

Holy Innocents' High School
 Social Studies
 Secondary 4 Express / 5 Normal (Academic)
 2272/01, 2273/01
 PRELIM EXAM 2019

ANSWERS

Section A: Source-Based Case Study

1. Living in a Diverse Society

(a) Study Source A.

What is the cartoonist's attitude towards the relationship between SES and a child's educational opportunities? Explain your answer, using details of the source. **[5]**

Level	Answer	Mark
L1	Describing source without answering the question directly. <i>E.g. This source shows two students climbing up steps, one with help of the stacked money bills, one without.</i>	[1]
L2	Because of event/general context. <i>E.g. The cartoonist created this to highlight the problem of unequal educational opportunities based on SES.</i>	[2]
L3	Because of the message the cartoonist wanted to deliver, without supporting evidence, or weak message, supported. <i>E.g. The cartoonist thinks that the SES of a child's family determines the educational opportunities the child will have access to. Children from a less advantaged background will not be likely to succeed compared to those of a more privileged background.</i> <i>E.g. The cartoonist thinks that children from high SES can afford more to pave their way towards their future, just like how Student B has money to build steps for him to climb higher, while those of a low SES background have nothing else to aid them to succeed, just like how Student A has to struggle without any help to climb the steps.</i>	[3]
L4	Because of the message the cartoonist wanted to deliver, with supporting evidence. Higher mark will be awarded to the answer which clearly states what the cartoonist's attitude is (i.e. how he feels towards SES and educational opportunities). <i>E.g. The cartoonist adopts a skeptical/pessimistic attitude towards the education system. He feels that the SES of a child's family determines the educational opportunities the child will have access to (M). From the source, we can see that Student B has the help of the money bills to help him ascend the steps comfortably. This represents the ability of families with more financial resources to push their child towards success. On the other hand, we see Student A, who represents someone with no or little financial resources, struggling to climb up the steps. (E) [4] Hence, the cartoonist feels that children from a less advantaged background will not be likely to succeed compared to those of a more privileged background [E] [5].</i>	[4-5]

(b) Study Sources B and C.

Do the authors of these two sources agree? Explain your answer.

[7]

Level	Answer	Mark
L1	Similarity/difference based on provenance/source type.	[1]

	<i>E.g. Source B does not agree with Source C because Source B is a report of a study while Source C is a response by an MOE personnel.</i>	
L2	<p>Difference or Similarity provided, without supporting evidence/ matching idea. Award 2 marks for difference or similarity. Award 3 marks for difference and similarity.</p> <p><i>E.g. The authors of both sources agree as both say that the proportions of high SES students in top schools and low SES students in “disadvantaged schools” are increasing.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>E.g. The authors of both sources disagree as Source B states that the low SES students in “disadvantaged schools” have little resources provided for their learning while Source C mentions that this is not true and that the low SES students in “disadvantaged schools” are not worse off.</i></p> <p><i>(Students should answer the question directly, i.e. the authors of both sources agree/disagree, in order to score L2)</i></p>	[2-3]
L3	<p>Difference or similarity provided, with matching idea and supporting evidence. Award 5 marks for more elaborated answer with explanation of sources (bolded portions).</p> <p><i>E.g. The authors of both sources agree in terms of acknowledging that the <u>proportions of high SES students in top schools and low SES students in “disadvantaged schools” are increasing</u>. Source B mentions that “there is evidence to suggest that there is a “disproportionate percentage of high SES students who tend to be enrolled in ‘more prestigious secondary schools’, and the reverse is also true”. This means that the advantages that come with being from a high SES background does increase the educational opportunities for a child and vice versa. Similarly, Source C mentions that “nevertheless, MOE has been monitoring the trend and is concerned about the slow creeping up of the disproportionate distribution.”. This also shows that the trend is real.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>E.g. The authors of both sources disagree in terms of saying that the low SES students in “disadvantaged schools” have little resources provided for their learning. Source B mentions that “students from better socio-economic backgrounds tended to perform better at the Programme for International Student Assessment (Pisa)” and that “disadvantaged students attending disadvantaged schools are... doubly disadvantaged as they strive for achievement”. This means that low SES students have their educational opportunities compromised because of the little resources provided by their SES and it is compromised furthermore because of being in ‘disadvantaged schools’. On the other hand, Source C mentions that “all our schools are well-resourced by international standards. Therefore, our lower-SES students in what OECD termed as ‘disadvantaged schools’ are actually not worse-off in terms of resources provided to them”. This means that even if SES has led to less resources for the lower SES students, schools are still able to provide them with enough resources compared to top schools.</i></p> <p><i>(accept other possible matching ideas that are specific and appropriate)</i></p>	[4-5]
L4	Both aspects of L3.	[6]
L5	<p>Difference in purpose e.g. The authors of these two sources disagree due to their different purposes. Source B is trying to educate (W) the general public (A) about the findings of the OECD report, that Singapore’s education system has seen students from lower SES being put at a disadvantage (M). Source B states that “<i>disadvantaged students attending disadvantaged schools are... doubly disadvantaged as they strive for achievement</i>”. (E) <i>This is to shed light on the issue as the journalist would likely want</i></p>	[7]

