Fajar Secondary School, 4NA Prelims 2019

SUGGESTED ANSWERS

Section A: Source-Based Question (35m)

(a) Study Source A.

What can you infer about the role of foreign domestic workers (FDWs) in Singapore? Explain your answer.

[5]

Level	Level Description	Marks
L1	Describes the topic i.e. FDWs without stating any message / Lifting from source	[1]
	There are a lot of FDWs in Singapore.FDWs are like a swiss army knife.	
L2	Inference of sub-message / Weak inference	[2-3]
	Award the higher mark to answers with supporting details (evidence).	
	Submessage:FDWs are scared to work in Singapore.	
L3	Inferences based on content + link to question	[4-5]
	4m for Inference, supported (many roles mentioned only) 5m for well-explained answers (mention of FDWs not liking it/ intimidation to work)	
	e.g. I can infer that FDWs have too many roles to juggle in Singapore. As I can see from the source, the FDW is portrayed as a swiss army knife and has many 'arms' extending out of her, representing the different roles and jobs that she must do. For example, she is expected to cook, clean, iron, as well as walk the dog. She looks worried and intimidated due to the many roles that is expected of her. This shows how FDWs in Singapore are treated unfairly because they have too many responsibilities.	

(b) Study Source B.What is the intention of this source? Explain your answer.

[6]

Level	Level Description	Marks
L1	Lifting / Copies the source	[1]
	The intention is for Ms Teo to respond to the FDWs being listed on Carousell.	
L2	Weak inference / Inference unsupported / Misinterpretation	[2-3]
	2m for weak inference 3m for weak inference + supporting details/evidence	
	 Weak inference: FDWs put in a lot of effort in working here. FDWs are caring towards their employers We should be more caring towards FDWs 	
L3	Inference supported 4m for 1 supported inference	[4]
	Inference: FDWs should be shown respect and dignity. As I can see from Source B, Ms Teo says that the act of "marketing" FDWs on Carousell "in such an undignified manner is not only insensitive, but absolutely unacceptable". She disapproves of the Carousell listings of FDWs.	
L4	Explains purpose, supported 6m for purpose answer with support (acceptable inference and	[5-6]
	reaction) Cap at L3/4 for Weak Impact.	
	The intention is for Ms Teo to convince Singaporeans that FDWs deserve to be treated with respect so that Singaporeans will stand up when they see FDWs being treated disrespectfully, like being treated as commodities on Carousell. In doing so, she hopes that Singaporeans would empathise with FDWs and be more caring towards them. As I can see from Source B, Ms Teo says that the act of "marketing" FDWs on Carousell "in such an undignified manner is not only insensitive, but absolutely unacceptable".	
	Weak impact = so that Singaporeans will understand what the MOM is trying to do.	

(c) Study Sources C and D.How different are these two sources? Explain your answer.[7]

Level	Level Description	Marks
L1	Similarity or Difference of provenance/source type/ source topic	[1]
	Both sources talk about FDWs in Singapore. Both are articles.	
L2	One-sided or Half matching	[2]
	Source B says that FDWs need more food to eat, while Source C is encouraging towards FDWs having a weekly off day.	
L3	Similarity OR Difference in content	[3-4]
	No evidence = $L3/3$ With evidence = $L3/4$	
L4	Similarity AND Difference in content	[5-6]
	No evidence = $L4/5$ With evidence = $L4/6$	
	[Difference] Both sources are different in whether the FDWs are treated fairly or not . Source C shows how the FDW is treated unfairly, but Source D shows how the FDW is treated fairly. C mentions how Paulene's employers only left her "\$20" and "half a can of luncheon meat, some dumplings, eggs, noodles and onions", which is not enough for one week's worth of food. However in D, Hani's employer ensures that she has her rest day, and even "supports her study by paying the fees for her".	
	[Similarity] Both sources are similar in showing how the FDW takes the initiative in taking care of themselves . In Source C, she says that "she has had to use her own money to buy enough food". This shows how she has to take care of her basic necessity of food. In Source D, Hani take the initiative to take a course during her rest day so that she has "a chance to better" herself and maybe start her "own small business" when she goes back to Indonesia.	
L5	Difference in purpose (supported)	[7]

