

Crescent Girls' Prelim 2024
Suggested Answer Key

1) Study Source A.

What is the message of Source A? Explain your answer using details from the cartoon. [5]

Suggested Answer		Success Criteria
Source A's message is that the government prioritises development while Singaporeans prefer to prioritise conservation over development (A). This can be seen by the tractor that is attempting to remove the trees while the Singaporean telling the tree to 'Run, Forest! Run!' (E) away from the bulldozer shows that the government prioritises land for development while Singaporeans prefer conservation instead (E).		ATQ
		Evidence
		Explanation

2) Study Sources B and C.

How different are the two sources? Explain your answer. [7]

Suggested Answer Note: Comparison question NO NEED to cross reference 0m if you used agree/ disagree/ support/ refute		Success Criteria
<u>Difference based on content</u> Sources B and C are different (ATQ) as they differ on which areas have been proposed as alternative areas for development. Source B gives a plausible alternative area for development while (CW) Source C gives a difficult alternative area for development (CC). Source B says that 'instead of felling Dover Forest. If more flats need to be built, we have a solution in Ulu Pandan itself' (evi1), suggesting an alternative to developing Dover Forest within Ulu Pandan itself (exp1). In contrast (CW), Source C states that 'Do you know where the airbase is? Have you seen where most of the golf courses are? They are in the most inconvenient parts in the middle of nowhere' (evi1), claiming that those who oppose developing Dover Forest present alternatives which are far away/isolated/inaccessible (exp2).		ATQ
		Comparison criteria
		Comparison word
		Evidence
		Explanation
<u>Difference based on content</u>		ATQ

<p>Sources B and C are similar (ATQ) as both (CW) sources talk about how the residents of Ulu Pandan being opposed to the development of Dover Forest (CC). Source B states that Dover Forest is 'not just a forest but a shared and extended green landscape that the residents have, for a long time, admired and grown used to' (evi1) suggesting that residents have grown attached to Dover Forest as a green space and are thus opposed to its development (exp1). Similarly (CW), Source C states 'feel that many of those who oppose development on Dover Forest tend to come from the current residents' (evi2), suggesting that the main group of people who object to the development of Dover Forest are those who live nearby.</p>		Comparison criteria
		Comparison word
		Evidence
		Explanation
<p><u>Difference in purpose</u></p> <p>**NOTE: Complete answer requires only 2 paragraphs. Writing 3 may take up too much time. So, for the 'difference' paragraph, write either this or the first paragraph above</p> <p>Sources B and C <u>differ on the capacity from which they were presenting their perspective</u>. Source B, as a member of parliament representing Ulu Pandan, has to represent his residents/constituency who are mainly opposed to development while at the same time, acknowledge the government's need to develop Dover Forest as he is also a part of the government. Hence, source B articulates the wishes of his residents who wish to conserve Dover Forest while also presenting alternative sites in Ulu Pandan for development for those who wish to move to Ulu Pandan. In contrast, source C, in the capacity of a private citizen and an aspiring homeowner, needs to only concern himself with articulating/representing those who hope for housing development. Hence, source C accuses those who opposed development of being selfish and not considering those who hope for housing development in the area.</p>		ATQ
		Comparison Criteria
		Comparison word
		Evidence x2
		Explanation x2

3) Study Sources D and E.

Does Source D make Source E surprising? Explain your answer. [7]

Suggested Answer	Success Criteria
-------------------------	-------------------------

<p>Must compare given sources!</p> <p>Source D does not make Source E surprising (ATQ) as it is expected as Source D supports Source E (LOR). Both (CW) sources agree that Singaporeans prefer more conservation efforts to development benefits (CC). Source D states that 'A recent study also found that 60 per cent of Singaporeans valued the environment over economic growth, and that this figure has grown over the last two decades' (Evi 1), suggesting that most Singaporeans value conservation (Exp 1). In contrast (CW), Source E stated how the Housing Board town, Tengah was 'billed as a "forest town" but has since drawn flak for causing significant deforestation in the area' (Evi 2). suggesting that Singaporeans are criticising decisions which prioritise development over conservation (Exp 2).</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Source D makes Source E surprising (ATQ) as it is unexpected as Source D refutes Source E (LOR). Source D states that there are alternatives (technology) to the trade-off between development and conservation while (CW) Source E states that there are no alternatives between development and conservation (CC). Source D states that 'Singapore has the technology and capacity to build taller blocks of flats without having to touch existing forests' (Evi 2), suggesting that technology is another way to solve the two issues of development and conservation (Exp 1). However (CW), Source E states that 'citing "difficult trade-offs" that had to be made.' (Evi 2), suggesting that Singapore can only have one or the other but not both (Exp 2).</p>		ATQ + LOR
		Comparison criteria
		Comparison word
		Evidence
		Explanation
<p>Cross reference main source to another source</p> <p>Source D makes Source E surprising (ATQ) as it is unexpected as Source E is refuted by Source B (LOR). Source E states that it is impossible to achieve conservation while allowing for development to meet housing needs whereas (CW) Source B states that it is possible to achieve conservation while allowing for development to meet housing needs (CC). Source E states that 'citing "difficult trade-offs" that had to be made" (Evi 1), suggesting that it is an either-or option and there are no other viable ways (Exp 1). However (CW), Source B states that "So, to preserve as much of the forest as possible, one way to achieve this is using the vacant plots of land</p>		ATQ + LOR
		Comparison criteria
		Comparison word
		Evidence
		Explanation

