

1. How does the author illustrate his doubt when he asks, 'But who is truly walking the climate talk?' (line 5)? [2]

From the passage/Lift	Pt	Suggested Answer	Mk
<p>The carnivore who doesn't fly? (lines 5-6)</p> <p>The vegan who travels to see family abroad? (line 6)</p>	A	<p><i>The author uses the examples of</i></p> <p><b>[Identify correct examples] tension must be captured to see contradictory nature</b></p> <p>i. the carnivore who consumes meat but chooses not to take flights/be part of air travel</p> <p>and</p> <p>ii. the vegan who maintains a vegetarian diet / a diet that is not derived from animal sources but chooses air travel/to take flights</p> <p>Do not accept generic answers or name dropping of examples. There must be reference to specific behaviours of the examples.</p> <p>Both examples (i. &amp; ii.) required since identifying only one party who is hypocritical would not necessarily illustrate his doubt (see note for B)</p>	1m
<p>Note: In asking 'who is truly walking the climate talk?' (line 5) the author is expressing doubt that <u>anyone</u> is walking the climate talk</p>	B	<p><b>[Explain/Link: Actions of both are hypocritical or both harm the environment in some way]</b></p> <p>to show that</p> <p>1. both are <u>hypocritical</u> / only <u>helping the environment superficially</u>.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>2. both <u>help the environment in one way but harm it in another</u>.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>3. both their actions are <u>contradictory/inconsistent</u>.</p> <p>Note: For B1, accept any answer that conveys the idea of saying one thing but doing something different For B3, it is wrong if the contradiction is shown to be between the carnivore and the vegan.</p>	1m

2. Explain the author's use of the word 'even' in line 18. [2]

From the passage/Lift	Pt	Suggested Answer	Mk
		<i>He uses 'even' to...</i>	
... even hundreds of scientists, choosing to never fly again is not going to help the environment. (lines 18-19)  If students go further up in the text, then 0.	A	<b>Function/Meaning</b> highlight the <u>severity / insignificance</u> of  Note: 'extent of' on its own is insufficient because the 'what' it is referring to is unclear	1m
	B	<b>Context</b> i. <u>climate change such that hundreds more of scientists foregoing flying is not going to mitigate it.</u>  OR  ii. <u>hundreds of scientists foregoing flying in protecting / saving the environment.</u>	1m

3. What is the strategy of 'industry-funded' (line 21) campaigns? [2]

From the passage/Lift	Pt	Suggested Answer	Mk
There is a long history of industry-funded 'deflection campaigns' (line 21)		<i>The strategy is to</i>	
aiming to <b>divert</b> <u>attention</u> from big polluters (lines 21-22)	A	<b>[Divert attention from themselves]</b> to <b>redirect</b> <u>focus</u> away <b>from</b> / <b>avert</b> <u>criticism</u> of themselves / companies that contaminate / harm the environment greatly and	1m
and place the <b>burden</b> on individuals. (line 22)	B	<b>[Make individuals responsible]</b> lay / put the <b>responsibility / obligation</b> on individuals / people instead. OR make individuals / people <b>responsible</b> instead.	1m

4. In lines 31-32, why does the author place additional information in brackets? [2]

From the passage/Lift	Pt	Suggested Answer	Mk
		<i>The author places additional information in brackets...</i>	
... we have tactics to bring <u>environmentally friendly</u> (and to be clear, these need not be <u>lifestyle-disrupting</u> ) options to fruition... (lines 31-32)  Note: Tension must be captured	A	<b>Function</b> to <u>emphasise / highlight / clarify</u> that  BOD: qualify (reasonable answer but no textual evidence for it)	1m
	B1	<b>Context</b> <b>[Environmentally friendly]</b> there are choices (optional: to reduce our carbon footprint / emissions) that are <b>beneficial / helpful</b> to the climate	1m
	B2	<b>[Inconvenience]</b> but <u>need not require changes / modifications to people's way of living / daily routines.</u>  Note: Allow lift of "life", as in 'way of life'	

5. According to the author, what is an important consideration when 'putting a price on carbon' (lines 33-34)? [1]

From the passage/Lift	Pt	Suggested Answer	Mk
But a price on carbon needs to be designed such that (lines 36-37)		<i>It should be made such that / We need to ensure that</i>	1m or 0
marginalised communities <u>most at risk</u> from such a climate impact (line 37)	A	disadvantaged groups with the <u>greatest exposure</u> to the effects of the climate  Note: 'marginalised' need not be captured, since this is a 1-mark question	
aren't <b>adversely</b> impacted <u>economically</u> as well. (lines 37-38)	B	are not <b>worse off / negatively affected financially / monetarily.</b>  Note: Accept answers that convey a negative economic impact in other ways, as long as sensible.	

