption out because, it
~~is so~~ is free and transparent to the people
and the world, so if they will not tolerate
corruption because the people all have a
say in what happens and this reduces
corruption because of an equal chance among
all.

Though corruption is a prevailing problem in nearly all governments, certain types of government are better equipped to handle it than others. In an authoritarian govt. like Russia the Corruption Perception Index is 29/100 which is higher than a democratic govt. like the United Kingdom with a rank of 82/100. A democratic government is more effective in reducing corruption than an authoritarian one because it is more transparent as a government and treats civil society organizations fairly.

The UK, ^{which} is really at the bottom of the list of corrupt countries, treats the civil society organizations fairly. Barclay's a bank in the UK was convicted

of a corruption scandal and allegedly wants an independent investigation having paid fines of 8090 million to settle investigations by UK and US regulators. "Transparency" this scandal, though showing cracks in UK's government, shows that the UK is willing to investigate and find out what went wrong in one of their own banks. Also, recently the UK has taken actions against secret companies. By being the 'police' of the civil societies, and ensuring the companies are held accountable to their mistakes the UK makes sure that other companies don't try the same thing. Also the UK gov. has transparency in their own gov. by the article 20 of the UNCAC which has ~~made~~ improved the efficiency of their judicial bodies in investigation corruption and allowed the people to understand what the government is doing.

In Russia, who has a very corrupt government they have 'draconian amendments' to laws that govern the NGOs. currently there is a law that if passed would 'singh out' organized that work on legitimate public issues.

and labelling them, 'agents of foreign influence' ^(transparency) this shows that by Russia not being equal to all NGOs it is raising its corruption ability by letting corrupt companies work freely and others that are helpful work under rules and regulations. The Russian Govt. is also not transparent in its doing, the Ukrainian Govt, has raided opposition offices, shutting down media outlets and intimidation of civil societies ^(transparency). This has raised corruption because it has let the govt do whatever they want without being held accountable for its actions, and silencing the voices of its citizens.

A [The opposite perspective may be that authoritarian govs may prevent corruption by having such a strong hold on society. This could be true, but is currently not because in any country that has a strong hold on its government, they are taking actions that are helping corruption because no one can challenge them. Others may say that a Democratic Govt. will fester corruption.

because they are free. And a democratic
govt. keeps corruption out because, it
is so free and transparent to the people
and the world, so if they will not have
corruption because the people all have a
say in what happens and this reduces
corruption because of an equal chance among
all.

COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

Section II

Civil Liberties

China: Great Firewall, Rule by law, Muslim & Tibetan minorities
press is not independent of state

Civil Society

Falun Gong, Tiananmen square

Election Free, Fair, Frequent

US: trying to make life, indirect elections

UK: Proportional Rep / Referendum

Both authoritarian and democratic regimes have their own way of reducing corruption. Authoritarian regimes center their power on a group of elites, giving little to no power to the people, while democratic regimes are run by the people of the country, with their government ~~representing~~ representing them. While authoritarian regimes ~~may seem~~ look less corrupt on paper, democratic regimes are the most effective when it comes to reducing corruption because of their civil liberties, civil society, and elections.

The civil liberties, freedom of speech, press, religion, etc., is more apparent in a democratic regime than an authoritarian one. For example, the UK, as a democratic regime, has complete freedom of speech ~~and~~.

as seen through various social media like twitter or facebook. Their press is also independent of their government, so their media is not filtered or blocked. Even their debates in parliament can be watched live on cable. In contrast, China, an authoritarian regime, has restricted civil liberties. While they are allowed to practice free religion and advocate for some rights, if it interferes with politics, the government will quickly crack down on any threat, resulting in torture or death. The press is also not independent of the government. ~~The~~ Media in China is completely filtered, while most communicating apps are blocked using the "Great Firewall". Also, while UK uses rule of law to base its government on, China uses rule by law to govern their people.

