

<b>Name:</b>		<b>Index Number:</b>		<b>Class:</b>	
--------------	--	----------------------	--	---------------	--



# **CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL**

## **Preliminary Examination**

### **Secondary 4 (O-Level Programme)**

---

<b>Humanities (Social Studies, Geography)</b>	<b>2272/01</b>
<b>Humanities (Social Studies, History)</b>	<b>2273/01</b>
<b>Humanities (Social Studies, Literature)</b>	<b>2274/01</b>

Paper 1: Social Studies

Additional Materials:      Answer Booklet

**30 August 2021**  
**1 hr 45 mins**

---

Section A	/ 35 m
Section B	/ 15 m
<b>Total</b>	<b>/ 50 marks</b>

---

This document consists of **7** printed pages.

**SECTION A (Source-Based Case Study)**

This section is **compulsory** for all candidates.

**Exploring Citizenship and Governance**

Study the Background Information and the sources carefully, and then answer all the questions.

You may use any of the sources to help you to answer the questions, in addition to those sources, which you are told to use. In answering the questions, you should use your knowledge of the issue to help you interpret and evaluate the sources.

**1** Study Source A.

What is the message of the cartoonist? Explain your answer. [5]

**2** Study Source B.

Why did the Prime Minister make the speech? Explain your answer. [6]

**3** Study Sources C and D.

Does Source D prove that the concerns raised in Source C are unjustified? Explain your answer. [7]

**4** Study Sources E and F.

Having read Source E, are you surprised by Source F? Explain your answer. [7]

**5** 'Vaccination is the best way to combat the spread of Covid-19.'

Using sources in this case study, explain how far you would agree with this statement. [10]

## Covid-19 Vaccination: Public interest or personal right?

### BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Read this carefully. It may help you to answer some of the questions.

Since December 2019, the Coronavirus 2019 (Covid-19), a serious and infectious respiratory disease, has infected over 200 million people and caused over 4 million deaths. Governments worldwide have struggled to contain the spread of the disease as well as manage the severe economic and social impacts. Apart from mandating safe management measures such as the wearing of face masks, quarantining the sick and tightening borders, governments have also embarked on vaccination drives to immunise their population in a bid to achieve herd immunity\*. Some organisations, particularly those working in the frontline sectors like healthcare, have made vaccination compulsory for their employees while some have pushed governments to introduce mandatory vaccinations. However, the anti-vaxxers\*\* have questioned the efficacy of the vaccines and claim that it infringes on their personal rights.

Read the following sources to find out whether the Covid-19 vaccination should be one of public interest or personal right.

\* Herd immunity is achieved when a majority of people in a population are immune to a virus or disease. It is achieved through vaccination or natural infection, leading to reduced transmission.

\*\* A person who is opposed to vaccination

**Source A:** A cartoon published in an international newspaper in April 2021.



[Turn over

**Source B:** *An extract from the Prime Minister's speech outlining Singapore's strategy to deal with Covid-19 in the future, broadcast on 31 May 2021.*

Living with endemic\* Covid-19 also means we do not completely close our borders. We need food, essential supplies, workers, business and other travelers to keep on flowing. We must stay connected to the world, with effective safeguards and border restrictions to keep ourselves safe. We will not be able to prevent some infected persons from slipping through from time to time. But as long as our population is mostly vaccinated, we should be able to trace, isolate, and treat the cases that pop up, and prevent a severe and disastrous outbreak.

\*regularly found among particular people or in a region

**Source C:** *Adapted from an article from the Straits Times published on 7 August 2021 in response to the government's announcement of a differentiated strategy between the vaccinated and unvaccinated. The new strategy gives more privileges such as being able to dine-in and gather in larger numbers to the vaccinated.*

Is the Government being fair to them? After all, Covid-19 vaccination is not compulsory, unlike vaccination against diphtheria and measles. So, should it not be up to the individual whether to get vaccinated or to risk getting the disease? Why stop them from taking part in activities that others can? So yes, they are being discriminated against, even as the choice of being vaccinated remains with them. But instead of asking if this is fair to them, we should ask: Are these people being fair to the rest of the nation? People who are not vaccinated face a much higher risk of getting infected and spreading the disease. This could lead to an upsurge in cases, more clusters and many people falling sick. Unvaccinated seniors who become infected also face higher risks of falling seriously ill. Society has the right to protect itself against harm.