6. What is the author implying when he says that we ‘need change not just at the breakfast table, but at the ballot box as well’? (lines 40-41) [2]

From the passage/Lift	Pt	Suggested Answer	Mk
		<i>He is suggesting that change is required</i>	
We need change not just at the <u>breakfast table</u> , (line 40)	A	<b>[Inferred: Change at personal level]</b> in terms of people’s <u>lifestyle / personal choices</u>  Do not accept: specific examples of lifestyle choices	1m
but at the <u>ballot box</u> as well. (lines 40-41)	B	<b>[Inferred: Change at policy level]</b>  and (optional: just as importantly,) in terms of <u>policies / laws / government measures</u> as well.  Note: ‘policies’ or ‘laws’, by definition, already signify changes at the policy level. For answers that signify general changes, there should be a modifier to signify the involvement of the government or state Do not accept if answer merely describes the act of voting	1m
Accept any answer that sufficiently captures the idea of change at the personal level or policy level, but not answers that are too closely/literally related to “breakfast table” or “ballot box”.			
No marks at all if ‘at the breakfast table’ and/or ‘at the ballot box’ are lifted, since there is no understanding shown.			

## From Passage 2

7. Summarise why personal action is important to climate change and how people should go about tackling it.

Write your summary in **no more than 120 words**.

From passage	Pt	Suggested paraphrase
... individual behaviour changes are not only required but <b>righteous</b> . (lines 1-2)	A	<b>[WHY: Principle of being morally correct]</b>
OR		Personal action is <b>ethical / moral</b> .
... the more important issue of <b>integrity</b> (line 4)		OR Personal action is important because we need to be <u>honest / upright</u> .

... we need to <b>walk the talk</b> . (line 4)	B	<b>[WHY: Action must match words]</b>  Also, we need to <b>align our actions with our words</b> .
... makes an attempt to align our individual actions with our <u>role</u> as <u>public citizens</u> . (lines 5-6)	C	<b>[WHY: It is our civic duty]</b>  It is our <u>responsibility / duty</u> as <u>citizens</u> to.
This doesn't have to involve <u>foisting guilt on people</u> (lines 6-7)	D	<b>[HOW: Not shame others]</b>  We do not have to <u>shame others</u>
it should take the form of a <b>steely determination</b> to <u>transform our way of living</u> . (lines 7-8)	E	<b>[HOW: Act with resolve to transform our lives]</b> but should act with <b>firm resolve</b> to <u>change our lifestyles</u> .
... we are <u>making a statement</u> that our actions matter (line 10)	F	<b>[WHY: Taking a stand]</b>  In acting, we <u>assert / proclaim</u> that our behaviours / deeds have significance. OR Our actions <u>send a message</u> that our behaviours / deeds have significance.
... it <u>amplifies political activism</u> . (lines 10-11)  OR  [personal action] act as a kind of alloy that <u>strengthens political activism</u> (line 18)	G	<b>[WHY: Strengthens ground up initiatives]</b>  but (actually) <u>enlarges / enhances / increases the magnitude of political advocacy / action</u> .  OR  but actually serves as a catalyst that <u>enhances / maximises political advocacy / action</u> .
... we are likely to find that the effort is <b>empowering</b> (lines 13-14)  OR  ... we feel like we are <b>in control</b> (line 15)  OR  ... perhaps then we'll feel more <b>empowered</b> (line 16)	H	<b>[WHY: Personal enablement]</b>  We feel <b>enabled / inspired / motivated</b> .  Do not accept if idea refers to others being enabled or inspired  OR  We feel like we are <b>in charge / on top of things</b>  OR  We feel like we have <b>agency</b>

