



Assumption English School
Preliminary Examination
2019

Subject: Humanities (Social Studies)

Level/Stream: Secondary 4 Express and Secondary 5 Normal (Academic)

Date: 27 August 2019

Time: 0750 - 0935

Duration: 1 hour 45 minutes

SBQ LORMS

Section A: Source-Based Case Study (35 Marks)

(a) Study Source A.

What is the message of the source? Explain your answer, using details from the source.

[5]

Question Target: Infer message Skill

| | | |
|----|--|-------|
| L1 | <p>ANSWERS BASED ON UNDEVELOPED PROVENANCE/ DESCRIPTION FROM SOURCE/ MISINTERPRETATION</p> <p><u>Example</u></p> <p>The cartoonist is sharing his perspective on the Subject-based banding after the announcement of Subject-based banding to replace streaming in secondary schools. <i>[answer based on undeveloped provenance]</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p>The source shows the cartoonist labelled the buttons on the machine as “EXPRESS” and “NORMAL” and changing it to “G1”, “G2” and “G3”. <i>[answer based on description of source]</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p>The source is trying to convey the cartoonist’s approval for the Subject-based banding. <i>[Misinterpretation]</i></p> | [1] |
| L2 | <p>MAKES MESSAGES BASED ON CONTENT, UNSUPPORTED <i>[Award 2 marks for one weak inference, without support]</i> <i>[Award 3 marks for one strong inference, without support]</i></p> <p><u>Example</u></p> <p>The message of the source is Subject-based banding is favoured over streaming. [P] <i>[Weak inference]</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p>The message of the source is the changes in the education system from streaming to Subject-based banding is redundant/ pointless/ futile. [P] <i>[Strong inference]</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p>The message of the source is Subject-based banding cannot completely eradicate social stigma. [P] <i>[Strong inference]</i></p> | [2-3] |
| L3 | <p>MAIN MESSAGE BASED ON CONTENT <i>[Award 4 marks for one weak inference with support]</i> <i>[Award 5 marks for one strong inference with support]</i></p> <p><u>Example</u></p> <p>The message of the source is Subject-based banding is favoured over streaming [P] <u>because students are labelled differently with more variation of bands in the new Subject-based banding system as compared to the previous system of streaming.</u> [E] The evidence from Source A is “The students are labelled as “EXPRESS” or “NORMAL” by the factory worker in streaming and the students are labelled as “G1”, “G2” or “G3” after the Subject-based banding is implemented.” [E] <i>[Weak inference]</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p>The message of the source is the changes in the education system from streaming to Subject-based banding is redundant/ pointless/ futile [P] <u>as the changes in the education system will not make any difference since students are still labelled according to the different bands in the new Subject-based banding system.</u> [E] The evidence from</p> | [4-5] |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>Source A is "The students are labelled as "EXPRESS" or "NORMAL" by the factory worker before the Subject-based banding and the students are still labelled as "G1", "G2" or "G3" even after the Subject-based banding is implemented." [E] <i>[Strong inference]</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p>The message of the source is Subject-based banding cannot completely eradicate social stigma [P] <u>as the changes in the education system will not make any difference since students are still labelled according to the different bands in the new Subject-based banding system.</u> [E] The evidence from Source A is "The students are labelled as "EXPRESS" or "NORMAL" by the factory worker before the Subject-based banding and the students are still labelled as "G1", "G2" or "G3" even after the Subject-based banding is implemented." [E] <i>[Strong inference]</i></p> | |
|--|--|--|

(b) Study Sources B and C.

How different are Sources B and C? Explain your answer.

[6]

Question Target: Comparison Skill

| | | |
|----|---|-------|
| L1 | <p>SIMILAR/DIFFERENCE BASED ON UNDEVELOPED PROVENANCE/ BLIND LIFTING</p> <p><u>Example</u></p> <p>Sources B and C are different as Source B is adapted from a comment by Associate Professor Jason Tan from the National Institute of Education (NIE) while Source C is adapted from an article by SMU Behavioural Sciences Institute Director Professor David Chan. [answer based on undeveloped provenance]</p> | [1] |
| L2 | <p>SIMILAR/DIFFERENCE IN CONTENT <i>[Award 2 marks for one similar/ difference, unsupported]</i> <i>[Award 3 marks for both similar and difference, unsupported]</i></p> <p><u>Example</u></p> <p>Sources B and C are similar in telling me that social stigma cannot be completely eradicated with the introduction of Subject-based banding as there needs to be a shift in attitudes. [C]</p> <p>OR/AND</p> <p>Sources B and C are similar in telling me that streaming has resulted in negative impact of social stigmatisation. [C]</p> <p>OR/AND</p> <p>Sources B and C are different in telling me whether Subject-based banding would result in social stigma to continue taking place. [C]</p> | [2-3] |
| L3 | <p>SIMILAR/DIFFERENCE IN CONTENT SUPPORTED <i>[Award 4 marks for one similar/ difference, supported]</i> <i>[Award 5 marks for both similar and difference, supported]</i></p> <p><u>Example</u></p> <p>Sources B and C are similar in telling me that social stigma cannot be completely eradicated with the introduction of Subject-based banding as there needs to be a shift in societal mindset. [C] The evidence in Source B is "For the changes to have the intended effect, it has to take place together with a review of social attitudes." [E] This means that a shift in the mindsets is important in ensuring that the social stigma would gradually be eliminated in the society as changes in the system alone is insufficient to make a significant change. [E] The evidence in Source C is "We hope that in order for systems and society to change for the better, we should revisit our assumptions, attitudes and actions. We can initiate action and change and inculcate positive values and attitudes in ourselves and those around us." [E] This means that Singaporeans need to evaluate their current mindsets and behaviour towards students with varying abilities and change their mentality in order for social stigma to be eradicated in future. [E] Hence, Sources B and C are similar. [C]</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Sources B and C are similar in telling me that streaming has resulted in negative impact of social stigmatisation. [C] The evidence in Source B is "It is understood by many that streaming tends to be rather stigmatising. It tells us that many of the students were unnecessarily pigeonholed." [E] This means that streaming had caused many students to be negatively categorised according to their ability to perform in their studies. [E] The evidence in Source C is "The stigma associated with social labelling resulting from streaming has been corrosive in many people's lives and for society." [E] This means that streaming has led to students be stigmatised based on their ability to perform in schools and it is detrimental to them. The society continues to ingest these negative perceptions and stigmatise people with these labels. [E] Hence, Sources B and C are similar. [C]</p> | [4-5] |