	<p>to spark conversation among readers and attract more so that they would be better informed and circulate the article (I).</p> <p>The author of B is criticising Singapore's education system for disadvantaging students from lower SES. In source B, it states that "....". This reflects how students from lower SES are not able to enter better schools due to their limited resources, and in turn go to disadvantaged schools that are not able to support them in their learning, providing them a disadvantaged education. Hence, this may pressurise the Singapore government to think about how they can better support students from Lower SES to provide them with better educational opportunities.</p> <p>On the other hand, Source C is trying to reassure (W) Singaporeans (A) that MOE does enough to ensure no school or child is disadvantaged due to their SES (M). Source C states that "all our schools are well-resourced by international standards. Therefore, lower-SES students...are actually not worse-off in terms of resources provided to them." (E) Hence the director of MOE's planning division would like Singaporeans to support MOE's efforts and be assured that the educational system in Singapore is fair. (I)</p>	
--	--	--

(c) Study Source D. How surprised are you by this source? Explain your answer.

[7]

Level	Answer	Mark
L1	<p>Surprised/not surprised, based on undeveloped provenance.</p> <p>E.g. I am surprised by this source as it is written by a parent. [1m] This means that they would feel the stresses of competing and constantly be trying to keep up with sending their children for tuition. Yet, they seem to be doing the opposite, advocating for independent learning and strategising instead. [2m]</p>	[1-2]
L2	<p>Surprised/not surprised based on contextual knowledge and inference of source's message.</p> <p>Award the higher mark for more fully developed answers, with clear explanation (bolded).</p> <p>E.g. I am surprised as I expected parents to believe that SES will affect a child's educational opportunities. This is because parents have been feeling the stress and need to provide their children with as much academic resources as possible, and have been a huge part of how this problem came about. However, according to Source D a child's educational opportunities is independent from their SES. (M) It is stated from the source that "do not be hung up on the idea that you must be wealthy or live in private property for your child to succeed in school. If you have this mindset and rub it off on your children, it may cause itself to become true" (E). This suggests that how wealthy a child's family is does not determine their educational opportunities.</p>	[3-4]
L3	<p>L2+ CR surprised/not surprised because of reliability/unreliability of the source</p> <p>Award 5 marks for weak CR statement/explanation/concluding statement. Award 6 marks for clear explanation and concluding statement.</p> <p>I am surprised by Source D as Source E contradicts it in terms of whether SES will affect a child's educational opportunities. I can infer from Source E that the SES of a child does indeed affect their educational opportunities quite vastly. (M) The source mentions that "we see SES differences in secondary schools as well, where entry is supposed to be determined in large part by the children's results in the PSLE. Entry is not about distance or alumni associations, yet we also see marked SES differences in elite secondary schools". (E) This means that the education system seems to be inadequate in bridging the gap and providing equal opportunities for students from different backgrounds. [5] Hence, since Source E proves that Source D is unreliable, I am surprised by Source D. [6]</p> <p>OR</p>	[5-6]