... to <u>take control of</u> —or at least <u>play a role</u> in—larger <u>political</u> systems. (lines 15-16)	I	<p><b>[WHY: Influencing political systems]</b></p> <p>Consequently, we feel we have <u>agency</u> / <u>a part</u> in <u>shaping politics/influencing political structures</u>.</p> <p>Do not accept: 'shaping society' because the focus is on shaping policy-making.</p>
Taking the first step in walking more lightly on the planet is all the more important because it <u>creates momentum</u> . (lines 18-19)	J	<p><b>[WHY: Personal action generates force]</b></p> <p>Initiating action is very significant as it <u>generates force for</u> / <u>reduces inertia for change</u> / <u>progress</u>.</p>
...should ... <u>stop</u> rhetorically <u>putting personal action and collective action in opposition</u> to each other as if there were some kind of activism <b>zero-sum game</b> (lines 23-24)	K	<p><b>[How: Stop treating personal and collective action as mutually exclusive]</b></p> <p><u>We should cease pitting individual action against political / community action</u> as if they are <b>at odds / contradictory / mutually exclusive</b>.</p> <p><b>Note: Accept positive connotations of the idea (See Script C)</b></p>
Ultimately, <u>how, when, where, and in what form</u> to act is up to you. (line 23)	L	<p><b>[HOW: Personal action can take different forms]</b></p> <p>Individual action can be <u>expressed in a variety of ways</u>. OR We / Individuals are free to decide <u>what changes to make</u>.</p>
<p>The most important thing is simply <u>to act</u> ... (lines 23-24)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>and <u>not overthink</u> it. (line 24)</p> <p>Note: Don't let anyone tell us differently (line 24) is a reiteration of the advice in lines 23-24.</p>	M	<p><b>[HOW: Simply act / do not overthink]</b></p> <p>The key is to</p> <p>just <u>make changes</u>.</p> <p>OR</p> <p><u>stop over-analysing / ruminating over</u> the issue.</p>

<b>Points</b>	1-2	3-4	5	6	7	8	9	10+
<b>Marks</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

**Suggested Summary:**

*Personal action is not only necessary but ethical.<sup>A</sup> More crucially, our actions must align with our words.<sup>B</sup> It is our duty as citizens to.<sup>C</sup> We do not have to blame others,<sup>D</sup> but should firmly resolve to change our lifestyles.<sup>E</sup> In acting, we proclaim that our deeds have significance.<sup>F</sup> Personal action enhances political advocacy<sup>G</sup> and is significant because it is personally enabling.<sup>H</sup> Consequently, we feel we have a part in shaping politics.<sup>I</sup> Initiating action is very significant as it reduces inertia for change.<sup>J</sup> We should cease pitting individual action against political action as if they are mutually exclusive.<sup>K</sup> Individual action can be expressed in a variety of ways.<sup>L</sup> The key is to just make changes and stop over-analysing the issue.<sup>M</sup>*

(13 points, 119 words)

**From all the passages**

Note to Markers: Justification for this section should be original and not be rehashed from existing text material.

8. Passage 1 states that ‘That level of sacrifice is unacceptable to most.’ (lines 9-10)

Identify **one** specific idea from Passage 3 which can be used to support this statement. Justify your answer. [2]

Pt	From Passage 3	Suggested answer	Mk
A	The truth is this: people want to reduce their plastic usage without <u>giving up convenience</u> . (lines 10-11)	<p><b>Identify</b>                      The idea from Passage 3, found in lines 10-11, is that consumers / people only wish / are only prepared to cut down / minimise their utilisation / consumption of plastic if / provided they do not have to <u>sacrifice / surrender / let go of ease / comfort</u>.</p> <p>Accept “efficiency” (while it is not exactly the same as “convenience”, they are closely related)</p> <p>Note: Allow lift of “plastic”</p>	1m
B		<p><b>Justify</b>  <i>This supports the claim in Passage 2 because</i></p> <p><b>B1 [Use of example/evidence to support point]</b>                      it <u>provides / gives a specific example</u>                      OR it <u>exemplifies / demonstrates / shows the unwillingness of most people to sacrifice / give up something important</u> to help the environment / reduce their climate cost, (optional: which in this case, is ease / comfort).</p>	1m



		<p><b>B2</b> <b>[Commonality/Similarity]</b> the passages similarly suggest / it mirrors the idea that saving the environment requires sacrifices unacceptable to most because people would only try to help the environment if they do not have to give up anything significant in their lives.</p> <p><b>B3</b> <b>[Future projection]</b> it suggests that if people are already loath to give up minor comforts, they are <u>even less likely to make changes that demand significant effort</u>, like the ones suggested in Passage 1.</p> <p>For both B1 and B2, <b>no marks</b> for answers that mention convenience specifically, without broadening the explanation to include something important that people are simply not prepared to sacrifice, which is the idea from Passage 1</p>	
--	--	--	--

9. Passage 2 states that the ‘most important thing is simply to act and not overthink it.’ (lines 23-24)

Identify **one** specific idea from Passage 3 which can be used to undermine this statement.  
Justify your answer. [2]