Civil society in democratic regimes is much more seen than in authoritarian regimes. Since democratic regimes are run by the people, the citizens have the freedom to express themselves and create groups that ~~are created~~ can evolve their society. This can be seen in the UK through its ~~many~~ many clubs, NGO's, movements that are not controlled by the government. ~~For example~~ ~~The citizens of UK were able to hold a referendum~~

~~On the other hand, China's civil society is completely restricted if it interferes with political views. For example, the spiritual practice of Falun Gong was completely obliterated as it became a larger and more impactful of Chinese lives. All books were ruined and it is even blocked from all websites in China. Another example is the tragedy in Tiananmen Square, where political protesters were brutally killed by the government's military. It is so hidden and suppressed that there aren't even records of how many deaths took place.~~

Elections in democratic regimes are more ~~free~~ free, fair, and frequent than authoritarian regimes. While every regime has its corruption through its elections, the UK, for example, gives the choosing power to the people when it comes to elections. While votes aren't centered on ~~a~~ a specific candidate in parliamentary elections, ~~even the case of~~ they still have the right to vote in the process of proportional representation. ~~An~~ An example of a direct and fair vote was the referendum of 2015 to allow Scotland to become its own country. Although ~~the~~ Scotland lost the referendum, the vote was still an accurate representation of the people. For authoritarian regimes

however, elections are based less on the people. In China, for example, although they have direct elections at the local level, they are not regulated and have a lot of room for error, while any position higher than local positions are appointed, not voted on. Even the current president of China, Xi, is fighting to rule for life instead of the standard 5 year term,

While democratic regimes more effectively reduce corruption, authoritarian regimes still have their own way of reducing it. For example, even though China's elections aren't fair or frequent, they still attempt to have direct elections for the local level. This shows a slight push towards democracy.

Section II

Civil liberties

China: Great Firewall, Rule by law, Muslim & Tibetan minorities
press is not independent of state

Civil society

Falun Gong, Tiananmen square

Election Free, Fair, Frequent

US: trying to alter life, indirect elections

UK: Proportional Rep / Referendum

Both authoritarian and democratic regimes have their own way of reducing corruption. Authoritarian regimes center their power on a group of elites, giving little to no power to the people, while democratic regimes are run by the people of the country, with their government representing them. While authoritarian regimes ~~may look less corrupt on paper~~, democratic regimes are the most effective when it comes to reducing corruption because of their civil liberties, civil society, and elections.

E1 The civil liberties, freedom of speech, press, religion, etc., is more apparent in a democratic regime than an authoritarian one. For example, the UK, as a democratic regime, has complete freedom of speech ~~and~~

as seen through various social media like twitter or facebook. Their press is also independent of their government, so their media is not filtered or blocked. Even their debates in parliament can be watched live on cable. In contrast, China, an authoritarian regime, has restricted civil liberties. While they are allowed to practice free religion and advocate for some rights, if it interferes with politics, the government will quickly crack down on any threat, resulting in torture or death. The press is also not independent of the government. Media in China is completely filtered, while most communicating apps are blocked using the "Great Firewall". Also, while UK uses rule of law to base its government on, China uses rule by law to govern their people.

Civil society in democratic regimes is much more seen than in authoritarian regimes. Since democratic regimes are run by the people, the citizens have the freedom to express themselves and create groups that ~~are created~~ can evolve their society. This can be seen in the UK through its many clubs, NGO's, movements that are not controlled by the government. ~~For example the citizens of UK were able to hold a referendum~~

~~On the other hand~~ On the other hand, China's civil society is completely restricted if it interferes with political views. For example, the spiritual practice of Falun Gong was completely obliterated as it became a larger and more impactful of Chinese lives. All books were ruined and it is even blocked from all websites in China. Another example is the tragedy in Tiananmen Square, where political protesters were brutally killed by the government's military. It is so hidden and suppressed that there aren't even records of how many deaths took place.

Elections in democratic regimes are more free, fair, and frequent than authoritarian regimes, while every regime has its corruption through its elections. The UK, for example, gives the choosing power to the people when it comes to elections. While votes aren't centered on a specific candidate in parliamentary elections, ~~even the case of~~ they still have the right to vote in the process of proportional representation. ~~An~~ An example of a direct and fair vote was the referendum of 2015 to allow Scotland to become its own country. Although Scotland lost the referendum, the vote was still an accurate representation of the people. For authoritarian regimes

however, elections are based less on the people. In China, for example, although they have direct elections at the local level, they are not regulated and have a lot of room for error, while any position higher than local positions are appointed, not voted on. Even the current president of China, Xi, is fighting to rule for life instead of the standard 5 year term,

While democratic regimes more effectively reduce corruption, authoritarian regimes still have their own way of reducing it. For example, even though China's elections aren't fair or frequent, they still attempt to have direct elections for the local level. This shows a slight push towards democracy.

