

VICTORIA SCHOOL
SECONDARY 3 SOCIAL STUDIES 2020
SA2 SUGGESTED ANSWERS

1) **Study Source A.**

What is the message of this cartoon? Explain your answer. [6]

L1 **Misconception / Description** [1]

L2 **General Statements not about recycling** [2]

Singaporeans are selfish

Education has failed

L3 **Sub-messages / Tone toward parents** [3]

Parents are to be blamed for poor recycling rates / Parents are not supporting their children / Parents should support their children in recycling

Mocking parents / Critical toward parents

L4 **Message** [4-5]

The message is that recycling is seen as negative / undesirable act by many adult Singaporeans. **(Behaviour of Singaporeans toward recycling)**

**OR [4]
AND [5]**

This is because many feel that it is not their responsibility and it should be the responsibility of those who earn/are paid to do these jobs such as the Karang Guni men. **(reasons for their behaviour – mainly relating to responsibility)**

L5 **Message with broader outcome** [6]

The message of this cartoon is to create a sense of shared responsibility among Singaporeans toward recycling (source was created in 2010). In the past since recycling was perceived to be undesirable act, it was necessary for actions to be taken to have a change of mindset among Singaporeans and work together for the good of society – protecting the environment.

2) Study Sources B and C.

Does the resident in Source C think that the project in Source B will work? Explain your answer. [7]

L1 Will work based on Provenance / Mismatch [1-2]

L2 No clear basis of Comparison [3]

L3 Will work OR Will NOT work based on Content with clear basis of comparison [4-5]

Well explained answers will get 5 marks

Will work – as the new bin educates residents of how to recycle

Source B – “we aim to increase public awareness about the process of recycling right and reduce contamination”...“Notices are also to be placed at a person’s eye-level...visualise what is allowed to be recycled with minimal effort”

Source C – “...many are still not very educated about how to recycle properly...”

Will not work – convenience

Source B – “We hope to create a transparent bin which may make people more conscious of what they are placing into the bin...”

Source C – “Do you really think that Singaporeans in general will take the time out to do that when they don’t even take the time to do simple things?”

Will **not work** as most Singaporeans may still throw things that do not belong to the recycling bin even if the bin is transparent as the process of recycling right is too tedious and time consuming.

L4 Will work AND Will NOT work based on content [6]

L5 Will not work based on Perspective (need to be clearly explained) [7]

The resident would not think that the project will work as she feels cynical/negative that Singaporeans will change their mindset and put in the time to recycle properly. Source B’s project may not address the root cause which is Singaporean’s behaviour as it is only dealing with the bin’s structure.

(Note: Explanation must be clear and detailed. Do not accept 'pessimism' if explanation does not relate directly to the mindset of Singaporeans.)

2) The resident in Source C thinks that the project in Source B will ~~not~~ work as they ^{both} think that Singaporeans 'do not know how to recycle properly'. Source B states that "we aim to increase public awareness about the process of recycling right", suggesting that they think the ~~the~~ problem lies in Singaporeans not knowing how to recycle properly and needs to be managed. Source C states "Singaporeans are still not very educated about how to recycle properly", implying that the resident thinks that Singaporeans lack knowledge on how to recycle, and that the project in B will solve this problem and so recycling rates will increase, making the project successful.

The resident in Source C does not think that the project in B will work as their tone towards Singaporeans ^{Source} ~~being~~ ^{more into} recycling is different. Source C states that the project will "facilitate intuitive and conscious recycling process" and that the project "may make people more conscious", suggesting that the project will solve the issue of low recycling rates ~~as~~ ^{as it will} make recycling ^{more} ~~more~~ understandable to residents, ^{causing} ~~making~~ Source B, have an optimistic tone for this project. However, Source C states that "Do you really think that Singaporeans in general will take the time out to do that when they don't even take the time to do simple things?", implying that Singaporeans have a negative attitude towards ~~recycling~~ recycling and any project will not help unless they change the attitude of Singaporeans. Hence, Source C has a more pessimistic tone about increasing recycling rates in Singapore.

Why do you think this source was published? Explain your answer.

L1 Literal description / Misconception [1]

This source was posted to show that there is a lot of wastage involved in delivery packages.

L2 Context [2]

This source was posted in the context of rising e-commerce and the Earth Day.

L3 Message [3]

This source was posted to show that more can be done to reduce excessive wastage resulting from e-commerce and packaging.

This source was posted to raise awareness among Singaporeans regarding the excessive wastage resulting from e-commerce and packaging.

This source was posted to educate Singaporeans regarding excessive wastage resulting from e-commerce and packaging.

L4 General Purpose with Outcome [4]

This source was posted to educate Singaporeans regarding excessive wastage resulting from e-commerce and packaging so that...