Pt	From Passage 3	Suggested answer	Mk
A	<p>We ought to consider the impact of our actions <b>carefully</b> ... (line 12)</p> <p>... instead of <b>jumping on the bandwagon.</b>’ (lines 12-13)</p>	<p><b>Identify</b> The idea from Passage 3, found in lines 12-13, is that we / people who wish to protect the environment must</p> <p>think about / analyse the effects / consequences / ramifications of the changes we make <b>thoroughly / thoughtfully</b></p> <p>OR</p> <p>not <u>simply / merely / unthinkingly</u> <b>join in a popular movement / follow</b></p>	1m

		<p><b>what many others are already doing.</b></p> <p>Note: Students only need to capture either 'simply to act' or 'not overthink it' (from Passage 2)</p>	
B		<p><b>Justify</b> <i>This undermines the idea in Passage 2 because</i></p> <p><b>B1 [Contradiction/Difference]</b> it is advising us to not hop on trends or make changes to our lifestyle without thoroughly understanding / analysing the effects our actions, instead of to act first, which <u>is the exact opposite of what is advised in Passage 2.</u></p> <p><b>No marks</b> for answers that merely assert that Passage 3 is contrary to Passage 2 without justifying why</p> <p><b>B2 [Future projection]</b> it suggests that if we act first without attempting to think about the likely effects of our actions, like Passage 2 says we should do, we <u>may not help the environment / could end up doing harm to the environment.</u></p>	1m

10. How far do you agree that personal action is necessary to address climate change in your society?

Support your answer with reference to:

- the ideas and opinions from at least one of the reading passages
- examples drawn from your own experience and that of your society

### Key reminders for the AQ

1. Text material should be selected appropriately based on two main metrics – relevance and evaluative potential. The most relevant points are the ideas that could be reasonably linked to the ***necessity of personal action***, which is the focus given in the question. In fact, many answers focused primarily on ideas that concern the feasibility and/or effectiveness instead, and very often solely on political action rather than personal action. Note that a sustained focus on the requirements of the question is a key parameter for a response to be placed in Band 4.

Evaluative potential is a function of how far you are able to link the applicability of an idea to specific characteristics of Singapore, and whether there are appropriate examples for support.

Generally, **opinion-based ideas or arguments have greater evaluative potential compared to fact-based claims or observations.**

- E.g. Say a student selects line 1 of passage 1, where Mann asserts that ‘everyone faces choices every day that carry a climate cost’, as the point to evaluate. This is a largely uncontentious observation that would hold true to a large extent regardless of the society concerned, and is unlikely to allow for good evaluation.
- Other ideas that some students selected that they often could do little proper evaluation with was Mann’s point that ‘we need to put a price on carbon’ (line 13); Marks’ point that we need to keep ‘insisting that individual behaviour changes are ... required’ (lines 1-2); and Ma’s point that ‘the only guaranteed way to make a difference [is] to stop using single-use straws altogether’ (lines 13-14) . If you select these points, your response will be limited to identifying simple, illustrative points of confluence or divergence.

2. The skill that the AQ requires but which students still seemed confused about is Evaluation. Evaluation is your ability to judge the applicability of specific points made by the author(s) to the context of Singapore, through the use of logical justification and explanation. The quality of your evaluation is determined by a combination of how well elaborated/developed and how well informed it is by relevant knowledge of Singapore’s specific context (such as history, politics, social norms).

Often, **students confuse evaluation with illustration.** A common strategy is to offer supporting examples to show or ‘prove’ that the idea chosen is applicable to Singapore, and conversely to provide counter-examples to ‘disprove’ an idea and show that it is inapplicable or not relevant to Singapore. Given the descriptive nature and lack of reasoning involved, such an approach is not evaluative.

Of course, examples do play an important role as support for your evaluation, and when **selected appropriately and equipped with relevant key details**, help to enhance cogency and make your evaluation more convincing.

- In terms of selection, some students focus on environmental issues such as biodiversity advocacy, with the protection of Chek Jawa being commonly cited. However, the subject matter for the AQ is climate change, so examples that focused solely on protection against environmental harm or degradation are not the most appropriate.
- Another observation is that some students included details highlighting salient Singapore characteristics in their examples, but may not link them sufficiently to the issue of climate change. An example of this is how some may provide details illustrating Singapore’s low tolerance for public protest, citing the law against illegal assembly and/or the need for groups to apply for permits, but neglecting to link this to a dearth of or a clampdown on climate-related protests/activism.