next to the Community Centre, around the market, and the fields next to the now-defunct schools, all in Ulu Pandan." (Evi 2), suggesting that there is a solution to achieve both conservation and development (Exp 2).		
Expected of Sources E, due to provenance. Source D does not make Source E surprising (ATQ) as Source E is expected (V) since it is written by Desmond Lee, who is the Second Minister for National Development (WHO), thus he would have the necessary credible information of Singapore's growth and future plans (WHO), thus addressing the concerns that Singaporeans may have and explaining the decisions that they have made to clearing land and forest cover for more housings and shelters in an objective way (WHAT). As someone from the government, it is natural of him to address the concerns of citizens as he was responding to a commentary that was posted a few days earlier (WHEN), which was what was stated in Source D, to urge the government to rethink their decisions about developments and prioritise conservation instead (WHY). Hence, with a purpose of educating/informing citizens in mind, it is expected that the Minister will publish this to explain to citizens about the importance of trade-offs (WHY - EXP).		ATQ
		Who
		When
		What
		Why
		Explanation

4) Study Source F.

How far does this source prove that there is a need to prioritise development over conservation in Singapore? Explain your answer. [7]

Suggested Answer		Success Criteria
Source F proves that there is a need to prioritise development over conservation (ATQ) as it is reliable as supported by Source D (LOR). Both (CW) sources show that there is a need to prioritise development over conservation (CC). Source F states that 'nature groups had strongly implored the government to consider the going around option to avoid any negative impact on the reserve close to the MacRitchie Reservoir' (Evi1), suggesting that it is important to preserve nature areas to prevent any negative consequences (Exp1). Similarly (CW), Source D states that 'Compounded with warming caused by climate change, it is even more imperative to		ATQ + LOR
		Comparison criteria
		Comparison word
		Evidence
		Explanation

<p>keep pockets of forests around the island so that our neighbourhoods keep cool' (Evi1), suggesting that conservation helps to bring in positive effects to people (Exp2).</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Source F does not prove that there is a need to prioritise development over conservation (ATQ) as it is unreliable as refuted by Source E (LOR). Source F shows that there is a need to prioritise development over conservation while (CW) Source E shows that there is no need to prioritise development over conservation (CC). Source F states that 'nature groups had strongly implored the government to consider the going around option to avoid any negative impact on the reserve close to the MacRitchie Reservoir' (Evi1), suggesting that it is important to preserve nature areas to prevent any negative consequences (Exp1). However, Source E states that 'Tengah was needed to provide homes over the next two decades for 42,000 families, and jobs are for more than 20,000 people as the town develops progressively' (Evi2), suggesting that development is still more important and essential as compared to conservation (Exp2).</p>		
<p>Explained Provenance + Content of Source F</p> <p>Source F does not prove that there is a need to prioritise development over conservation as it is unreliable due to its underlying purpose. Since it is posted on a website based on property trading in Singapore (WHO), Source F will naturally stand to gain from more interest/wider readership/more membership if property trading is more active in Singapore (WHO). Hence, it portrays the pro-development side positively, even presenting supporting data, such as showing that 'the average fares will also be 15% cheaper as the route is shorter and more direct. Furthermore, construction costs will also be \$2 billion lower', offering concrete reasons in favour of development (WHAT). Even though it mentions that 'while the option of skirting around and going directly under the reserve area were both considered viable after an extensive study, nature groups had strongly implored the government to consider the going around option to avoid any negative impact', there was no further explanation or details being provided to substantiate why the skirting option is a viable and plausible option</p>	ATQ	
	Who	
	When	
	What	
	Why	
	Explanation	

<p>(WHAT). Thus, this makes the content imbalance as it presents a one-sided biased view of how development is more important than conservation, so that people will be more supportive and positive of the more cost-efficient option (WHY), so that more money could be saved from skirting around the estates as well as bringing more convenience to citizens (EXP).</p>		
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

- 5) "The Singapore government is the key stakeholder in deciding between conservation and development in Singapore."