	<p>I am not surprised by Source D as Source F supports it in terms of saying that the SES of a child will not affect their educational opportunities. I can infer from Source F that the government is channeling resources to ensure that SES does not affect a child's educational opportunities. (M) Source F states that "The Government is investing more in early education so that children from disadvantaged families do not fall too far behind before starting formal schooling." (E) This means that resources are provided specially to help the lower SES students such that they will have a fair competition ground as their peers from higher SES. [5] Therefore, Source F proves that Source D is reliable and hence, I am not surprised by Source D [6].</p> <p>*e.g. of weak concluding statement: "Source F supports Source D..." *no CR statement = L3 (5m)</p>	
L4	<p>Critical analysis based on provenance.</p> <p>I am not surprised by Source D. This parent seems to be convincing/encouraging (W) fellow parents (A) that a child's educational opportunities is independent from their SES. (M) What matters the most is proper planning and strategising. It is stated from the source that "do not be hung up on the idea that you must be wealthy or live in private property for your child to succeed in school. If you have this mindset and rub it off on your children, it may cause itself to become true" (E). This suggests that how wealthy a child's family is does not determine their educational opportunities. The author hopes that parents will work on planning (I) with their children on how to succeed, instead of relying on financial resources to do well. As it is from a parent's perspective, he would have experienced the challenges one has to face to develop their children to succeed in the local education system. Hence, what he is sharing is reliable as it is based on a tried and tested method.</p>	[7]

(d) Study Source E.

Do you believe source E in telling you about the effects of SES on education? Explain your answer. [6]

Level	Answer	Mark
L1	<p>Undeveloped provenance or weak address of question.</p> <p>E.g. I believe Source E as it is written by representatives of official organisations, Singapore Children's Society and NUS.</p>	[1]
L2	<p>Yes/No, explained by content. Award 2 marks for weak/simplistic explanation/supporting evidence. Award 3 marks for valid explanation.</p> <p>E.g. I believe Source E as the findings are based on a research study conducted by professionals. I can infer from Source E that the SES of a child affects their educational opportunities quite vastly. (M) It is stated from the source that "we see SES differences in secondary schools as well, where entry is supposed to be determined in large part by the children's results in the PSLE. Entry is not about distance or alumni associations, yet we also see marked SES differences in elite secondary schools" (E). This means that the education system seems to be inadequate in bridging the gap and providing equal opportunities for students from different backgrounds.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>E.g. I do not believe Source E as this study was conducted based on a research in 2016. Over the past three years, new changes to the education system has been introduced and this might no longer be the trend anymore. I can infer from Source E that the SES of a child affects their educational opportunities quite vastly. (M) It is</p>	[2-3]