**Source D:** *Views from an Australian about vaccination and the pandemic, printed in an Australian newspaper in July 2021.*

Vaccines are totally ineffective. This strategy to segregate society into different groups of vaccinated and unvaccinated is disgraceful, blatantly discriminatory and unconstitutional. The pandemic is a front for organisations and powerful individuals to advance their own agenda. It is fraudulent. These global parasites think they own the world and everyone else should obey them. The government has no right to treat us like second class citizens. I stand up against it, I don't submit to that and if it gets me into jail, so be it. I'm putting everything I got here because I don't want my little grand-daughter to grow up in this crazy, oppressive world.

**Source E:** *A Straits Times interview with Singapore's Ministry of Health's Chief Health Scientist, Professor Tan Chorh Chuan, published on 17 November 2020.*

The estimates for herd immunity vary generally around 65% of the population. The government strongly encourages everyone who is suitable to have the vaccination because this would protect you and your loved ones with whom they are in close contact, and reduce the likelihood of spread in Singapore. Priority will be given to healthcare and front-line workers, as well as elderly and vulnerable patients. But rest assured we will have enough vaccines for everyone by the third quarter of next year. Achieving herd immunity against Covid-19 helps protect those who cannot be vaccinated because of their age or their medical conditions.

**Source F:** *Adapted from an article on a panel of experts' view on herd immunity published in an international newspaper in August 2021.*

The Infectious Diseases Society of America estimated that the Delta variant\* had pushed the boundary to achieve herd immunity to well over 80% and possibly close to 90%. Meanwhile, vaccine hesitancy and supply issues mean most countries won't get close to even the original numbers. Regardless, the end may not come via herd immunity. Instead, the virus has a high likelihood of remaining entrenched globally, causing outbreaks that are hopefully mitigated partly by vaccinations, masking and other interventions. "Delta is not something we will be able to eradicate," Hanage said. "However with sufficient immunity, ideally achieved by vaccination, we can expect it to become a much milder illness."

\* The Delta Variant is a deadlier strain of the Covid-19 Virus which was discovered in December 2020. It is more infectious than the original virus and is responsible for the worldwide spread of Covid-19 this year.

[Turn Over

**SECTION B (Structured-Response Question)****Being Part of a Globalised World**

Study the extracts carefully, and answer the questions.

**Extract 1**

Economic globalization is not a new phenomenon. However, over the past 50 years, global economic forces have accelerated significantly in pace and intensity. People now must adapt to a global market that is undergoing rapid transformation as individuals and firms take advantage of the opportunities created by new enabling information and communications technologies and a substantial decrease in transportation costs.

**Extract 2**

On 8 June 1959, the Singapore government led by the newly elected People's Action Party (PAP) launched a campaign against yellow culture. The term "yellow culture" is a direct translation of the Chinese phrase *huangse wenhua*, which refers to decadent behaviour such as gambling, opium-smoking, pornography, prostitution, corruption and nepotism that plagued much of China in the 19th century.

**Extract 3**

An advertisement for the Hainanese Chicken Burger at McDonald's in Singapore.



- 6 Extract 1 shows how the pace of globalization has increased exponentially over the years.

In your opinion, how can Singapore companies benefit economically from globalisation? Explain your answer using two ways. [7]

- 7 Extract 2 and 3 illustrate ways to prevent loss of local culture in a globalised world.