AP Comparative Government and Politics
Free-Response Question 4
2020 Scoring Commentaries
(Applied to Student Responses from 2018 Pilot)

Index of Scores for Samples: Question 4

Sample Reference	Row A	Row B	Row C	Row D
A	1	2	1	0
B	1	1	1	0
C	0	0	0	0
D	1	2	1	0
E	1	2	1	1
F	1	2	1	0
G	1	2	1	1
H	1	0	0	1
I	0	2	0	0

AP Comparative Government and Politics
Free-Response Question 4
2020 Scoring Commentaries
(Applied to Student Responses from 2018 Pilot)

Sample A
4/5 Points

Row A: Claim/Thesis - 1/1

The response earned the point for Claim/Thesis with the argument in the first paragraph which outlines that corruption occurs in countries with a lack of civil liberties and political rights: *“Russia, on the other hand, has a lack of civil liberties & political rights which allows power to be concentrated & a higher chance of corruption to occur. Thus, by studying both countries it is evident that democratic regimes are more effective in reducing corruption than authoritarian regimes, as seen through the UK & Russia.”*

Row B: Evidence - 2/2

The response earned both points for Evidence. The first evidence point is earned in the second paragraph with the explanation that *“the UK has always made an effort to protect the human rights that citizens deserve, which allows them to speak out and organize peacefully.”* The second evidence point is earned in the third paragraph with the explanation of *“the UK has several parties & competition during elections. These elections allow people to have a say in who their leader is & prevents too much power in one party.”* There is a third piece of evidence provided in the second paragraph about Russia, but it is not needed as the response has already earned two points.

Row C: Reasoning - 1/1

The response earned the point for Reasoning because it explains the relationship between the evidence provided and the claim that democratic regimes are more effective in reducing corruption than authoritarian regimes. The Reasoning point is found in the second paragraph after the first evidence point about how the UK protects citizens’ rights to speak out and organize: *“In doing so, the govt. can be criticized into making improvements by the people. This hinders the development of corruption...”* The response provides reasoning for an additional evidence point, but it is not needed as it has already earned the point for Reasoning.

Row D: Responds to an Alternate Perspective - 0/1

The response did not earn this point because it does not attempt to respond to an alternate perspective.

AP Comparative Government and Politics
Free-Response Question 4
2020 Scoring Commentaries
(Applied to Student Responses from 2018 Pilot)

Sample B

3/5

Row A: Claim/Thesis – 1/1

The response earned the point for Claim/Thesis with the argument in the second paragraph which explains the connection between civil liberties and the people’s ability to hold the government accountable: *“One reason democracies are more effective at reducing corruption is that civil liberties are present. If parts of the government are corrupt, the people seek change and holds the government accountable.”*

Row B: Evidence – 1/2

The response earned one point for Evidence. The first evidence point is earned in the second paragraph with the explanation that *“In countries like the United Kingdom, there are these organizations that are run by the people. The civil society organizations keep the government in check through civil disobedience. Examples include protesting, boycotting, and marches.”* The third sentence is necessary to earn this point because it provides specific examples that demonstrate a clear understanding of what “civil disobedience” means.

Row C: Reasoning – 1/1

The response earned the point for Reasoning because it explains the relationship between the evidence provided and the claim that democratic regimes are more effective in reducing corruption than authoritarian regimes. The Reasoning point is found in the second paragraph after the first evidence point about civil society organizations and civil disobedience examples keeping democratic governments in check. *“Protest such as these inform the general populace if the politicians they may be voting for is corrupt or not.”*

Row D: Responds to an Alternate Perspective – 0/1

The response did not earn this point. It attempts to describe and refute an alternate perspective: *“While there are examples of compelling evidence on why democracies are better at reducing corruption, there are those who still argue the contrary. They argue that authoritarian regimes can reduce corruption. However, these governments have the most corruption. Countries such as Russia have been suspected in rigging elections of officials.”* Although the response identifies an alternate perspective it does not offer an actual description of that perspective—it simply identifies it. The rebuttal is ineffective because the response never demonstrates understanding of the alternate perspective.