	<p>stated from the source that “we see SES differences in secondary schools as well, where entry is supposed to be determined in large part by the children's results in the PSLE. Entry is not about distance or alumni associations, yet we also see marked SES differences in elite secondary schools” (E). This means that the education system seems to be inadequate in bridging the gap and providing equal opportunities for students from different backgrounds.</p>	
L3	<p>L2+ Believe/not based on cross-reference. Award 4 marks for weak CR statement/explanation/ concluding statement. Award 5 marks for clear explanation and concluding statement.</p> <p>E.g. I believe Source E because Source B supports it. I can infer from Source B that the proportion of high SES students in top schools and low SES students in “disadvantaged schools” are increasing. (M) Source B states that “there is evidence to suggest that there is a “disproportionate percentage of high SES students who tend to be enrolled in ‘more prestigious secondary schools’, and the reverse is also true.” (E) This means that the advantages that come with being from a high SES background does increase the educational opportunities for a child and vice versa, similarly to Source D’s message. [4] Therefore, Source B proves that Source E is reliable and hence, I believe Source E. [5]</p> <p>OR</p> <p>E.g. I do not believe Source E as Source D contradicts it. I can infer from Source E that a child’s educational opportunities is independent from their SES. (M) The source mentions that “do not be hung up on the idea that you must be wealthy or live in private property for your child to succeed in school. If you have this mindset and rub it off on your children, it may cause itself to become true”. (E) This suggests that how wealthy a child’s family is does not determine their educational opportunities. [4] Hence, since Source D proves that Source E is unreliable, I do not believe Source E. [5]</p>	[4-5]
L4	<p>Critical analysis based on reliability of source/provenance.</p> <p>e.g. I believe Source E as the research results come from a legitimate study, and the thoughts shared provide deep insights into Singapore’s education system. The two researchers, a research officer from Singapore Children’s Society and a post-doctoral fellow at NUS are questioning (W) the role schools in Singapore play to help bridge the current advantage that children from high SES have in terms of educational opportunities (M). It is stated from the source that “we see SES differences in secondary schools as well, where entry is supposed to be determined in large part by the children's results in the PSLE. Entry is not about distance or alumni associations, yet we also see marked SES differences in elite secondary schools” (E). This means that the education system seems to be inadequate in bridging the gap and providing equal opportunities for students from different backgrounds. This is in hopes of creating more awareness among both Singaporeans and MOE/the government (A) so that more effort can be put in to help ensure fairness and to stop inequality from continuing (I) in the education system.</p>	[6]

(e) **Study all sources.**

“SES can limit a child’s educational opportunities.” Using sources from this case study, how far would you agree with this statement? **[10]**

Level	Answer	Mark
L1	<p>Writes about statement, no valid source use/explanation</p> <p>E.g. SES limits a child’s educational opportunities because it determines how much advantage they can get over their peers.</p>	[1]
L2	Yes or No, supported by valid source use/explanation	[2-4]

	<p>Award 2 marks for one stand only with use of 1 source. Award 3 marks for one stand only with use of 2 sources. Award 4 marks for one stand only with use of 3 sources.</p> <p><i>E.g. Yes, I agree with the statement as Source A supports it. Source A suggests that the SES of a child's family background provides an unfair competition ground and will affect a child's educational opportunities. (M) From the source, we can see that Student B has the help of the money bills to help him ascend the steps comfortably. This represents the ability of families with more financial resources to push their child towards success. On the other hand, we see Student A, who represents someone with no or little financial resources, struggling to climb up the steps. (E) Hence, the cartoonist feels that children from a less advantaged background will not be likely to succeed compared to those of a more privileged background [E].</i></p> <p><i>Yes, I agree with the statement as Source B supports it. Source B suggests that the low SES students in "disadvantaged schools" have little resources provided for their learning. (M) Source B mentions that "students from better socio-economic backgrounds tended to perform better at the Programme for International Student Assessment (Pisa)" and that "disadvantaged students attending disadvantaged schools are... doubly disadvantaged as they strive for achievement". (E) This means that low SES students have their educational opportunities compromised because of the little resources provided by their SES and it is further compromised because of being in 'disadvantaged schools' (E).</i></p> <p><i>Yes, I agree with the statement as Source E supports it. From Source E, I can infer that the SES of a child does indeed affect their educational opportunities quite vastly. (M) The source mentions that "we see SES differences in secondary schools as well, where entry is supposed to be determined in large part by the children's results in the PSLE. Entry is not about distance or alumni associations, yet we also see marked SES differences in elite secondary schools". (E) This means that the socioeconomical background of a child does limit their educational opportunities, and that the education system seems to be inadequate in bridging the gap and providing equal opportunities for all children. (E)</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>E.g. No, I disagree with the statement as Source C does not support it. I can infer from Source C that Singapore's education system does its best to ensure that no student and school, regardless of their background, is at a disadvantage as schools are provided with adequate resources for learning (M). Source C states that "all our schools are well-resourced by international standards. Therefore, lower-SES students...are actually not worse-off in terms of resources provided to them." (E) This means that whatever SES a child is from, it will not affect their educational opportunities.</i></p> <p><i>No, I disagree with the statement as Source D does not support it. I can infer from Source D that a child's educational opportunities is independent from their SES. (M) It is stated from the source "do not be hung up on the idea that you must be wealthy or live in private property for your child to succeed in school. If you have this mindset and rub it off on your children, it may cause itself to become true" (E). This suggests that how wealthy a child's family is does not determine their educational opportunities</i></p> <p><i>No, I disagree with the statement as Source F does not support it. I can infer from Source F that the government is channeling resources to ensure that SES does not affect a child's educational opportunities. (M) Source F states that "The Government is investing more in early education so that children from disadvantaged families do not fall too far behind before starting formal schooling." (E) This means that resources are provided specially to help the lower SES students such that they will have a fair competition ground as their peers from higher SES. As a result, in Singapore, SES does not limit a child's educational opportunities. (E)</i></p>	
--	--	--