Do you agree that resisting foreign culture is more important than promoting local efforts in preventing loss of local culture? Explain your answer. [8]

-- End of Paper --

---

*Copyright Acknowledgements:*

- Source A : <https://theweek.com/articles/981296/5-scathingly-funny-cartoons-about-antivaxxers-jeopardizing-herd-immunity>  
 Source B : <https://www.straitstimes.com/singapore/pm-lees-speech-in-full-covid-19-testing-contact-tracing-and-vaccinations-to-be-ramped-up>  
 Source C : <https://www.straitstimes.com/singapore/health/covid-19-only-fair-to-protect-vulnerable-against-spread-by-unvaccinated-people>  
 Source D : <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2021-08-21/covid-19-accelerating-rise-of-conspiracy-movements-in-australia/>  
 Source E : <https://www.straitstimes.com/singapore/health/80-of-spores-population-needs-to-be-vaccinated-to-achieve-herd-immunity-chief>  
 Source F : <https://www.thestar.com.my/aseanplus/aseanplus-news/2021/08/14/the-world-may-never-reach-herd-immunity-against-covid-19-say-experts>

**1 Study Source A.**

What is the cartoonist's message? Explain your answer.

[5]

Level	Descriptor	Marks
<b>L1</b>	<b>Literal reading of source</b>  e.g The source shows a person struggling in chains to move forward but is hampered by a person sitting on top of a heavy ball.	1
<b>L2</b>	<b>Identifies sub-message</b> <i>Award 3 marks for a more developed answer.</i>  e.g The cartoonist's message is that herd immunity is very difficult to achieve / an impossible goal Evidence: weak man struggling to move forward to the sign post "herd immunity" while being chained to a heavy ball.	2-3
<b>L3</b>	<b>Answers using main message</b> <i>Award 5 marks for more developed answers</i>  The cartoonist believes that the <b>public's already very strenuous path</b> towards herd immunity is being made <b>more difficult</b> because of the presence of the anti-vaxxers. This can be seen where the anti-vaxxer is <b>deliberately adding to the weight of the already heavy ball</b> by sitting on it and not helping society /public ("everyone else") who are already struggling to achieve herd immunity.	4-5

**2 Study Source B.**

Why did Prime Minister make the speech? Explain your answer.

[6]

**\*Zero mark if answers are not framed as reasons**

L1	<b>Reason based on generalised context</b>  Eg. He made the speech to update the public about covid-19	1
L2	<b>Reason based on sub-message (Literal reading from source)</b>  Eg. To <b>tell</b> Singaporeans that Singapore needs to stay connected and cannot be isolated / cannot prevent the disease from coming into Singapore forever	2



L3	<p><b>Reason based on main message</b>  <i>Award 4m for more developed answer</i></p> <p>Eg. To <b>warn</b> Singaporeans that the <b>disease is here to stay (ie. endemic)</b> / of <b>future infections from outside (ie. Inevitable transmission)</b> as Singapore needs to open up eventually</p> <p>To <b>assure</b> Singaporeans that the government is doing its best and is prepared to see Singaporeans safely through the Covid-19 pandemic / has things under control</p> <p>To <b>justify</b> the importance of opening up the economy / borders eventually</p> <p>To <b>stress</b> the importance of vaccination /</p>	3-4
L4	<p><b>Makes inference of purpose (valid message + outcome)</b>  <i>Award 6m for more developed answers</i></p> <p>*Outcome (with evidence) but without Message – L3/4          (specific audience and outcome must be clearly shown ie create awareness, etc)</p> <p>Accept other plausible answers.</p> <p><b><u>Message</u></b>          He <b>made the speech to warn Singaporeans (intention)</b> that the disease is here to stay and there is a possibility of future cases of infections as Singapore needs to open up eventually. <b>(main message)</b></p> <p><b><u>Outcome</u></b>          He made the speech so that <b>Singaporeans (audience) will be prepared (action)</b> of what is to come / more will come <b>forward for vaccination (Action)/ support the government's strategy of reopening (action)</b></p>	5-6

### 3 Study Sources C and D.

Does Source D prove that the concerns raised in Source C are unjustified?  
 Explain your answer. [7]

\*Answers need to focus on the concerns raised in C, ie the government's differentiated strategy and/ or effectiveness of vaccination strategy.