Level	Level Description	Marks
	Cap at L4/6 for answers with no valid Content paragraphs, but valid Purpose paragraph.	
	Both sources are different in tone because Source C is critical of employers who are not mindful of their FDW needs for proper meals, but Source D is praising employers who allow freedom to their FDWs. In C, Paulene, a FDW, is left with little food and money when her employer left for a one-week holiday. In fact, she "had to use her own money to buy enough food", which shows how uncaring her employer is. But in D, it paints a happier picture of Hani, a FDW, who had a "weekly rest day" and is also allowed to take classes every alternate Sundays and whose employer even "supports her study by paying the fees for her".	
	OR	
	Both sources are similar in purpose which is to convince Singaporeans that FDWs are humans too and deserve to be treated with more care and dignity. C's impact is for employers to be more caring towards their FDWs, while D wants employers to continue being caring towards their FDWs, just like Hani's employer. In C, Paulene, a FDW, is left with little food and money when her employer left for a one-week holiday. In fact, she "had to use her own money to buy enough food", which shows how uncaring her employer is. In D, it paints a happier picture of Hani, a FDW, who had a "weekly rest day" and is also allowed to take classes every alternate Sundays and whose employer even "supports her study by paying the fees for her". Even though both sources depict different FDWs, both wish to encourage employers to be caring to their FDWs.	

(d) Study Source E.

Is this source reliable in showing that foreign domestic workers in Singapore are treated unfairly? Explain your answer.

[7]

Level	Level Description	Marks
L1	Lifting / Copies the source / Not answering the question	[1]
	This source is an extract from a research about forced labour in Singapore.	
L2	Weak inference / Inference unsupported / Misinterpretation/ Typicality	[2]
	2m for weak inference	
	Weak inference: This source is reliable in showing how HOME is working hard to ensure the well-being of FDWs in Singapore.	
	Typicality: This source is reliable in showing how FDWs are being mistreated, but it does not apply to all FDWs.	
L3	Reliable/ not reliable based on content 3m for no evidence, 4m for answers with evidence	[3-4]
	This source is reliable in showing that foreign domestic workers (FDWs) in Singapore are treated unfairly because there is a high number of cases of FDWs who come to HOME "for help" and to report being mistreated. As I can see from the table, over a 12-month period, there are 483 cases of FDWs who report to being "overwork", and 472 faced "verbal abuse. These are high numbers of FDWs just for a 12-month period.	
	OR	
	This source is not reliable in showing that foreign domestic workers (FDWs) in Singapore are treated unfairly because it is just based on one research report, over a 12-month period. As I can see from Source E, the statistics are only "over a 12-month period". Furthermore, we do not have qualitative evidence of the FDWs who ask for help, and whether they are also fair towards their employers, or are only asking HOME for help as a way out of their jobs. Therefore, there needs to be more evidence to support whether FDWs are treated unfairly or not.	
L4	Reliable/ not reliable based on cross-reference 5m for no evidence, 6m for answers with evidence	[5-6]

Level	Level Description	Marks
	This source is not reliable in showing that FDWs are treated unfairly because it is challenged by Source D. D rebuts the statistics shown in E by showing how Hani is not mistreated and actually has a very caring and supportive employer who "supports her study by paying the fees for her". Hani attends trainings programmes every Sunday to better herself. Therefore, Hani's experience shows that foreign workers are treated fairly and are given opportunities to better themselves.	
	OR	
	This source is reliable in showing that FDWs are treated fairly because it is supported by Source C which shows how Paulene, a FDW, was left with insufficient food when her employers went on holiday, similar to what E shows when there were 292 reports of "inadequate or poor quality food" for the FDWs. Therefore, the support of E with a detailed case of one FDW shows how E is reliable.	
L5	Reliable based on purpose and understanding that there is mistreatment This source is reliable in showing that FDWs are treated unfairly because it is published by a charity group and an anti-human trafficking organisation, who would be doing research to help people who are being taken advantage of. Its intention is to raise awareness in how FDWs are treated in Singapore. As I can see from the table, over a 12-month period, there are 483 cases of FDWs who report to being "overwork", and 472 faced "verbal abuse. These are high numbers of FDWs just for a 12-month period. By convincing the international community about how many reports there are about FDWs being mistreated, they hope to increase pressure on the Singapore government/ MOM to put in more protection for the FDWs.	[7]