L3	<p>Yes + No, supported by valid source use and explanation <i>Award 5 marks for both stands with use of 1:1 (2 sources)</i> <i>Award 6 marks for both stands with use of 2:1 (3 sources)</i> <i>Award 7 marks for both stands with use of 3:1, 2:2 (4 sources)</i> <i>Award 8 marks for both stands with use of 3:2 (5 sources)</i></p> <p>Note: Consideration on number of sources used and the quality of analysis in deciding on marks in L2 & L3</p>	[5-8]
	<p>** To score additional 2 marks, candidates can use any one of these 3 methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> through analysing at least one source in relation to its reliability, utility or sufficiency <i>e.g. Source D comes from a biased point of view, purely based on one individual's opinion on the matter, and cannot be generalized to the sentiments and experiences of other Singaporeans especially those from the lower SES. Also, it is not clear from the source what it truly means by being a "heartlander". It does not provide enough evidence or information about the SES of this parent as majority of Singaporean residents are "heartlanders" living in HDB flats. Hence, the success of this parent's children are not sufficient enough to prove whether SES has or has not limited the educational opportunities of the author's children. [+2]</i> by sharing example(s) from their contextual knowledge <i>e.g. I agree with the statement as in my own experiences as a Singaporean student coming from a middle income family, I have often felt afraid to lose out to my peers in terms of the number of tuition and enrichment classes I have. This has put a strain on my parents financially, as they also have my siblings to support. This is similar to what I see in Source A, where Student A, the one with no additional financial resources is struggling to climb up the steps. This reality speaks to many of my peers' experiences as we feel the inadequacy compared to our peers with higher SES, constantly struggling to achieve academically, while they seem to have it much easier, with resources and aid easily available at home. I often feel unable to keep up and reach what society labels as achievement. [+2]</i> by giving a balanced conclusion / resolution <i>e.g. Overall, I feel that SES can limit a Singaporean child's educational opportunities in the form of providing passive support handed to us in the form of tuition and enrichment classes. As mentioned in Source E, "if you started off with high SES, chances are because you have more resources, you are better prepared for PSLE, so you are more likely to get into good secondary schools". However, it is also undeniable that there is a variety of support the government provides for our students of lower SES. This is evident in Source F whereby it is mentioned that "the Government is investing more in early education so that children from disadvantaged families do not fall too far behind before starting formal schooling". In addition, bursary schemes are also available for students of lower SES to apply for. Hence, SES does limit a child's education opportunities to a certain extent, but it can be overcome by utilizing the resources available for students. [+2]</i> <p>This allows scope for candidates to decide what comes more naturally for them, and will invite meaningful thinking, without making any of the above a direct requirement.</p>	2 marks

Section B: Structured Response Question (15 marks)

2 Being Part of a Globalised World

- (a) Extract 1 shows how the elderly in Singapore are vulnerable to cyber crime.