AP Comparative Government and Politics
Free-Response Question 4
2020 Scoring Commentaries
(Applied to Student Responses from 2018 Pilot)

Sample C
0/5

Row A: Claim/Thesis - 0/1

The response did not earn the point for Claim/Thesis because it does not offer a coherent or accurate argument that establishes a line of reasoning.

Row B: Evidence – 0/2

The response did not earn either evidence point because the examples provided are inaccurate and not specific.

Row C: Reasoning - 0/1

The response did not earn the point for Reasoning because it does not attempt to explain how or why the evidence supports a claim or thesis. Had the response attempted to do so it still would not have earned the Reasoning point because it did not earn the point for Claim/Thesis.

Row D: Responds to an Alternate Perspective - 0/1

The response did not earn this point. It attempts to describe and refute an alternate perspective:

“People like to believe that a democratic regime type is the best at everything. This is incorrect. While they are certainly the best for most things, corruption just isn’t one of them. The fact that they have elections opens the door to the highest bidder to come in and ‘own’ the winner. Most democracies have been trying to work on this, but there is simply no way to know for sure if the last corruption politician is taken care of.” Although the response identifies an alternate perspective, it does not offer an actual description of that perspective—it simply identifies it. The rebuttal is ineffective because the response never demonstrates understanding of the alternate perspective.

AP Comparative Government and Politics
Free-Response Question 4
2020 Scoring Commentaries
(Applied to Student Responses from 2018 Pilot)

Sample D

4/5

Row A: Claim/Thesis - 1/1

The response earned the point for Claim/Thesis with the argument in the first paragraph that explains the connection between accountability in elections and transparency because of civil liberties: *“In general, however, democratic regimes are more effective at reducing corruption due to increased accountability in elections and more transparency that is due to greater civil liberties.”*

Row B: Evidence – 2/2

The response earned both points for Evidence. The first evidence point is earned in the middle of the second paragraph with the explanation that *“In Nigeria, a democratic state, the press has continued to gain more freedom in recent years. They have begun to report more and more on the government, politics, officials, etc.”* Both sentences are needed to earn the evidence point because the second sentence provides a specific context for what “more freedom” means. The second evidence point is earned at the end of the second paragraph with the explanation of *“On top of that, the right to organize and freely speak allows the Nigerian people to place public pressure and voice their opposition to corruption on the government.”* There is another piece of evidence provided in the third paragraph with a discussion about free and fair elections in the U.K., but it is not needed as the response has already earned two points.

Row C: Reasoning - 1/1

The response earned the point for Reasoning because it explains the relationship between the evidence provided and the claim that democratic regimes are more effective in reducing corruption than authoritarian regimes. The Reasoning point is found in the second paragraph after the first evidence point about Nigeria’s freedom of the press which allows the press to report on the government: *“and because of this, corruption is slowly becoming less common in Nigeria.”* The response provides reasoning for an additional evidence point, but it is not needed as it has already earned the point for Reasoning.

Row D: Responds to an Alternate Perspective - 0/1

The response did not earn this point. It attempts to describe and refute an alternate perspective: *“Although some may suggest that the lack of civil liberties breeds fear of corruption in government officials in authoritarian regimes, this is simply not the case. In Russia, Putin has created fear in his government by showcasing what happens to corrupt officials, yet corruption is still very prevalent in Russia.”* Although the response attempts to describe the alternate perspective, it demonstrates an incorrect understanding. The rebuttal is ineffective because the response never demonstrates understanding of the alternate perspective.

AP Comparative Government and Politics
Free-Response Question 4
2020 Scoring Commentaries
(Applied to Student Responses from 2018 Pilot)

Sample E
5/5

Row A: Claim/Thesis - 1/1

The response earned the point for Claim/Thesis with the argument about political transparency and free and fair elections. While it begins the argument in the first paragraph, it is the continuation of that argument into the second paragraph that earned the point. The response has to connect political transparency to one of the provided course concepts, which it does at the beginning of the second paragraph: *“However, democratic regimes tend to be more effective at reducing corruption than authoritarian regimes, due to a higher rate of political transparency. In democratic states like the United Kingdom, elections are free, open, fair and competitive.”* The rubric stipulates that the claim or thesis may be located anywhere in the response, allowing for this response to earn the point for Claim/Thesis.