3. **Do engage with ideas in FULL.** Where relationships exist between ideas, evaluate those relationships as well, **rather than engage with points in a piecemeal fashion.**
- For instance, a good number of students chose to evaluate Marks' point about the significance of personal action in allowing citizens to 'align ... individual actions with [people's] role as public citizens' (line 6). The key idea here is that personal action is a way for people to fulfil their civic responsibilities or duty as citizens. Many students, however, simply ignored this key aspect, and in fact many simply turned it into a much more general point about the importance of personal action.
4. **Develop your evaluation to logical conclusions.**
- The key distinction between attempted evaluation (Band 3) and convincing evaluation (Band 4) is development and support, in terms of both elaboration of your claims and effective illustration through the purposeful use of appropriate examples.

While some students went beyond merely illustrating selected ideas from the passages, it was still all too common to see students offer a single assertive statement as evaluation. E.g. Saying that Marks' point that people 'need to walk the talk' (line 4) is not that applicable to Singaporeans because of our competitive society.

While there is conceivably some relationship between Singaporean society being competitive and Singaporeans thereby choosing not to walk the talk when it comes to saving the climate, **the logical links should be explained and 'fleshed out' as thoroughly as possible.** Conscientious students may choose to delve into Singapore's history, or cultural environment to explain where our sense of competitiveness stems from, which is still useful depth, but the most crucial development is ultimately the **logical relationship between competitiveness and an aversion or refusal to 'walk the talk'**, because that is the **crux of your evaluation.**

A related reminder is that **chaining together a series of related but separate assertions is not necessarily development or depth**, particularly when each assertion is perceived as being a separate reason for why the idea applies to a good extent or not so much.

***From Passage 1***

<b>Broad idea: Personal action necessary, but unrealistic</b>		
<b>Passage/ Para</b>	<b>Author argues that</b>	<b>Possible areas of evaluation</b>
Passage 1, Para 1	<u>Lines 9-10</u> "That level of sacrifice is unacceptable to most."	<i>Mann argues that while personal sacrifices are very much required if societies are to combat climate change effectively, most individuals find it "unacceptable" (line 9) to make concessions in significant aspects of their lives.</i>  <b><u>AGREE:</u></b>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This aversion to making fundamental changes or giving up significant aspects of one's lifestyle is also mirrored in Singapore, given <b><u>how much convenience and the material trappings of a good life are prioritised by Singaporeans.</u></b></li> </ul> <p><b><u>Possible EV &amp; examples as support</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Singapore's rapid development in a relatively short period of fifty odd years coupled with the current high standard of living have <b>acclimatised most Singaporeans to a comfortable lifestyle and a certain sense of entitlement when it comes to material well-being.</b> Our societal preoccupation with materialism is well-documented, so much so that periodically, there would be calls by concerned stakeholders for us to redefine the infamous 5C's that many Singaporeans desire and chase after – including car, cash, credit card, country club, and condominium – to embrace less material forms of success. This means that <b>Singaporeans are generally loathe to give up material possessions and aspects of a good life, especially as these are often seen as status symbols or markers of one's hard-earned success, regardless of the effects acquiring such symbols of success may have on the environment.</b> For example, despite the negative effects of car transport on the environment being so evident and there being a high quality alternative in the form of Singapore's world class public transport system, many Singaporeans continue to bid aggressively for Certificates of Entitlement (COEs) as they are unwilling to give up car ownership, regularly driving up COE prices into 6-figure amounts even for small cars.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>DISAGREE:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b><u>Due to higher levels of engagement with the issue of climate change,</u></b> attitudes amongst young Singaporeans are becoming more proactive and gaining a greater degree of urgency, and so Mann's point is becoming less applicable to Singapore.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Possible EV &amp; examples as support</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Somewhat ironically, <b>the momentum for personal climate action in Singapore comes partially from the visibility of the government's climate change efforts,</b> ranging from the well-publicised Singapore Green Plan 2030 to the ambitious target to be achieve net zero emissions by 2050 as part of her Long-Term Low-Emissions Development Strategy, as well as <b>the effectiveness of school and public climate education,</b> such as the Eco Stewardship Programme for all schools up to pre-university levels.</li> </ul>
--	--	--