In your opinion, how can we promote better cyber safety among the elderly? Explain your answer using **two** strategies. [7]

Level	Answer	Mark
L1	<p>Describes the topic i.e. cyber safety.</p> <p><i>E.g. Cyber safety is important to protect individuals from crime.</i></p>	[1]
L2	<p>Identifies / Describes strategies Award 2 marks for identifying one strategy and 3 marks for identifying two strategies. Award 3 marks for describing one strategy and 4 marks for describing two strategies.</p> <p><i>E.g. One way to promote better cyber safety among the elderly is by educating them on how to stay safe in cyber space. [2] The government could organize events to raise awareness, starting from mature estates, to teach the elderly how to recognize the signs of a suspicious message or advertisement they may receive. Simple and engaging games, or even talks or tests could be part of the activities during these events. In addition, information on who the elderly can get in touch with to ask for assistance or who to report these cyber scams to can be distributed to these elderly participants. [3]</i></p> <p><i>E.g. Another way to promote better cyber safety among the elderly is to encourage all Singaporeans, especially the younger generation, to guide the seniors in their homes through the use of technological devices and social media applications. [2] Families and friends have an important role to play, be it in helping seniors to better recognise common online scams and red flags, or simply spending some time to help walk them through their devices. [3]</i></p> <p>Other acceptable answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subsidise courses on cyber safety practices for seniors 	[2-4]
L3	<p>L2 + Explains the way. Award 5-6 marks for explaining one strategy. Award 6-7 marks for explaining two strategies.</p> <p>Note: An explanation is showing the effectiveness of their suggested strategy.</p> <p><i>E.g. One way to promote better cyber safety among the elderly is by educating them on how to stay safe in cyber space. [2] The government could organize events to raise awareness, starting from mature estates, to teach the elderly how to recognize the signs of a suspicious message or advertisement they may receive. Simple and engaging games, or even talks or tests could be part of the activities during these events. In addition, information on who the elderly can get in touch with to ask for assistance or who to report these cyber scams to can be distributed to these elderly participants. [3] Through engaging activities like that, the level of understanding and awareness among the elderly will increase, as they are able to prevent falling into such scams by applying what they learnt. [5] Over time, the elderly can become more empowered to protect themselves against cyber crimes and also become more equipped in the steps to take if they ever fall victim to cyber attacks. [6]</i></p> <p><i>E.g. Another way to promote better cyber safety among the elderly is to encourage all Singaporeans, especially the younger generation, to guide the seniors in their homes through the use of technological devices and social media applications. [2] Families and friends have an important role to play, be it in helping seniors to better recognise</i></p>	[5-7]

	<p>common online scams and red flags, or simply spending some time to help walk them through their devices. [3] Through this, the elderly would be more equipped to use their devices and understand how cyber criminals may exploit the loopholes in technology. [5] More importantly, as many cyber crimes exploit on the loneliness endured by seniors by offering them company and social contact in return for their money, engaging the family and friends of the seniors also provides them with a sense of social security, making them less vulnerable to such cyber attacks. [6]</p>	
--	---	--

- (b) Extracts 2 and 3 show the protective measures and preventive measures taken by the Singapore government to manage transnational terrorism.

Do you think protective measures or preventive measures is more effective in keeping Singapore safe from terrorism? Explain your answer. [8]