Row B: Evidence – 2/2

The response earned both points for Evidence. The first evidence point is earned in the second paragraph with the explanation that authoritarian governments will do whatever is needed to maintain power and that leads to corrupt elections like *“In China, where a strong authoritarian government is in place, citizens are not even able to election higher officials like the president.”* The second evidence point is earned in the second paragraph with the example of civil society: *“In states like the UK, activity in organizations like Quangos encourages political thought and gives a voice to the people who may have policy concerns.”* There is a third piece of evidence provided in the second paragraph about China, but it is not needed as the response has already earned two points.

Row C: Reasoning - 1/1

The response earned the point for Reasoning because it explains the relationship between the evidence provided and the claim that democratic regimes are more effective in reducing corruption than authoritarian regimes. The Reasoning point is found in the second paragraph after the first evidence point about elections in China and citizens’ inability to elect higher officials. *“This makes secret deals and trades for support much easier, which can lead to corruption.”* The response provides reasoning for an additional evidence point, but it is not needed as it has already earned the point for Reasoning.

Row D: Responds to an Alternate Perspective - 1/1

The response earned this point in the fourth paragraph by describing an alternate perspective and refuting it: *“Some may claim that an authoritarian regime, with a strong leader, may root out corruption with its great influence, but often corruption is wove to deeply into the system to be taken out. Corruption is common in bureaucracies, where bribes will get you favorable treatment, and bureaucracies are both massive and powerful. Bureaucrats are most often not voted into their positions, which disconnects them from public scrutiny. Bureaucratic positions themselves can be used as a bribe, giving favorable positions to those who are loyal to the leader and the state.”*

AP Comparative Government and Politics
Free-Response Question 4
2020 Scoring Commentaries
(Applied to Student Responses from 2018 Pilot)

Sample F

4/5

Row A: Claim/Thesis - 1/1

The response earned the point for Claim/Thesis with the argument in the first paragraph about civil liberties and competitive elections: *“In a democratic regime people’s civil liberties are usually more protected than in an authoritarian regime. Also, civil society normally has a strong presence in democratic regimes along with fair and competitive elections. Due to these trends, a democratic regime is more effective in reducing corruption rather than an authoritarian regime.”*

Row B: Evidence – 2/2

The response earned both points for Evidence. The first evidence point is earned in the second paragraph with the explanation about civil liberties being protected in democratic countries: *“In democratic countries like the UK, people are able to practice free speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of the press.”* The second evidence point is earned directly after that with the discussion about China and the lack of civil liberties: *“The same cannot be said for an authoritarian regime like China. For instance, prodemocracy protesters held a demonstration at Tiananmen Square in which their rights to freedom of speech and assembly were repressed when authorities arrested the protesters and shut down the demonstration.”* There are additional pieces of evidence provided in subsequent paragraphs, but they are not needed as the response has already earned two points.

Row C: Reasoning - 1/1

The response earned the point for Reasoning because it explains the relationship between the evidence provided and the claim that democratic regimes are more effective in reducing corruption than authoritarian regimes. The Reasoning point is found in the second paragraph after the second evidence point about the Tiananmen Square demonstration where freedom of speech and assembly were repressed: *“When people are allowed to freely utilize civil liberties, corruption can be battled against and people can attempt to stop it.”* The response provides reasoning for an additional evidence point, but it is not needed as it has already earned the point for Reasoning.

Row D: Responds to an Alternate Perspective - 0/1

The response did not earn this point. It describes an alternate perspective, but it does not attempt to refute, concede or rebut that perspective: *“After exploring the variety of characteristics that define both an authoritarian and democratic regimes it is apparent that a democratic regime would be more efficient in reducing corruption. However, some could argue that an authoritarian regime could more effectively reduce corruption since it has more power within the country it can more easily stop corruption from continuing.”* The alternate perspective is described in the second sentence above, but the response ends without refuting, conceding, or rebutting that perspective.

AP Comparative Government and Politics
Free-Response Question 4
2020 Scoring Commentaries
(Applied to Student Responses from 2018 Pilot)

Sample G

5/5

Row A: Claim/Thesis - 1/1

The response earned the point for Claim/Thesis with the argument in the first paragraph about elections and freedom of the press: *Democratic regimes are better than authoritarian regime at reducing corruption because democracies allow for elections and freedom of the press.* This is a minimally acceptable example that earned the point because of the inclusion of “freedom of the press”, which is a civil liberty. Had it stopped at “elections” it would not have earned the point.