...Singaporeans will reduce their e-commerce purchases.

...Singaporeans will go to local shops/physical shops to purchase their products.

L5 L4 + Context [5]

Context can be L2 or higher context (in L7)

L6 Specific Purpose with Outcome [6]

This source was posted to **educate** Singaporeans regarding the excessive wastage resulting from online shopping and packaging. This is so that Singaporeans will support the fight against excessive wastage generated by the e-commerce packaging by posting this wastage on social media and exercising responsible buying. This will also allow Singaporeans to stop buying from companies that create such wasteful packaging.

This source was posted to **educate** Singaporeans regarding the excessive wastage resulting from online shopping and packaging. This is so that Singaporeans will support the fight against excessive wastage generated by the e-commerce packaging by highlighting this wastage on social media. This

will also motivate companies engaging in e-commerce to change their packaging methods so that the overall waste production can be reduced.

L7 L6/6 + Context about larger issue

[7]

Government is concerned about the fact that the nation's only landfill is expected to only last till 2035 and along with the zero-waste campaign in 2019 this source was also published.

34/10 Source D was published to criticise the waste generated by online e-commerce. The source is targeted at Singaporeans to show that the sheer amount of waste produced by shopping online. This is to dis- to garner support against waste produced by online shopping to pressure e-commerce companies to combat the waste produced. Based on context. At that time, waste in Singapore has already reached its peak of produced 7.7 million tonnes of waste, prompting many to try and reduce the waste produced. Source D refers to a small packaging compared to the huge amount of waste generated by the packing alone. This shows the clear contrast in size of the size of the packaging and product, suggesting that packaging generates a huge amount of unnecessary waste that can be reduced.

4) Study Source E.

How useful is this source as evidence about Singaporeans' attitude towards recycling? Explain your answer.

[7]

L1 Useful – Common sense

[1]

Useful because the resident is actually going through these problems.

L2 Not Useful – Typicality

[2]

Not useful as it is only the experience of a single resident in Singapore. Others might actually be finding it easy to recycle.

L3 Useful (Sub-message – not addressing Singaporeans' attitude)

[3]

This source is useful as it shows that **domestic recycling is difficult / frustrating / confusing.**

OR

Not Useful

Because this source only shows the lack of action by the government. / Source doesn't tell you about Singaporean's negligence and only tells you about the government's lack of actions.

(Note: There is no cross-reference to this level.)

L4 Useful (Main message – addressing Singaporeans' attitude) [4]

Useful –

This source is useful as it shows that Singaporeans are frustrated toward recycling in Singapore as the way it is carried out by the government is not helping them despite the blame being put on them.

This source is useful as it shows that Singaporeans have a positive attitude toward recycling but they are frustrated at the lack of help provided by the government.

L5 Useful (Cross-reference) to attitude [5]

Cross-reference to **Source C – positive attitude of people toward recycling: people do put in the effort of separating the recyclables** – “Before bringing my recyclables down to the blue bins, I always take the time to clean or wash the items that accumulate in my recycling corner”

(Note: Do not accept direct cross-reference to C to prove E unreliable. Do not accept cross-reference A, as A is based the opinion of a cartoonist.)

L6 Not Useful (Cross-reference Typicality) – reference to Singaporean's attitude [6]

Cross-reference to **Source C & BI: most people in Singapore are lacklustre about recycling and do not bother to do it properly.** Hence Source E might be the experience of a single resident.

Source C: “Do you really think Singaporeans in general will take the time out to do that when they don't even take the time to do simple things?”

BI: “The National Environment Agency (NEA) revealed that although the amount of waste generated decreased, recycling rates also decreased in Singapore.”

L7 Not Useful (Over-exaggeration + Pushing of blame) [7]

Source E is over-exaggerating the situation to shift the blame from residents to the government for the lack of recycling. He uses rhetoric questioning and overexaggerates the positive actions taken by Singaporeans and the lack of actions taken by the government to

convince others that the government needs to do more to solve the problem of low recycling rates. Hence it is not reliable and not useful as evidence about Singaporean's attitude towards recycling.

"Don't just put a big blue bin and expect everyone to know what to do."

"we always categorise the items by putting them into different bags but in the end we can only dump everything into the big blue bin."

"Or in the end do all the things that we put into the big blue bin just get thrown away?"

"You can't blame the public for the mix-ups of recyclables and trash when the bins are not helpful.

(Note: Do not accept students that simply claim that the source is biased – no reason for source to have a balanced view in this scenario. If they can relate to the purpose of shifting the blame to the government then the answer can be excepted.

Do not accept answers that do not provide evidence to show over-exaggeration in the source.)