		<p><b>Combined with greater exposure to climate advocacy through social media and the uptick in climate action initiatives</b> like WWF Earth Hour, and the SG Climate Rally, <b>climate-positive attitudes are taking a greater hold here.</b> In particular, young Singaporeans in particular are reported as feeling a greater sense of pressure about the climate crisis, as reported in the TODAY Youth Survey 2022, with half of those surveyed reporting that they have made lifestyle changes in response to climate change. Another survey, conducted by the Institute of Policy Studies in 2021, found that younger Singaporeans are more likely to feel that the environment should be prioritised even over economic growth, which is tantamount to a willingness to jeopardise their economic well-being or livelihoods as long as the climate is better addressed.</p>
<p>Passage 1, Para 5</p>	<p><u>Lines 40-41</u> “We need change not just at the breakfast table, but at the ballot box as well.”</p>	<p><i>Mann argues that while personal action is necessary, it is not the full equation to solving the climate change issue, when he reminds readers that an alteration of the status quo is important “not just at the breakfast table, but at the ballot box as well” (lines 40-41).</i></p> <p><b><u>AGREE:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In fact, equal prioritisation of the ‘ballot box’ and ‘breakfast table’ might be particularly crucial in the case of Singapore, <b><u>in terms of potentially cultivating a greater sense of ownership amongst Singaporeans amidst an environment where the government has been a principal driver in climate action.</u></b></li> </ul> <p><b><u>Possible EV &amp; examples as support</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This may seem counterintuitive, given that the Singapore government has arguably been one of the more proactive ones around when it comes to environmentally beneficial systemic change, but emphasising that change is required at every level is <b>crucial to jolting Singaporeans out of a false sense of complacency and a relatively laid-back outlook when it comes to saving the climate.</b> The Singapore government has approached the task of addressing climate change with its usual ‘brand’ of forward-looking, efficiency-driven governance, bringing about holistic, durable national policies that aim to address climate change on multiple fronts. These range from the multifaceted Singapore Green Plan 2030, structured around key pillars like Sustainable Living, Energy Reset, and Green Economy; to specific initiatives like the Zero Waste Masterplan that strives to reduce waste sent to the Semakau Landfill by 30% by 2030 and the OneMillionTrees project to restore nature back into Singapore’s urban centres. <b>Ironically, these efforts seem to have</b></li> </ul>

		<p><b>contributed to lowering Singaporeans' sense of urgency when it comes to climate change.</b> In the Southeast Asia Climate Outlook 2023 Survey, less than half of the Singaporean respondents saw climate change as a critical and pressing threat, which is the lowest amongst all the Southeast Asian nations. A particularly revealing finding showed that there were positive perceptions regarding how impactful various government agencies' plans to improve energy and food security have been, and this has consequently raised Singaporeans' trust in the government's ability to protect them from climate change, leading to a <b>corresponding decline to the sense of responsibility Singaporeans may feel towards improving the climate.</b> While it is unlikely that many Singaporeans would think that a change in government is required, seeing as the government is actually the most proactive stakeholder in dealing with the climate, <b>stressing the importance of climate activism on top of personal lifestyle changes could inject a greater sense of urgency through creating a positive feedback loop in terms of personal responsibility for the climate.</b></p> <p><b><u>DISAGREE:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• However, in the context of Singapore, where <b><u>climate policy is already largely well-considered, proactive, and comprehensive</u></b>, this point is less applicable in the sense that the need for the people to advocate for the climate through the 'ballot box' is significantly lower.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Possible EV &amp; examples as support</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Several factors contribute to the Singapore government stepping up more decisively in its efforts against climate change.</b> As outlined by Senior Minister and Coordinating Minister for National Security Teo Chee Hean in the 2023 Committee of Supply Debate, <b>climate change poses a substantial existential threat to Singapore on multiple fronts</b> – Singapore is vulnerable to rising sea levels as a low-lying island; we are also prone to the 'heat island effect', being highly urbanised; finally, as a heavy importer of essential resources, our food and water security also comes under severe strain due to erratic weather patterns worsened by a warming planet. Additionally, SM Teo also disclosed that seizing the initiative in <b>fully realising Singapore's climate action also yields strategic benefits for Singapore</b> in that it puts us in good stead as a key player for businesses and investors in the region that are keen to participate in the green economy. The more Singapore translates innovative ideas and practices into feasible policies and sustainable</li> </ul>
--	--	---