(€	domestic workers in Singapore are protected?	[10]
Level	Level Description	Marks
L1	Writes about statement, no valid source use e.g. There are a lot of foreign domestic workers in Singapore. Their rights are protected by MOM but there are some employers who will bend and break the rules.	[1-2]
L2	 Yes / No, supported by valid source use Show (protected): Sources B*, D, E* Does not show (not protected): Sources A, C, E*, B* (B and E can be argued both sides) Award 3-4 marks for 1 source Award 4-5 marks for 2 sources Award 5-6 marks for 3 sources e.g. Source B shows that the rights of foreign domestic workers in Singapore are protected because the Minister of Manpower, Ms Josephine Teo, is standing up for the FDWs who have been mistreated by being "auctioned off" and advertised on Carousell. Even though they were treated like commodities, the minister stepped in to publicly condemn the act and say how it is "insensitive" and "absolutely unacceptable". This sends a strong message to the public that the government and the minister will not condone anybody who goes against the law and mistreats FDWs, thus showing how their rights are protected because Hani is entitled to her "weekly rest day", and she has the encouragement of her employer in taking classes on alternate Sundays, as her employer "supports her study by paying the fees for her". This shows how the FDW has her rights protected and she is even encouraged to improve her own skills outside of being a FDW. Source E shows that the rights of foreign domestic workers in Singapore are protected because there are organisations in place to ensure that FDWs have an outlet to voice out their worries in the event of their employer sexploting them. For instance, "HOME" is a "Singapore charity group" whoe go to HOME to ask for help. Even though there is a high number of FDWs whoe go to HOME to ask for help, their plight is still being studied and publicized, showing that there are people looking out for the interests of FDW, despite errant employers. 	[3-6]

OR	
e.g. Source A does not show that the rights of foreign domestic workers in Singapore are protected because it shows how the FDW is overworked and a lot is expected from her. A shows a cartoon showing the FDW as a swiss army knife, with a lot of 'functions' such as ironing clothes, walking the dog, cooking, and sweeping. She looks overwhelmed and has a tear on her face to represent her being tired. This shows how she has too many roles to play, and thus, her rights for fair work expectations are not protected.	
Source C does not show that the rights of foreign domestic workers in Singapore are protected because it shows the case study of a FDW who was left with inadequate food after her employer left for a week of holiday. Even the "\$20 for the week" given to her was not enough as after buying food for her employer's daughter, she was left with "\$9 for three days". This shows how some employers lack empathy and care towards their FDW, to the extent that she has to "use her own money to buy enough food".	
Yes + No, supported by valid source use	
i.e. Both elements of L2	[7-10]
Award 7 marks for 2 sources (1:1)	
Award 8 marks for 3 sources (2:1, 1:2)	
Award 9-10 marks for 4 sources (2:2)	
Unbalanced answer capped at L3/7-8 (even if all are well-explained)	
	Singapore are protected because it shows how the FDW is overworked and a lot is expected from her. A shows a cartoon showing the FDW as a swiss army knife, with a lot of 'functions' such as ironing clothes, walking the dog, cooking, and sweeping. She looks overwhelmed and has a tear on her face to represent her being tired. This shows how she has too many roles to play, and thus, her rights for fair work expectations are not protected. Source C does not show that the rights of foreign domestic workers in Singapore are protected because it shows the case study of a FDW who was left with inadequate food after her employer left for a week of holiday. Even the "\$20 for the week" given to her was not enough as after buying food for her employer's daughter, she was left with "\$9 for three days". This shows how some employers lack empathy and care towards their FDW, to the extent that she has to "use her own money to buy enough food". Yes + No, supported by valid source use <i>i.e. Both elements of L2</i> <i>Award 7 marks for 2 sources (1:1)</i> <i>Award 8 marks for 3 sources (2:1, 1:2)</i> <i>Award 9-10 marks for 4 sources (2:2)</i>