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

'The Singapore government is the key stakeholder'		
	Agree - Gvt	Disagree – Not gvt
Source A		
Source B	✓	✓
Source C		✓
Source D	✓	✓
Source E	✓	✓
Source F	✓	

Suggested Answer		Success Criteria
<p>I agree (ATQ) that the Singapore government is the key stakeholder in deciding between conservation and development in Singapore (W). Source B states that "So, to preserve as much of the forest as possible, one way to achieve this is using the vacant plots of land next to the Community Centre, around the market, and the fields next to the now-defunct schools, all in Ulu Pandan" (B). The Singapore government is the key stakeholder because they have the power and authority to [listen to its citizens and decide what to do with the lands to meet the needs of citizens (R). As a result, the Singapore government will need to be open-minded when listening to the views and perspectives of citizens (S1) → assess what is best for the citizens living in the area (S2) → meet the needs of people and improve their SOL (S3)</p>		ATQ
		Who
		Best evidence
		Reason
		Sequence of outcomes beyond source S1 -S2- S3
<p>I disagree (ATQ) that the Singapore government is the key stakeholder in deciding between conservation and development in Singapore. Residents are the key stakeholder in deciding between conservation and development in Singapore (W). Source C states that 'The ones opposing the development are mostly rich people who live in that area, so it really feels like a "Not In My Back Yard" type of scenario here' (B). Residents are the key stakeholder as they have the ability to voice their opinions and put pressure on other people such as the government and developers (R). As a result, when many residents participate in decision-making discussions and voice their opinions (S1) → they are able to put pressure on other stakeholders such as the government and developers (S2) →</p>		ATQ
		Who
		Best evidence
		Reason
		Sequence of outcomes

more more considerations/perspectives will be taken when decisions such as conservation and development are made (S3)		beyond source S1 -S2- S3
I agree (ATQ) that the Singapore government is the key stakeholder in deciding between conservation and development in Singapore. The government is the key stakeholder in deciding between conservation and development in Singapore (W). Source E states that 'It is a decision we make after very careful deliberation and inter-agency discussion, taking into account Singaporeans' needs and the trade-offs involved' (B). The government is the key stakeholder as they have the ultimate say in decision due to their power and authority to make decisions for the country (R). As a result, when the government chooses development over conservation, more people will be employed in the workforce (S1) → increase economic growth (S2) → people's standard of living will improve (S3).		ATQ
		Who
		Best evidence
		Reason
		Sequence of outcomes beyond source S1 -S2- S3
I disagree (ATQ) that the Singapore government is the key stakeholder in deciding between conservation and development in Singapore. The citizens are the key stakeholder in deciding between conservation and development in Singapore (W). Source D states that 'Singaporeans are starting to make it known that they care about preserving forests, as seen by the recent spate of petitions.' (B). The citizens are the key stakeholder as they have the ability to voice their opinions and come together to raise awareness of an issue, thus having the ability to put pressure on the government or those who are in charge (R). As a result, with a shift in focus towards conservation (S1) → citizens are coming together due their beliefs (S2) → exerting pressure on those in authority to reconsider their decisions (S3)		ATQ
		Who
		Best evidence
		Reason
		Sequence of outcomes beyond source S1 -S2- S3
Bonus para: By Analysing one source in relation to its reliability, utility or sufficiency: Source E is reliable as it is based on a minister directly involved in making the trade-off decision at the highest level (WHO), hence having access to the information of how such decisions are made, thus making him reliable and credible. In addition, although it presents the government's stance on this issue of building the newest Housing Board Town, Tengah (WHEN), it did not hide the fact that the government		

itself has come under criticisms for the decisions it made, hence giving the issue a fair and objective treatment (WHAT). With the intention of educating the pros and cons of developing a new town, he naturally wants to present all the facts and statistics to people (WHY), so that they understand the trade-offs between development and conservation and how development is more beneficial to citizens as compared to conservation (EXP).