		<p>infrastructure, the more we can capture new economic opportunities, as the region take concrete steps towards greater sustainability. For example, according to Reuters, Singapore is keen to become Southeast Asia’s carbon hub, and has been offering related services such as carbon monitoring, credit verification and climate risk analysis. <b>Coupled with Singapore’s status as an international aviation and shipping hub, moving quickly to introduce a carbon tax, establish organisations dedicated to research like Monetary Authority of Singapore (MAS)’s Singapore Green Finance Centre and setting up Climate Impact X, a voluntary carbon exchange, allows Singapore to ride the ‘Green Wave’ of global climate transition.</b> That effective climate action and systemic change is already taking place at the policy level means that it is far less important for Singaporeans to use the ‘ballot box’ to fight for positive change.</p>
<p>Passage 2, Para 4</p>	<p><u>Line 17</u> “Which is to say that personal action and collective, political action are self-reinforcing.”</p>	<p><i>Marks asserts that not only is personal action important, there is in fact a mutually beneficial relationship between it and ‘collective, political action’ (line 17).</i></p> <p><b><u>AGREE:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmentally friendly actions in Singapore are both driven by personal action from the ground which in turn encourages, and are encouraged, by political action, <b><u>due to sensible policies as well as a level of trust between the people and the government.</u></b></li> </ul> <p><b><u>Possible EV &amp; examples as support</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Considering Singapore’s vulnerability to climate change as an island nation, it stands to reason that the government and its people would see the importance of adopting environmentally friendly policies and lifestyles.</b> In recent years, we have seen how personal action and political action have been self-reinforcing. This is due to government campaigns and policies, which in turn has encouraged more grassroots activism and green literacy amongst the general public. Government efforts to raise awareness and encourage participation have been wide ranging. For example, the National Environment Agency (NEA)’s annual Clean &amp; Green Singapore (CGS) event organised more than 400 Clean &amp; Green activities, such as schools, grassroots, NGO and corporate events, talks, workshops, and visits to site of environmental interests. <b>The government has also given incentives to nudge public behaviour</b> such as a rebate on buying E.V cars, to more punitive policies such as a charge for all plastic bags at supermarkets. <b>Years of such green efforts have led to youths being highly aware of environmental</b></li> </ul>



		<p><b>issues</b> and it is quite common to see students organising green events to promote Upcycling, Recycling or simply bringing their own disposable cutlery. Similarly, due to such national policies, there is change in public behaviour. Singaporeans have grown accustomed to using re-usable bags for our everyday grocery shopping, and there is a clear increase in ownership of EVs. Conversely, it can also be argued that the pro-green efforts by the government is seen as a response to personal actions and activism from the people, signalling a desire for policies that will protect the environment. <b>The government has regularly consulted the people through formal dialogues</b>, the latest one being the Emerging Stronger Conversations. Coupled with movements like the online campaign to stop using plastic straws and the SG Climate Rally, the government have realised that Singaporeans do care about issues to do with sustainability and the environment.</p>
<p>Passage 2, Para 3</p>	<p><u>Lines 15-16</u> “And when we’re in control of our own life, perhaps then we’ll feel more empowered to take control of—or at least play a role in—larger political systems.”</p>	<p><b><u>DISAGREE:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While environmentally friendly actions are encouraged by the Singapore government, the ability for individuals to take control, influence or coerce larger political systems in Singapore are limited <b><u>due to the restrictions on any form of activism in Singapore.</u></b></li> </ul> <p><b><u>Possible EV &amp; examples as support</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compared to activism for other more sensitive issues, <b>rallies and talks concerning climate change are usually given more latitude, as they are probably politically more neutral.</b> Yet, such rallies are <b>still bound by local laws restricting public assemblies and protests</b>, and consequently confined to Hong Lim Park and only after police permission has been granted. The scale of larger environmental marches held in other cities, carried out to pressurise politicians into action, is simply unlikely to happen in Singapore. Acts of climate activism that failed to meet the prevailing regulations have in fact being met with the force of the law. For example, when a teenager stood outside ExxonMobil’s Singapore office, holding up messages scrawled on pieces of paper that read, “Planet over Profit”, “School Strike 4 Climate”, she was summoned by the police for questioning and her phone confiscated. Such restrictions, being <b>repeated and public, have a chilling effect amongst young activists</b> and seemingly <b>leaves an unspoken rule that</b> events encouraging green protests are permissible but <b>criticisms of government policies, partnerships, or attempts to force government action will not be tolerated.</b> Arguably, it <b>reinforces the view that Singapore’s pragmatism and unflagging focus on orderliness mean that even environmental</b></li> </ul>