The source is useful in showing that Singaporeans are very reluctant in recycling due to the ^{lack of clarity} ~~inconveniences~~ ^{shows to} it ~~makes~~ for them. The source states that 'don't just put a big blue bin and expect everyone to know what to do' and 'the government should have separators in the bins' showing the writer's frustration in the lack of information that recycling bins show and their lack of separation. He also points out 'you can't blame the public for the mix-ups of recyclables and trash when the bins are not helpful!' which further shows general Singaporeans' unwillingness to recycle properly due to lack of information at the bins.

it can be also said that
However, the source is not useful as it is not reliable when I cross-refer to Source B, which shows a complete redesign of the recycling bin which does not match source E. Source B states that recycling bins are 'transparent', to make ^{people} more conscious of what they are placing into the bin' and that 'notices are also to be placed at a person's eye-level which would catch people's attention'. This does not fit the description of E's blue bins with no notices despite it being written ^{in 2020,} a year later than the announcement in 2019 in B. Hence, it is not reliable in showing that Singaporeans are actually reluctant to recycle due to lack of information.

useful as it is not

I can also tell that it is not fully reliable in terms of its tone, which is very critical and one-sided ~~towards~~ in criticising the bins, not the behaviour of people. It may be the case that the writer is exaggerating details due to anger after seeing the article that criticizes the public's behaviour and defends the people by blaming the bins instead. ~~to~~ Hence, it is not fully reliable. The writer does this in response to the article to show readers that the government is more at fault in the situation using the excuse of non-informative bins despite clearly not being reliable enough to prove so, so that the public will be cleared from blame for not recycling properly.

Study Source F.

How far does this source prove that Singaporeans are becoming more interested in recycling? Explain your answer. [7]

L1 **Provenance** [1]
Yes it does prove as it is from NEA.

L2 **Typicality (Does not Prove)** [2]
This source does not prove as it just only shows a few vending machines which are being used by Singaporeans.

L3 **Does prove (Content)** [3]
Yes it does prove as there are a lot of Singaporeans who are taking part in this recycling process.

L4 **Does Prove (Cross-reference to Source C)** [4]
Yes it does prove as Source C shows that Singaporeans are becoming interested in recycling. Source C shows the efforts undertaken by the resident to ensure that recycling is done properly.

Does not Prove (Cross-reference to BI)

No it does not prove as when cross-referenced to BI, it shows that Singaporeans are still not interested in recycling. This can be seen from the decrease in recycling rates in 2019. *(Note: The cross-reference for this does not link directly to the sequence of events but just merely on the idea of 'interested' VS 'not interested'.)*

L5 **Does not Prove (Content elaborated) – in relation to the launch [5]** [5-6]
No, it does not prove as the number of people there at the reverse vending machines may just be because of the launch itself. There is no evidence of continued recycling from Singaporeans after the launch. People may just be attending the launch as it is new.

Does not Prove / Does Prove (Content Elaborated) – in relation to money [5]

It does not prove as NEA is trying to use monetary rewards to increase recycling rates. Hence Singaporeans may not be actually interested in recycling but rather in the value of the vouchers given by the machine.

It does prove as the usage of monetary rewards for recycling will increase the number of people who are becoming interested in recycling.

Does not Prove (Content Inferred) [6]

It does not prove as the reason the event is conducted and the photograph is posted shows that there are many Singaporeans who are still not interested

in recycling yet. Hence such an event must be organised to get them to be interested in recycling.

L6 Does Not Prove (Purpose)

[7]

There is a **purpose** to this source. NEA's agenda is to promote recycling and a zero-waste nation so they would **advertise the presence and immediate success** of the 'reverse' vending machine so that more Singaporeans **will start recycling** using this vending machine in the future. But this however **doesn't guarantee that many other Singaporeans will take part** in recycling using this machine. The source is trying to get more Singaporeans to take part in recycling so that recycling rates in Singapore can increase. Hence it does not prove that Singaporeans are becoming more interested in recycling.

L7 Cross-reference to Background Information

[8]

It **does not prove** as the reason the event is conducted and the photograph is posted shows that there are many Singaporeans who are still not interested in recycling yet. Hence such an event must be organised to get them to be interested in recycling. We can see from the **Background Information that recycling rates decreased at the end of 2019** which shows that there is a **clear lack of interest** in Singaporeans towards recycling and thus the need for such an event.

OR

No **it does not prove**, as cross-referenced to the Background Information. At the end of 2019 it was revealed that recycling rates **actually decreased**. Hence this photograph cannot prove that Singaporeans are becoming more interested in recycling. Instead the machines **failed in encouraging an increase in recycling rates** as they were introduced **earlier in the year and yet did not cause a change in Singaporeans' interest toward recycling**.