Level	Answer	Mark
L1	<p>Writes about the topic (i.e. transnational terrorism) but without addressing the question.</p> <p><i>E.g. Every government recognizes the importance of managing and countering transnational terrorism. [1] Because of the complex nature of it, a lot of resources are needed to manage this threat. [2]</i></p>	[1-2]
L2	<p>Describes factor(s) Award 3 marks for describing one measure. Award 4 marks for describing both measures.</p> <p><i>E.g. Protective measures are effective in keeping Singapore safe from terrorist attacks because it shields us against possible attacks. For example, surveillance is enhanced for key installations and infrastructure like power stations, as well as public places with large numbers of people. The Singapore Armed Forces (SAF) plays a vital role in protecting our borders through working closely with homeland agencies to protect key installations. [3] For instance, Jurong Island, the site of Singapore's petrochemical hub, is protected by the SAF troops, who work closely with the Singapore Police Force and Police Coast Guard, to guard the sea and land access to Jurong Island. In addition, the Navy works closely with the Police Coast Guard to guard the Sea Line of Communication and the Republic of the Singapore Air Force (RSAF) coordinates closely with Civil Aviation Authority of Singapore (CAAS) to safeguard our skies. [4]</i></p> <p><i>E.g. Preventive measures are effective in keeping Singapore safe from terrorist attacks because it serves as a deterrence against attacks. For example, Immigration Checkpoint Authority (ICA) in Singapore takes responsibility for fortifying our borders. One way is through the use of biometric technology in the immigration and clearance process and radiographic image analysis of cargo vehicles crossing Singapore's borders. [3] As part of its commitment to safeguard the region, Singapore also collaborates with other member countries in ASEAN to fight against transnational terrorism through various platforms such as the ASEAN Counter-Terrorism Workshop where countries exchange best practices so as to enhance cooperation in the region. [4]</i></p>	[3-4]
L3	<p>Explains the effectiveness of protective and/or preventive measures Award 5-6 marks for explaining one measure. Award 6-7 marks for explaining both measures.</p> <p><i>E.g. Protective measures are effective in keeping Singapore safe from terrorist attacks because it shields us against possible attacks. For example, surveillance is enhanced for key installations and infrastructure like power stations, as well as public places with large numbers of people. The Singapore Armed Forces (SAF) plays a vital role in protecting our</i></p>	[5-7]

	<p>borders through working closely with homeland agencies to protect key installations. [3] For instance, Jurong Island, the site of Singapore's petrochemical hub, is protected by the SAF troops, who work closely with the Singapore Police Force and Police Coast Guard, to guard the sea and land access to Jurong Island. In addition, the Navy works closely with the Police Coast Guard to guard the Sea Line of Communication and the Republic of the Singapore Air Force (RSAF) coordinates closely with Civil Aviation Authority of Singapore (CAAS) to safeguard our skies. [4] <u>As such, this protects people and places that are most vulnerable to terrorist attacks. These efforts also ensure that Singapore remains vigilant in the face of potential transnational terrorist threats. [5] At the same time, it also deters terrorists when they know that surveillance is enhanced in such places with laws and consequences in place, and they would not be so bold to carry out their attacks where their plans would likely face intervention. [6]</u></p> <p>E.g. Preventive measures are effective in keeping Singapore safe from terrorist attacks because it serves as a deterrence against attacks. For example, Immigration Checkpoint Authority (ICA) in Singapore takes responsibility for fortifying our borders. One way is through the use of biometric technology in the immigration and clearance process and radiographic image analysis of cargo vehicles crossing Singapore's borders. [3] As part of its commitment to safeguard the region, Singapore also collaborates with other member countries in ASEAN to fight against transnational terrorism through various platforms such as the ASEAN Counter-Terrorism Workshop where countries exchange best practices so as to enhance cooperation in the region. [4] <u>The cooperation has yielded positive outcomes for Singapore with Malaysia helping Singapore recapture its most wanted terrorist, Mas Selamat in 2009 and Indonesia foiling terrorist plans to launch a rocket to attack Marina Bay Sands from Batam in 2016. [6] These measures are hence helpful in deterring terrorists and help prevent loss of lives, destruction of property and disruption to the economy and society. [7]</u></p>	
L4	<p>Both aspects in L3 plus explains the relative importance of each factor.</p> <p>(Both examples above plus)</p> <p>E.g. I think that preventive measures are more important and effective in keeping Singapore safe against transnational terrorism. Preventive measures ensure that the threat has difficulty entering the country while protective measure ensures that the threat has difficulty in executing destruction within the country. Hence, if preventive measures are put in place, terrorists will not have access to our country in the first place and there would not be a need for protective measures.</p>	[8]