Row B: Evidence – 2/2

The response earned both points for Evidence. The first evidence point is earned in the first paragraph with the explanation about free elections and accountability of officials: *In the UK, for example, there are free and fair elections. This means that the elected officials are accountable to the citizens of the UK.* The second evidence point is also in the first paragraph with a discussion of freedom of the press. *Also, the UK allows for freedom of the press. This allows the press or media to call out and draw attention to any corruption.*

Row C: Reasoning - 1/1

The response earned the point for Reasoning because it explains the relationship between the evidence provided and the claim that democratic regimes are more effective in reducing corruption than authoritarian regimes. The Reasoning point is found in the first paragraph after the first evidence point about free and fair elections in the UK: *“If an official is corrupt, they can easily be removed from office or not voted in for the next election.”* The response provides reasoning for an additional evidence point, but it is not needed as it has already earned the point for Reasoning.

Row D: Responds to an Alternate Perspective - 1/1

The response earned this point at the end of the paragraph by describing an alternate perspective and refuting it: *“Although some do argue that authoritarian states like China limit corruption through consolidation of power. This power allows officials to crack down on corruption by firing anyone that is corrupt. However, this may be true in a few cases, in most cases when a ruler or party has absolute power, it causes even more corruption. This is because there is no one to keep this party/person in check because said party/person holds all the power.”*

AP Comparative Government and Politics
Free-Response Question 4
2020 Scoring Commentaries
(Applied to Student Responses from 2018 Pilot)

Sample H

2/5

Row A: Claim/Thesis - 1/1

The response earned the point for Claim/Thesis with the argument in the first paragraph about the transparency and the treatment of civil society organizations: *“A democratic government is more effective in reducing corruption than an authoritarian one because it is more transparent as a government and treats civil society organizations fairly.”*

Row B: Evidence - 0 /2

The response did not earn either evidence point because the evidence provided is not relevant to the course concepts in the prompt.

Row C: Reasoning - 0/1

The response did not earn the point for Reasoning because it does not provide an explanation of the relationship between the evidence and the claim or thesis.

Row D: Responds to an Alternate Perspective - 1/1

The response earned this point in the fourth paragraph by describing an alternate perspective and refuting it: *“The opposite perspective may be that authoritarian govts may prevent corruption by having such a strong hold on society. This could be true, but is currently not because in any country that has a strong hold on its government, they are taking actions that are helping corruption because no one can challenge them.”*

AP Comparative Government and Politics
Free-Response Question 4
2020 Scoring Commentaries
(Applied to Student Responses from 2018 Pilot)

Sample I
2/5

Row A: Claim/Thesis – 0/1

The response did not earn the point for Claim/Thesis because it simply restates the prompt and does not provide a defensible claim or thesis that establishes a line of reasoning.

Row B: Evidence – 2/2

The response earned both points for Evidence. The first evidence point is earned in the second paragraph with the explanation about civil liberties and freedom of speech in the UK: *“The civil liberties, freedom of speech, press, religion, etc. is more opponent in a democratic regime than an authoritarian one. For example, the UK as a democratic regime has complete freedom of speech as seen through various social media like twitter or Facebook.”* The second evidence point is earned directly after that with a discussion about free press: *“Their press is also independent of their government, so their media is not filtered or blocked. Even their debates in parliament can be watched live on cable.”* There are additional pieces of evidence provided in subsequent paragraphs, but they are not needed as the response has already earned two points.

Row C: Reasoning - 0/1

The response did not earn the point for Reasoning because it does not attempt to explain how or why the evidence supports a claim or thesis. Had the response attempted to do so it still would not have earned the Reasoning point because it did not earn the point for Claim/Thesis.

Row D: Responds to an Alternate Perspective - 0/1

The response did not earn this point. It minimally identifies an alternate perspective by stating that authoritarian regimes can also reduce corruption. However, it does not describe that perspective, nor does it attempt to refute, concede or rebut that perspective: *“While democratic regimes more effectively reduce corruption, authoritarian regimes still have their own way of reducing it.”*