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	<p><b>Proves / does not prove using Provenance / Failed cross-reference</b>  <i>*Candidates can use either source C or D</i></p> <p>Source C proves that concerns are unjustified because it is written by a journalist.</p>	1
L2	<p><b>Proves / does not prove using Main Source Content only (literal lifting)</b>  <i>Award 2 marks for one source, supported</i>  <i>Award 3 marks for 2 sources, supported.</i></p> <p>Source C does not prove that its concerns are unjustified because it tells me that people who are not vaccinated face a much higher risk of getting infected and spreading the disease.</p> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Proves because of limited information</b>  <i>Award 3m for more developed information</i></p> <p>The source C proves that the concerns are <b>unjustified</b> because it does not provide me with all the details about the strategy / does not give me all the reasons why the people are unhappy about the strategy</p>	2-3
L3	<p><b>Proves / does not prove using typicality</b></p> <p>Source C's proves that the views / concerns are <b>unjustified</b> because it might just be portraying the views/ feelings of one person in <b>Australia</b> and does not necessarily reflect the views/ feelings of everyone in the community.</p>	3
L4	<p><b>Proves or Does not prove that concerns are unjustified</b>  <i>Award 4-5 marks for one valid set</i></p> <p><b>No, it does not prove that concerns are unjustified as the concerns are the <u>same/ similar</u></b></p> <p>No, it <b>does not prove</b> that the concerns are unjustified because both Sources C and D <b>agree</b> that the <b>differentiated strategy is discriminatory</b>. This can be seen in "treated as second class citizens" in Source D.  Source C supports the idea by agreeing that it is the strategy is discriminatory. [insert evidence]</p> <p>OR</p>	4-5

	<p><b>Yes, it proves that concerns are unjustified as they are different.</b></p> <p>Source D claims that the <b>govt strategy is unfair</b> while Source C claims that the strategy is a fair one. [insert evidence]</p>	
<b>L5</b>	<p><b>Both arguments of L4</b></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>Source D cannot prove C unjustified because of Cross-reference (either Source C is reliable or D is unreliable)</b></p> <p>Source C's concern is that unvaccinated people pose a risk to society and need to be protected, and that <b>vaccines are effective</b> and do protect people and reduce the likelihood of transmission and infection.[insert evidence]</p> <p>The fact that <b>vaccines are effective</b> and do help to protect people are also echoed in <b>Source E</b>, "The government strongly encourages everyone who is suitable to have the vaccination because this would protect you and your loved ones with whom they are in close contact, and reduce the likelihood of spread in Singapore." Therefore D cannot prove that C is unjustified because <b>Source C is <u>reliable</u>.</b></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>Source D cannot Prove that C is unjustified as <b>D is <u>unreliable</u> and contradicted by E.</b> [same argument]</p>	<b>6</b>
<b>L6</b>	<p><b>Does not prove because Source D is Unreliable using Critical Analysis of Provenance, fully explained</b></p> <p><i>Award 7m for fully-explained answers.</i></p> <p><u>Using Ulterior motive</u></p> <p>Source D is <b>unreliable</b> as it is biased and is one-sided in its rhetoric. Being an <b>anti-vaxxer and unvaccinated</b>, it is not surprising that he would challenge the government on this issue. His arguments are <b>one-sided</b> and baseless with the intention of intentionally <b>put the government in bad light</b> by insinuating that the government is punishing the unvaccinated and feels that it should be a personal right to decide whether to be vaccinated. He has an ulterior motive to rally support from fellow anti-vaxxers to demand that their personal right be respected and to get the government to stop its discriminatory practices against them.[insert evidence]</p> <p><b>As Source D is unreliable, it cannot be used to prove that Source C's claim is unjustified / wrong.</b></p>	<b>6-7</b>