SECTION B (Structured Response Question) (15 marks)

2(a) Extract 1 describes how technological advancements will lead to a lot of people losing their jobs in the future.

In your opinion, how can Singaporeans remain competitive in the workforce? Explain your answer using one strategy.

Level of Response	Level Description	Marks Allocated
L1	Describes the topic without addressing the question	[1-2]
	e.g. There are a lot of people unemployed people in Singapore who are struggling to get a job.	
L2	Identifies/describes the strategy	[3-5]
	Award 3 marks for identifying a strategy. Award 4-5 marks for describing a strategy.	
	e.g. One strategy for Singaporeans to remain competitive is to continue upgrading themselves. For instance, Singaporeans above the age of 25 will receive SkillsFuture credit of \$500. They can use this credit to take up classes or courses to develop their skills. A Singaporean who wants to remain competitive can take up a course that is related to his jobscope.	
L3	L2 + explain the strategy	[6-7]
	Award the higher mark for clear explanation of the strategy.	
	Note: Suggestions must be feasible. Answers must show how it will lead to Singaporeans remaining competitive in the workforce.	
	e.g. One strategy for Singaporeans remain competitive is to continue upgrading themselves. For instance, Singaporeans above the age of 25 will receive SkillsFuture credit of \$500. They can use this credit to take up classes or courses to develop their skills. A Singaporean who wants to remain competitive can take up a course that is related to his jobscope. <u>By doing so, he can use the skills learnt and be</u> <u>more productive in his job or company. His employer can also</u>	
	see how he is putting in effort in upgrading his skills and would want to continue keeping him in the company as a valuable worker. This ensures his competitiveness in the workforce.	

(b) Extracts 2 and 3 describe the role of MNCs and advances in technology in Singapore.

Explain how MNCs and advances in technology has helped to drive globalisation.

[8]

Level of Respon se	Level Description	Marks Alloca ted
L1	Writes about the topic (i.e. driving globalisation) but without addressing the question.	[1 - 2]
L2	Describes the role of MNCs or advances in technology in helping to drive globalisation.	[3-5]
	Award the higher mark in the level for well-developed answers.	
	Award 3-4 marks for describing one factor. Award 4-5 marks for describing both factors.	

L3	Explains the role of MNCs or advances in technology in helping to drive globalisation.	[6-8]
	Award 6-7 marks for explaining one factor. Award 7-8 marks for explaining both factors.	
	F MNCs help to drive globalisation.	
	E MNCs refer to businesses with economic activities in more than one country.	
	E For example, the Starbucks Coffee Company is the largest coffee chain in the world today with operations spanning worldwide. Their coffee beans are sources from different countries from North and South America, Africa, and Asia, and then transported to roasting facilities in different cities in USA and India.	
	L Therefore, as MNCs grow, they control more aspects of the worldwide trade. The international span of their operations drives globalization because they increase the economic interactions between people and goods throughout the world. These interconnections can also lead to interdependent relationships between everyone involved in the operations of the MNCs, hence driving globalization.	
	AND	
	F Advances in technology help to drive globalisation.	
	E There is now greater access to the Internet, and increasing use of mobile communications. More and more people rely on their communications devices to interact with one another.	
	E For example, smartphones are used by a majority of the world population. An event that happened in London can be broadcasted worldwide almost instantaneously.	
	L This means that information can reach a wider audience in a shorter period of time as compared to in the past where information travelled slower. The faster speed of communication helps the community to stay connected almost all the time, leading to us being interconnected, and thus driving globalisation.	