		<p><b>concerns will take a backseat.</b> In this way, while green activism is possible and somewhat present in Singapore, there are clear limits to the extent individuals may influence the 'larger political system' here.</p>
<p>Passage 3, Para 4</p>	<p><u>Lines 12-13</u> "We ought to consider the impact of our actions carefully instead of jumping on the bandwagon."</p>	<p><i>Ma argues that personal action, while necessary, should be done after thoughtful assessment of the consequences; we should not blindly follow popular green trends.</i></p> <p><b><u>AGREE:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Her advice is definitely applicable to Singaporeans, as the younger generation in particular, are <b><u>deeply plugged into social media. Coupled with a consumerist mindset</u></b>, our youths are highly susceptible to the latest environmental trends in the adoption of environmentally-friendly habits.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Possible EV &amp; examples as support</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Singaporeans are known to spend over two hours daily on social media, with 27% of users frequently turning to these platforms for shopping. <b>The sheer scale to which Singaporeans' lives revolve around social media increases our exposure to social media fads and crazes</b>, and this is no different for those that concern saving the climate. <b>The rise of social media influencers and trends drives consumerism</b>, often leveraging buzzwords like 'reusable,' 'recycled,' or 'sustainable' to rationalise purchases. A notable example is the TikTok-driven craze for Stanley cups or Owala water bottles. While these bottles are indeed a more eco-friendly alternative to plastic ones, <b>social media's tendency to reward acts of virtue-signalling in terms of 'likes' and increased following</b> often lead otherwise well-meaning consumers to purchase multiple bottles — sometimes even an entire collection. Consequently, the bottles are used far less frequently than necessary to offset their environmental impact, ultimately contributing to more waste and harming our efforts against climate change.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>DISAGREE:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b><u>Due to growing awareness of greenwashing and greenhushing</u></b> (the practice where companies underreport or deliberately withhold information about their environmental efforts and achievements), Singaporeans are more likely to be cautious rather than simply hop on green trends.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Possible EV &amp; examples as support</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With a global shift to focus on sustainability and climate responsibility in recent years, Singaporeans' exposure to and knowledge of the topic has increased</li> </ul>

		<p><b>exponentially.</b> Whether it is in the announcement of the Singapore Green Plan 2030, the charging for single-use plastic bags and takeaway containers, or removal of plastic straws from some F&amp;B outlets, Singaporeans are now more sensitised to various climate change movements. <b>With high levels of education and media literacy rates, most Singaporeans are well equipped to pause and think of the sustainability claims products are making before buying into them. Even when not all Singaporeans are able to, there are self-regulatory bodies to inform them.</b> In December 2023, a PRISM+ advertisement claims that their air-conditioner was the “best tip” to “save Earth”. The advert was called out by Singapore’s advertising standards watchdog ASAS (Advertising Standards Authority of Singapore) for its unsubstantiated claims and PRISM+ later removed the advert. Such incidents send a strong signal to Singaporeans to be mindful of greenwashing and for them to consider carefully if their actions will indeed aid sustainability efforts. Earlier this year, a survey by South Pole reported that 40% of Singaporean companies were greenhushing — deliberately under-reporting their environmental, social and governance initiatives — to avoid scrutiny. <b>The dissemination of such information helps to educate Singaporeans on the importance of making informed decisions that contribute meaningfully and positively to sustainability efforts.</b></p>
<p>Passage 3, Para 5</p>	<p><u>Lines 16-17</u> “Ultimately, we need to change our lifestyles so that we use items that can be used again and again.”</p>	<p><i>Ma argues that the necessity of personal action is ultimately dependent on whether the specific actions taken are indeed based on careful, calculated changes to one’s lifestyle that would truly aid efforts to combat climate change, such as using ‘items that can be used again and again’ (lines 16-17).</i></p> <p><b><u>AGREE:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is particularly relevant in <b>consumer-driven Singapore, where individuals both willing and able to spend on ‘green’ alternatives.</b> Together with a <b>superficial understanding of climate change issues and efforts,</b> thoughtless personal action exacerbates the problem.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Possible EV &amp; examples as support</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fuelled by consumerist tendencies and a superficial understanding of personal responsibility, many Singaporeans are eager to spend on products that are <b>marketed as environmentally friendly.</b> They believe that purchasing these items will help ‘save the Earth,’ but often fail to recognise that their actions may be contributing to the problem. For instance, it has become common to collect reusable cotton tote bags, whether through purchases or as gifts from well-meaning companies. Yet, these bags</li> </ul>

2024 RI Y6 General Paper Preliminary Examinations  
Paper 2 Answer Scheme  
For Internal Circulation Only

		<p>frequently go unused, piling up without serving their intended purpose. Prior to the 2024 National Day Parade, President Tharman Shanmugaratnam addressed this issue by promoting recycled polyester reusable fun packs, highlighting that cotton totes, despite their good intentions, have detrimental consequences due to the resources required for cotton cultivation, production, and transportation. In his Facebook post, he emphasised that “the single use of a bag — whether plastic, paper, or any other material — is the worse for the environment. So, let’s reuse bags as much as we can.” This underscores the reality that <b>while many Singaporeans feel a sense of accomplishment in their supposed contributions to fighting climate change, in their hurry to access this ‘feel-good’ factor, they may inadvertently be worsening the environmental crisis.</b></p>
--	--	---