	<p>*Other acceptable CAP explanations/ routes</p> <p><u>Tone</u> Candidates can also use tone to explain CAP with examples of loaded words (“ global parasites”, “Second class citizens” in order to put the government in bad light</p> <p><u>Context</u> D is in Australia, C is in Singapore. Hence, different country and cultural context esp with reference to ‘personal rights’. Hence cannot prove that C is unjustified because both Sources D and C are in different cultural and social context / situations.</p>	
--	--	--

**4** Study Source E and F.

Having read Source E, are you surprised by Source F? Explain your answer [7]

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	<b>Surprised OR Not Surprised by Source E OR F (no reason given)</b>	1
L2	<p><b>Surprised OR Not Surprised based on provenance of E and F.</b> <i>Award 3 marks for both sides.</i></p> <p>E.g. I am surprised that both are experts but disagree on herd immunity. E.g. I am not surprised as the authors came from different countries.</p>	2-3
L3	<p><b>Surprised OR Not surprised based on content details between Sources E and F (Comparison)</b> <i>Award 4-5 marks for one side.</i> <i>Award 6 marks for both sides.</i></p> <p><b><u>Not surprised (Similarity in content)</u></b> E.g. Having read Source E, I am not surprised by Source F as <b>both sources suggest that vaccinations still work / help to lessen the effects of covid.</b> Source E states, “to have the vaccination because this would protect you and your loved ones with whom they are in close contact, and reduce the likelihood of spread in Singapore”. Also, Source F states, ‘with sufficient immunity, ideally achieved by vaccination, we can expect it to become a much milder illness.’. Hence, this suggests that vaccinations are still useful to blunt the effects of Covid-19.</p>	4-6

	<p><b><u>Surprised (difference in content)</u></b>  E.g. Having read Source E, I am surprised by Source F because they disagree <b>on the level of vaccinations it would take to achieve herd immunity</b>. Source E states, "The estimates for herd immunity vary generally around 65% of the population" This means that 65% of the population need to be vaccinated before herd immunity can be achieved. However, Source F states, "The Infectious Diseases Society of America estimated that the Delta variant* had pushed the threshold for herd immunity to well over 80% and possibly close to 90%. " This means that 80-90% of the population need to be vaccinated before herd immunity can be achieved.</p> <p>Accept any plausible comparisons. Eg: herd immunity achievable versus not achievable.</p>	
<b>L4</b>	<p><b>Not Surprised due to difference/ similar in purposes</b></p> <p>E.g. I am not surprised despite the <b><u>difference in content</u></b> as both have their own agendas.</p> <p><b>In</b> Source E, the Professor is supportive of the use of the herd immunity approach as it is a <b><u>national response</u></b> and he believes it will enable Singaporeans to reduce the spread of the virus and protect others. As Singapore's Health Ministry's chief health scientist, he has to highlight the benefits of the vaccinations and is responsible in encouraging Singaporeans to be vaccinated. This is supported by Source E where the author states, 'Achieving herd immunity against Covid-19 helps protect those who cannot be vaccinated because of their age or their medical conditions.'</p> <p>However Source F is an article by a panel of experts giving their updates and views of herd immunity and Covid -19. It is the experts' job to give their expert opinion on what they think might or might not work, and offer suggestions based on their experience so that governments might use the information for policy and decision making.</p> <p>As both sources have their <b>own agendas</b>, <b>it is conceivable that both might not agree</b> entirely on the idea of herd immunity and vaccination. Hence it is not surprising.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>I'm not surprised by the <b>similarity in content</b> because they have the <b>same broad purpose and want the same outcome</b>.</p> <p>Both sources are stating the idea that vaccination is useful to control the spread of the virus because both who are in the medical field believe in it and want to encourage their respective audiences (Singaporeans / wider international audience) to continue with vaccination. (same outcome)</p> <p>Important: Candidates must link content to purpose</p>	<b>6</b>
<b>L5</b>	<p><b>Not Surprised based on Critical Analysis of provenance</b></p>	<b>7</b>