By giving a balanced conclusion/resolution:

Even if our government makes the final decision on conservation or development in Singapore, it is still ultimately, responding to various demands from and the needs of different stakeholders and environmental pressures, as seen from Source E. Since stakeholders such as residents know what are the needs on the ground, they play a pivotal role in choosing between development and conservation. Hence, the biggest factor in deciding between conservation and development in Singapore at any point of time will depend on what exerts the biggest pressure on Singapore at that point of time and whether there are factors like technology which can mitigate some other factors/trade-offs.

Provide contextual knowledge:

Singapore has signed a few international treaties such as the Kyoto Protocol's net zero emission and/or zero forest cutting by 2023 during COP26 in 2021. With Singapore's international reputation on the line, and Singapore always being dependent on the globalised economy, the government will have no choice but to comply with those treaties. Hence I agree with Source D that there is an increasing emphasis on preserving forests and investing in technology to help protect the environment so as to reduce heat trapped inland.

6) Extract 1 describes an interaction demonstrating racial intolerance in Singapore.

In your opinion, what are some lessons we can learn from such interactions in Singapore? Explain your answer with reference to **two** lessons. [7]

Suggested Answer		Success Criteria
One lesson is that it is important for Singapore to continue building understanding across different cultural groups, because of the hurtful nature of these interactions (D). For example, in 2022, a Chinese ex-Polytechnic lecturer (E) threw racial slurs at an inter-		Describe
		Example - Name - 2 details

racial couple walking along the streets (D1). He showed his disapproval towards inter-racial relationships and told the Indian man that he was 'preying on Chinese girls' (D2). As a result, such prejudices and stereotypes cause unhappiness in society (O1) → hurt and anger amongst people (O2) → disunity and divisive society (O3), thus it is important to learn more about one another to prevent such incidents from happening again in future		Sequence of outcomes O1- O2-O3
<p>One lesson is that we can draw a better understanding of what else needs to be done to ensure a harmonious diverse society in Singapore (D). For example, in 2022, a Chinese ex-Polytechnic lecturer (E) threw racial slurs at an inter-racial couple walking along the streets (D1). He showed his disapproval towards inter-racial relationships and told the Indian man that he was 'preying on Chinese girls' (D2). As a result, when people try to enforce their mistaken beliefs on others</p> <p>This shows that his attitude is rooted in mistaken beliefs. It suggests that one way of ensuring a harmonious society is to increase opportunities for intercultural exchange and interaction, which would help promote understanding between different groups. This could ultimately dispel some of the mistaken beliefs that give rise to such prejudiced views in the first place, paving the way for a more accepting and inclusive society.</p>		Describe
		Example - Name - 2 details
		Sequence of outcomes O1- O2-O3

7) Extracts 2 and 3 are about how individuals and community groups can respond to socio-economic diversity.

Do you think individuals play a greater role than community groups in responding to socio-economic diversity? Explain your answer.

Suggested Answer		Success Criteria
Individuals can respond to socio-economic diversity by starting ground-up initiatives and volunteering to support those in need (D). For example, Mr Nizar Mohamed Shariff started a charity called Free Food For All (FFFA) (E) to provide nutritious food to		Describe
		Example - Name - 2 details

<p>the less fortunate. The charity distributes food options ranging from ready-to-eat meals to fresh groceries to the needy in Singapore and collaborated with other food businesses to cater ready-to-eat meals for their beneficiaries (D1). In 2021, FFFA served more than 160,000 meals to more than 1,000 families each month. As a result, citizens from low-income families can have constant supply of food to eat (O1) → do not have to worry about not having enough food to eat (O2) → able to save their money for other necessities (O3) → improve standard of living and quality of life (O4)</p>		<p>Sequence of outcomes</p> <p>O1- O2-O3</p>
<p>Community groups can respond to socio-economic diversity by organising and sustaining long-term programmes catering to those in need (D). For example, Daughters Of Tomorrow (E) is a formal community group that conducts programmes to help women from less fortunate backgrounds. These programmes offer opportunities for upskilling, so that these women can pick up the skills needed for better-paying jobs (D1). They are also taught financial literacy so that they learn to manage their finances better (D2). As a result, these women from low-income households are able to pick up new skills and knowledge and be competitive in the workforce (O1) → get a job and earn a stable income (O2) → be financially independent and overcome any economic challenges (O3) → improve their standard of living and quality of life (O4)</p>		<p>Describe</p>
		<p>Example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Name - 2 details
		<p>Sequence of outcomes</p> <p>O1- O2-O3</p>