(Note: For the second cross-reference there must be clear relation to the time line of Source F and the BI)

-
- 6) **Extract 1 talks about the increase in the number of foreign domestic workers.**

In your opinion, give two reasons why there is an increase in the number of foreign domestic maids? Explain your answer. [7]

L1 Describes the topic i.e what foreign domestic maids do [1]

L2 Identifies/ Describes [2-4]

Award 2 marks for identifying 1 reason and 3 marks for identifying 2 reasons
Award 3 marks for describing 1 reason and 4 marks for describing 2 reason

L3 L2 + Explains reasons [5-7]

Award 5-6 marks for explaining one reason
Award 6-7 marks for explaining two reason

- 1) **Situation / Circumstance**
- 2) **What FDWs can do for Singaporeans**
- 3) **Benefit of having FDW**

1 OR 2 – L2/3

1 AND 2 / 3 – L3/5

1, 2 AND 3 – L3/6

One reason would be the ageing population in Singapore. There are more elderly in Singapore and a decreasing birth rate. There is a worsening gini-coefficient gap. With more old people, they tend to fall sick, are unable to take care of themselves and are possibly immobile, requiring families who are unable to be full time caretakers to hire foreign domestic maids to take care of the elderly in the house, such as administering medicine, feeding them, helping them get around and cooking and cleaning for them. Families

Another reason could be the Singapore's prospering economy. With Singapore's small manpower and the government subsidising education, both females and males have the same opportunities at education and work. We are also the 4th richest nation in terms of GDP in 2017. With both parents working and the government constantly diversifying and expanding our economy with developing the bio-science industry and the Integrated resorts, creating jobs for Singaporeans, many families do not have the time to take care of their children and elderly in Singapore but have the income to hire domestic help to take care of the children, bring them to school and deal with the cooking and cleaning in the house. Hence, with their enhanced

economic ability and the government allowing for the hiring of foreign domestic maid, these families would have the means and ability to hire domestic maids, allowing them to focus on their career and Singapore's economy to continue to prosper, hence leading to an increase in domestic maids in Singapore.

Do not accept answers that refer the perspective of FDWs. ONLY answer accepted for this would be 'employment opportunities' as it directly relates to the 'need' stated in Extract 1.

7) **Extract 2 and Extract 3 show the effects of diversity in Singapore.**

Do you think that different socio-economic status is a greater challenge than different religions in a diverse society like Singapore?

[8]

L1 Writes about the topic without addressing the question

[1-2]

L2 Describes

[3-4]

Award 3m for describing one factor.
Award 4m for describing two factors.

L3 Explains

[5-7]

Award 5-6m for explaining one factor.
Award 6-7m for explaining two factors.

Diversity in Singapore is a consequence of different social economic status. Socio-economic status refers to an economic situation shared by a group of people and some determinants are occupation, income, education and ownership of wealth. The socio-economic status of an individual may shape one's life experience as it affects the choice of housing, food, entertainment and activities. This in turn can influence the circle of friends that one interacts with. In this way, one's identity can be shaped by one's socio-economic status. For example, activities such as polo and golf, fine dining and travelling to distant destinations for vacations are usually activities carried out by people with higher socio-economic status. Activities such as swimming, soccer and basketball are enjoyed by individuals across all socio-economic groups as street soccer and basketball courts are easily accessible to the public. With different socio-economic status, it can result in an increasing income gap between the higher and lower socio-economic groups over time which will result in different life experiences within society, contributing to social tension, especially when the lower SES feel like they have not been given enough opportunities at social mobility. This may cause them to blame the

government for not doing enough to help them, hence, causing challenges in a diverse society like Singapore with different SES groups.

Diversity in Singapore is a consequence of difference in religions. A religion is an organised collection of attitudes, beliefs. Practices, world views and often, worship of a single or multiple gods. The religion that individuals believe in may be determined by birth or by choice. Most religions embody a set of shared core beliefs and practices. Believers keep to these beliefs and practices regardless of their nationality and ethnicity. There are currently 10 major religions such as Buddhism, Islam, Christianity, Hinduism etc practiced in Singapore as of 2015. Religious beliefs and practices shape the way we interact with others, the choices we make and our thinking. With different religions in Singapore shaping different beliefs and identities amongst Singaporeans. Different beliefs may clash and resulting in religious conflict, prejudice and misconception, discrimination which may lead to violence, hence causing challenges in a diverse society like Singapore with different religious groups.

L4 L3 plus explains the relative importance of each factor

[8]

In conclusion, religious diversity can be a bigger threat because people can react very strongly with regards to their religious beliefs, making it easy to trigger religious tension in a multi-racial and multi-religious society in Singapore. Whereas different socio-economic status still share many common activities together and the government has been active in promoting social mobility in Singapore.