	<p>E.g I'm not surprised <b>both sources disagree in terms of herd immunity</b>. The Singapore health expert's article (Source E) was published in November 2020 <b>before the discovery of the deadlier and more infectious Delta strain in December 2020</b>. Hence the estimates were more conservative and optimistic. The expert's view in Source F comes after looking at the consequences of the Delta Variant after its discovery and based its views on data since. Because it is a deadlier strain, <b>the experts probably had to revise their estimates upwards. Hence the difference in opinion and figures about herd immunity is therefore not surprising.</b></p> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Not Surprised because Use of Contextual Knowledge (NEW!)</b></p> <p>I'm not surprised by the different opinion about the availability of vaccines in Singapore and world-wide. In Singapore, we have enough vaccines because Singapore is a <b>small and rich country</b> with good business contacts with pharmaceutical firms worldwide and is therefore <b>able to afford</b> and secure enough vaccines quickly for its small population. On the other hand, Source F takes a wider aggregate view and it is conceivable that they might not be enough vaccines for everyone as <b>some nations are poorer with bigger populations like Bangladesh and most African countries</b> and therefore would <b>not be able to afford vaccines for their entire population</b>. Hence it is <b>not surprising that there is a difference in the availability of vaccines in Singapore and worldwide.</b></p>	
--	---	--

5 'Vaccination is the best way to combat the spread of Covid-19.'

Using sources in this case study, explain how far you would agree with this statement.

[10]

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	<b>Writes about statement, no valid source use</b>	1
L2	<p><b>Yes/Agreement OR No/Disagreement supported by valid Source use</b></p> <p><i>Award 2 marks for 1 "yes" OR 1 "no"</i>  <i>Only award 3-4 marks for 2 or more one-sided answers (all yes or all no)</i></p> <p><b>Please note the following:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extensions cannot be paraphrasing of the source content</li> <li>Same extensions can only be used <u>once</u> for <u>each stand</u> (positive and negative are treated as different stands)</li> </ol> <p><b><u>Agreement (Yes, vaccination is the best way to combat covid): Sources A, B, C, E, F [insert evidence]</u></b></p> <p>Source A:  Evidence: yes, it shows that vaccinations is the best way as it shows the government and 'everyone else' moving towards herd immunity which can be achieved through vaccinations.  Extension: once herd immunity is achieved, society and <b>everyone will be safer, and countries can restart their economy.</b></p> <p>Source B:  Evidence: "endemic in the region, cannot prevent disease from coming through  Extension: because the virus will be entrenched in the region, it is important for everyone to be vaccinated where possible so that <b>herd immunity is achieved</b> / once the people are protected, the government can restart and rebuild the economy / and as a result create more job opportunities for the people</p> <p>Source C:  Evidence: People who are not vaccinated face a much higher risk of getting infected and spreading the disease.  Extension: <b>to reduce number of infected cases / Do not overwhelm healthcare system</b></p> <p><b>Source E:</b></p>	2-4

	<p>Evidence: protect you and your loved ones with whom they are in close contact, and reduce the likelihood of spread in Singapore. Extension: so that healthcare system not overwhelmed, restart economy sooner, etc</p> <p>Source F Evidence: causing outbreaks that are hopefully mitigated partly by vaccinations, masking and other interventions Extension: leads to milder case, reduce number of cases so governments can deal with it easier, etc</p> <p><b><u>Disagreement (No, vaccinations is not the best way): Sources D, F</u></b></p> <p>Source C: Evidence: . So, should it not be up to the individual whether to get vaccinated or to risk getting the disease? Extension: it infringes on personal rights /There should be some other alternatives / not fair</p> <p>Source D: Evidence: Singaporeans who have concerns about vaccination were formally made second class citizens in their own country. Further by these orders and all the online criticism and ill will being made towards unvaccinated people, <b>Extension: no it is not the best way as it infringes on personal rights /There should be some other alternatives / not fair / can cause tensions in society</b></p> <p>Source F: Evidence: herd immunity may not be achieved mean most countries won't get close to even the original numbers. Extension: As a result governments need to explore other ways to complement vaccinations such as safe distancing, enforce laws to keep people from flouting safe management measures, make preparations for minor outbreaks every now and then/ learn to co-exist with the virus by making changes to society</p>	
<b>L3</b>	<p><b>Yes AND No, supported by Valid source use</b> Award 5 marks for 1 "yes" and 1 "no" Award 6 marks for 2 "yes" and 1 "no" and vice versa Award 7-8 marks for 2 "yes" and 2 "no" <b>(Award 8 marks only for well-developed answers)</b></p>	5-8
<b>L4</b>	<p><b><u>3 Routes: (sources must already have been explained earlier)</u></b> <b><u>Analysing at least 1 source in relation to its reliability, utility or sufficiency</u></b></p> <p>Reliability / Utility: Cannot use Source D.</p>	1-2



