Captivate
EDUCATION

SAMPLE QUESTIONS
One question from each section of this exam, with its marking scheme, so teachers can see what the full paper is like. Full exam and solutions: captivateeducation.com.au/trial-exams

Politics

Question and Answer Book

Practice examination 1 – 2027

- Reading time is 15 minutes
- Writing time is 2 hours

Materials supplied

- Question and Answer Book

Instructions

- Use the additional space at the end of this book if you need extra space to complete an answer.

Students are not permitted to bring mobile phones and/or any unauthorised electronic devices into the examination room.

Contents

Section A (12 questions, 45 marks)
Section B (4 questions, 15 marks)
Section C (2 questions, 20 marks)
Assessment criteria for Section C

SAMPLE

Section A

Instructions

- Answer **all** questions in the spaces provided.
- Write your responses in English.
- The focus of your responses must be on contemporary examples and case studies from within the last 10 years.

Sample – Question 1 of the 12 questions in this section.

Select **one** of the following global issues as the focus for Questions 1–4.

- climate change
- global economic instability
- development
- weapons of mass destruction

Selected global issue: _____

Question 1 (2 marks)

Outline **one** response by an institution of global governance to your selected global issue. 2 marks

SAMPLE

Section B

Instructions

- Answer **all** questions in the spaces provided.
- Write your responses in English.
- Read the following sources provided.
- Respond to the questions, referring to the provided sources when required by the question.
- The focus of your responses must be on contemporary examples and case studies from within the last 10 years.

Sample – Question 1 of the 4 questions in this section.

Source 1: Extract from an opinion column by an economics commentator on Australia's economic engagement with Southeast Asia

For decades Australia looked north mainly to sell. Iron ore, coal, gas and grain went out; tourists and students came in. That model made Australia rich, but it left the economy leaning heavily on one buyer in North Asia, and the trade restrictions of 2020 showed how exposed[1] that made us.

Southeast Asia is the obvious place to spread the risk. Its economies are growing quickly, its middle classes want education, health care and clean energy, and its governments want investment that comes without strings. Canberra's 2023 economic strategy for the region is built around investment rather than simply exports, and business champions, deal teams and scholarships are meant to build the links.

Yet goodwill is not the same as influence. Australian firms still invest far more in North America and Europe than in Vietnam or Indonesia, and regional business leaders tell me that Australians arrive with a brochure and leave before the contract is signed. Our neighbours also notice when Australian visa rules make it harder for their students and workers to come here.

If Australia wants to be seen as a partner rather than a quarry[2], it will have to show up, stay and share the profits.

[1]**exposed** – unprotected from risk

[2]**quarry** – a place where stone or minerals are dug out; here, a country valued only for its resources

SAMPLE

Source 2: Hypothetical survey data showing the share of respondents in five Southeast Asian states who describe Australia as a 'reliable economic partner'

State	2019 (%)	2022 (%)	2025 (%)
Indonesia	48	52	57
Vietnam	55	63	66
Philippines	61	64	62
Malaysia	50	47	53
Thailand	46	49	55

These data are hypothetical and were created for this examination.

Question 1 (2 marks)

Describe the trend in perceptions of Australia as a reliable economic partner shown in Source 2. 2 marks

SAMPLE

Section C

Instructions

- Answer **all** questions in the spaces provided.
- Write your responses in English.
- Your responses will be assessed according to the assessment criteria set out at the end of this book.
- The focus of your responses must be on contemporary examples and case studies from within the last 10 years.

Sample – Question 1 of the 2 questions in this section.

Question 1 (10 marks)

Evaluate the ability of global actors to respond effectively to **one** global issue **and one** contemporary crisis that you have studied this year. Use evidence to support your response. 10 marks

SAMPLE

End of sample questions

Assessment criteria for Section C

The two extended-response questions in Section C will be assessed against the following criteria:

- balanced exploration of the two areas of study within the specified unit
- development of a coherent and relevant argument that addresses the question
- demonstration of accurate and appropriate key knowledge
- application of relevant political thinking concepts such as cause and consequence, political interests and perspectives, political stability and change, and political significance
- use of contemporary examples and case studies (within the last 10 years) as evidence to support explanations, points of view and/or arguments

SAMPLE

Marking scheme for the sample questions

Section A

Question 1. (2 marks)

*Outline **one** response by an institution of global governance to your selected global issue.*

To be awarded full marks, students were required to:

Name a specific institution of global governance — global in scope and composed of states, such as the United Nations or one of its agencies, the International Monetary Fund or the International Atomic Energy Agency — and outline one specific response it made to the selected global issue, with evidence from within the last 10 years.

Common issues: a regional grouping (the European Union, ASEAN) or a non-government organisation given as an institution of global governance; an acronym alone; describing the institution's purpose rather than a response.

Mark allocation: 1 mark for a correctly categorised, named institution of global governance and its response; 1 mark for specific, dated evidence of the response in practice.

Responses could have included:

- **Climate change**: the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change agreeing at COP28 in Dubai (December 2023) to transition away from fossil fuels in energy systems and operationalising a loss and damage fund; COP29 in Baku (November 2024) setting a finance goal of at least US$300 billion a year by 2035.
- **Global economic instability**: the International Monetary Fund approving an Extended Fund Facility of about US$2.9 billion for Sri Lanka in March 2023 after its 2022 default; IMF emergency financing to dozens of states during the COVID-19 downturn in 2020.
- **Development**: the World Health Organization co-leading the COVAX facility from 2020 to deliver COVID-19 vaccines to lower-income states; the UN's Fourth International Conference on Financing for Development in Seville in mid-2025.
- **Weapons of mass destruction**: the International Atomic Energy Agency's Board of Governors finding Iran in breach of its safeguards obligations in June 2025; the UN conference that adopted the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in July 2017.