	<p><b>Sufficiency:</b> Source A assumes that herd immunity is the ultimately goal but to resolve the crisis, other measures such as mask wearing and may need to come into play especially when the virus becomes endemic. Hence, getting the people vaccinated and herd immunity may only explain part of the problem governments face, but itself may not be entirely useful in resolving the issue.</p> <p><u>**Sharing examples from contextual knowledge to add value to source content</u></p> <p>Eg: Source D: Vaccination may not be the best way because some people have illnesses such as those people suffering from immune-deficiency syndromes which precludes them from vaccinations.</p> <p>Accept any plausible use of contextual knowledge that is relevant and specific</p> <p><u>Giving balanced conclusion (Candidates must hit minimum L3/5)</u></p> <p>Both arguments make valid points. [insert both arguments with sources] Personal rights and public interest  <b>Resolution:</b> Need to balance between personal rights and public interest. Ultimately, in order to make the world a safer place, everyone needs to play their part and realised that vaccination is only one of the means to an end. It must be used in conjunction with other methods to control the illness because the world is only going to be safe, if everyone is.</p>	
--	--	--

## Section B

- 6 Extract 1 shows the increased pace of globalization over the years.

In your opinion, how can Singapore companies benefit economically from globalisation? Explain your answer using **two** ways.

[7]

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Describes the topic i.e globalisation	1

<b>L2</b>	<p><b>Identifies/Describes benefits</b>  <i>Award 2 marks for identifying one benefit and 3 marks for identifying two benefits. Award 3 marks for describing one benefit and 4 marks for describing two benefits.</i></p> <p>e.g.          new markets for Singapore companies to tap globally          cheaper manufacturing bases in other countries          foreign talent to tap on for knowledge and expertise</p> <p>Accept any other economic benefits from globalisation</p>	2-4
<b>L3</b>	<p><b>L2 + Explains strategy</b>  <i>Award L3/5 for minimal explanation</i>  <i>Award L3/6 for well-developed explanations (eg with more specific details, etc)</i>  <i>Award L3/7 only if both paragraphs merit L3/6</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Benefits must be <b>economic in nature</b></li> <li>2. Explanation – extends by explaining the <b>positive economic impact</b> on companies – eg <b>leading to increased profits and market share</b></li> </ol> <p>Examples:          Increased opportunity to invest overseas leading to <b>greater market share</b>. Singapore is a small country with a limited market size. By expanding overseas, Singapore companies can tap on larger overseas markets such as <b>China and Vietnam</b> to increase their market share and subsequently, increase their profits.</p> <p>Foreign countries also offer an opportunity for Singapore companies to tap as <b>low cost manufacturing bases</b>. As costs of doing business is significantly higher in Singapore than in many other developing nations, Singapore companies can move their manufacturing and production overseas lower costs and subsequently increased their profits. For example, Singapore companies such as <b>Super have their manufacturing base in Wuxi, China.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accept any other plausible measures</li> </ul>	5-7

7 Extract 2 and 3 describe ways to prevent loss of local culture.

Do you agree that resisting foreign culture is more important than promoting local efforts in preventing loss of local culture? Explain your answer.

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Writes about the topic (i.e greater diversity) but without addressing the question	1-2
L2	<p>Describes resisting foreign culture / promoting local efforts in preventing loss of local culture</p> <p><i>Award 3 marks for describing <b>one factor</b></i>  <i>Award 4 marks for describing <b>both factors</b></i></p>	3-4
L3	<p>Explains resisting foreign culture / promoting local efforts in preventing loss of local culture</p> <p><i>Award L3/5 for explaining <b>one factor (minimal)</b></i>  <i>Award L3/6 for well-developed explanations with explicit links to loss of local culture, details, etc</i>  <i>Award L3/7 only if both paragraphs are L3/6.</i></p> <p><i>*Candidates are expected to explain <u>how</u> the factor can help to prevent loss of local culture. Outcomes include <b>create a stronger local culture so that it would be able to withstand the effects of an external culture.</b></i></p> <p><u>Resisting foreign culture</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are instances when <b>foreign cultures are rejected</b> by governments who wish to protect local cultures / prevent cultural homogenisation. This is because foreign cultures are <b>perceived to undermine and threaten cultural, moral and religious values as well as threaten the local cultural industries.</b></li> <li>• Example: <b>Entertainment</b></li> <li>• China placed limits on the number of Hollywood movies which can be shown in China (eg Avatar) to protect local film industries</li> <li>• Dominican republic bans Miley Cyrus concert because it was deemed to racy</li> <li>• Japanese protest against the increasing presence of Korean programmes in network's daily broadcast</li> <li>• Example: <b>Food</b></li> <li>• The successful expansion of the fast food culture was seen as a threat to local food culture in some countries as it was seen as an extension of American culture.</li> <li>• Example: Italians protested with bowls of pasta against the "Americanisation" of Italian culture</li> <li>• Rejection of fast food was also evident in the attack on a KFC restaurant in Bangalore India by Indian farmers as</li> </ul>	5-7

	<p>these foreign food companies threatened their traditional agricultural practices.</p> <p>Historical Examples of 'Yellow culture' Ban are also acceptable but must be examples not taken from the extract such as long hair for men, etc</p> <p><b>Impact:</b> Hence, by resisting foreign culture, governments/ people hope to ensure the continuity of their local practices, industries and way of life. <b>(positive outcome)</b></p> <p><u>Increasing national efforts</u> Efforts should be made to promote and preserve local culture as it is seen as an extension of the nation's identity. An example to promote local culture can be seen in hybridisation efforts as well as efforts solely on promoting local cultural industries, practices and institutions.</p> <p>Hybridisation examples – examples must be clear that there is a <b>local element</b> found in it. Food: Nasi Lemak Burger, Rendang Burger, Laksa Spaghetti Promoting local hawker culture: UNESCO world heritage recognition Promoting Local food heritage – under Slow Food Heritage Heroes to celebrate traditional foods and celebrate hand crafted heritage treats Increasing local events / Festivals: Showcasing local singers/ music / artists / film makers. Hybridisation of music: Using traditional Chinese instruments to play western songs, etc</p> <p>Positive Impact: As a result elements of <b>local culture is preserved</b> either in the practice or as part of a new product.</p>	
L4	<p><b>Both aspects in L3 plus explains the relative importance of censoring foreign culture and increasing preservation efforts in protecting local cultural values and industries</b> <b>Note: Both factors must be explained before conclusion can be considered</b></p> <p>I personally find promoting local culture is more important because it is now <b>increasingly difficult to effectively ban foreign culture because of the accessibility of the internet. Even if it is successful, it can only work in the short term.</b> Therefore, increasing local efforts is more important as it brings prominence to local culture. By encouraging hybridization and increasing the number of festivals and events to showcase local talent, it brings local culture to new audiences, particularly the young, and in a sense, helps to <b>preserve it in the long term.</b></p>	+1