Sample full-mark response

> The Conference of the Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change responded to climate change at COP28 in Dubai in December 2023, where states agreed for the first time to transition away from fossil fuels in energy systems and launched a fund for loss and damage suffered by vulnerable states.

SAMPLE

Section B

Question 1. (2 marks)

Describe the trend in perceptions of Australia as a reliable economic partner shown in Source 2.

To be awarded full marks, students were required to:

Describe the overall trend in Source 2 — perceptions of Australia as a reliable economic partner rose in most of the five states between 2019 and 2025 — and support it with data from the table, ideally noting an exception.

Common issues: listing figures without stating a trend; describing one state only; explaining the trend from own knowledge when the question asks what the source shows.

Stimulus specification — Source 2 (hypothetical data table, invented for this paper). A five-row table headed State / 2019 (%) / 2022 (%) / 2025 (%), with the figures as printed: Indonesia 48, 52, 57; Vietnam 55, 63, 66; Philippines 61, 64, 62; Malaysia 50, 47, 53; Thailand 46, 49, 55, and the note that the data are hypothetical. The figures are not drawn from any real poll and must not be attributed to a real organisation. The intended reading is a broadly rising trend (four of five states higher in 2025 than 2019), with exceptions: the Philippines peaked in 2022 and Malaysia dipped in 2022. A teacher who substitutes real published polling must credit it in full, keep it within the last 10 years and preserve a trend with at least one exception.

Mark allocation: 1 mark for the overall trend; 1 mark for supporting data from Source 2 (an exception such as the Philippines' 2025 fall or Malaysia's 2022 dip strengthened the response).

Responses could have included:

- Overall rise: Vietnam from 55% (2019) to 66% (2025); Indonesia from 48% to 57%; Thailand from 46% to 55%.
- Exceptions: the Philippines peaked at 64% in 2022 and fell to 62% in 2025; Malaysia fell from 50% to 47% in 2022 before recovering to 53%.

Sample full-mark response

> Source 2 shows that perceptions of Australia as a reliable economic partner generally improved between 2019 and 2025: Vietnam rose from 55% to 66% and Indonesia from 48% to 57%. The trend was not uniform, as the Philippines fell slightly from 64% to 62% after 2022.

Section C

Question 1. (10 marks)

SAMPLE

*Evaluate the ability of global actors to respond effectively to **one** global issue **and one** contemporary crisis that you have studied this year. Use evidence to support your response.*

To be awarded full marks, students were required to:

Evaluate — with a clear judgement — the ability of a range of global actors (states, institutions of global governance, regional groupings, non-state actors) to respond effectively to one global issue and one contemporary crisis, integrated in a single argument, using the Unit 3 meaning of effectiveness (assisting resolution) and specific evidence from within the last 10 years. Responses were marked holistically against the five assessment criteria.

Common issues: a narrative of responses with no evaluation of ability; treating the issue and the crisis in two separate halves; using the Unit 4 idea of effectiveness (achieving interests).

Band guide for Section C (both questions)

Derived from the published assessment criteria and the performance-descriptor ladder; it is **not a VCAA rubric**.

Marks	Typical features
9–10	An integrated contention sustained across both areas of study; precise key knowledge; two or more thinking concepts applied (interests, perspectives, cause and consequence, stability and change, significance); specific contemporary evidence for every claim; a clear, justified judgement.
7–8	Integrated and evaluative, with minor imbalance between the two areas or thinner evidence in places.
5–6	Both areas addressed, mostly separately; some evaluation; evidence general in places.
3–4	Largely descriptive or narrative; one area dominates; little judgement.
1–2	Limited relevant knowledge; assertions without evidence.
0	Nothing relevant to the question.

Mark allocation: Marked holistically against these competencies: balanced exploration of both areas of study; a coherent contention that answers the question and binds the two areas; accurate key knowledge; application of political thinking concepts; contemporary evidence (within the last 10 years) for every claim. A specific number of points was not required.

Responses could have included:

- Model contention: 'Global actors' ability to respond effectively is limited less by resources than by sovereignty — actors that can only persuade states, such as the UN and NGOs, achieve partial progress, while states with veto power block resolution.'
- Model contention: 'States remain the actors most able to respond effectively, but only when their interests align, which happens more often on climate change than in armed conflict.'
- Climate change + armed conflict: the COP28 (2023) consensus and the 2025 ICJ advisory opinion against Russia's Security Council veto (2022) and the collapse of the Black Sea Grain Initiative (2023).
- Weapons of mass destruction + human rights crises: the IAEA's limited access in Iran and the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons without nuclear states; ASEAN's Five-Point

SAMPLE

Consensus (2021) ignored by Myanmar's military.

- Development + mass movement of people: 2025 aid cuts reducing UN agencies' capacity, including UNHCR and the World Food Programme; the EU's 2022 temporary protection showing effective regional response when interests align.

Sample full-mark response

> Opening: The ability of global actors to respond effectively to both climate change and the Russia–Ukraine war is determined by sovereignty: actors that rely on persuasion can shift norms, but only states can resolve either problem, and states act effectively only when their interests align. Body: Institutions of global governance show this limit in both cases. At COP28 in 2023 the Conference of the Parties secured consensus to transition away from fossil fuels, and the ICJ's 2025 advisory opinion clarified states' obligations, yet neither can compel a state to cut emissions. Similarly, the Security Council was paralysed by Russia's veto in February 2022, leaving the General Assembly to pass non-binding resolutions. Where interests aligned, effectiveness improved: the 2022 Black Sea Grain Initiative moved grain to world markets because Russia, Ukraine and Türkiye all gained, just as climate finance agreed at COP29 reflects donors' interest in stability. Overall, global actors are able to manage the consequences of both, but not to resolve them.

SAMPLE