| | | |
|-----------|---|------------|
| | <p>OR/AND</p> <p>Sources B and C are different in telling me whether Subject-based banding would result in social stigma to continue taking place. [C] The evidence from Source B is “There will be a replacement of one kind of stigma associated with streaming with another kind — that of subject combinations that students take in school. This might lead to a scenario where parents, or students, compare how many higher-level subjects they take, or aim for the maximum number of G3 (higher-level) subjects.” [E] <u>This means that the change in educational policy from streaming to Subject-based banding is not going to effect a change in the existing social stigmatisation as people would still make comparison of students based on the subjects they took at different levels.</u> [E] The evidence in Source C is “Even if parents try to compare and categorise students by their overall ability, it will be difficult to do so in the Subject-based banding system. They will not be confined to an ability category and labelled accordingly, unlike the case in Normal or Express streaming where students are placed into clear groupings, creating the perception of “us versus them”.” [E] <u>This means that the Subject-based banding system would be able to effect a positive change in gradually eradicating the existing social stigmatisation as Subject-based banding makes it more difficult for parents to make direct comparison when students are not placed in distinct streams as before.</u> [E] Hence, Sources B and C are different. [C]</p> | |
| | SIMILAR BASED ON PURPOSE | [6] |
| L4 | <p>Example</p> <p>Sources B and C are similar in their purpose. Source B is a comment by Associate Professor Jason Tan from the National Institute of Education (NIE) and Source C is adapted from an article by SMU Behavioural Sciences Institute Director Professor David Chan. The purpose of Source B is to convince [V] Singaporeans [A] that Subject-based banding cannot completely eradicate social stigma [M] so that the Singaporeans would change their mentality and behaviour to not engage in social labelling and stigmatisation [I]. The evidence in Source B is “For the changes to have the intended effect, it has to take place together with a review of social attitudes.” [E] <u>This means that a shift in the mindsets is important in ensuring that the social stigma would gradually be eliminated in the society as changes in the system alone is insufficient to make a significant change.</u> [E] The purpose of Source C is to convince [V] Singaporeans [A] that Subject-based banding cannot completely eradicate social stigma [M] so that the Singaporeans would change their mentality and behaviour to not engage in social labelling and stigmatisation [I]. The evidence in Source C is “We hope that in order for systems and society to change for the better, we should revisit our assumptions, attitudes and actions. We can initiate action and change and inculcate positive values and attitudes in ourselves and those around us.” [E] <u>This means that Singaporeans need to evaluate their current mindsets and behaviour towards students with varying abilities and change their mentality in order for social stigma to be eradicated in future.</u> [E] Hence, Sources B and C are similar in their purpose. [C]</p> | |

(c) Study Source D.

How useful is this source as evidence about the possibility of Subject-based banding in eliminating social stigma? Explain your answer.

[7]

Question Target: Utility Skill

| | | |
|----|--|-------|
| L1 | <p>USEFUL/ NOT USEFUL BASED ON DESCRIPTION MISINTERPRETATION</p> <p><u>Example</u></p> <p>The source is <u>useful</u> because it is an article about Subject-based banding by Lionel Oh, published on the Singapore Policy Journal. [answer based on undeveloped provenance]</p> | [1] |
| L2 | <p>USEFUL / NOT USEFUL BASED ON CONTENT</p> <p><u>Example</u></p> <p>Source D is <u>useful</u> as evidence about the possibility of Subject-based banding in eliminating social stigma because Subject-based banding is a move for society to achieve de-stigmatisation. [R]</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Source D is <u>not useful</u> as evidence about the possibility of Subject-based banding in eliminating social stigma because Lionel Oh does not have any concrete evidence about the positive impact of the Subject-based banding in eliminating social stigma. [R]</p> | [2] |
| L3 | <p>USEFUL / NOT USEFUL BASED ON CONTENT, SUPPORTED USEFUL/NOT USEFUL BASED ON UNDEVELOPED PROVENANCE</p> <p><u>Example</u></p> <p>Source D is <u>useful</u> as evidence about the possibility of Subject-based banding in eliminating social stigma because Subject-based banding is a move for society to achieve de-stigmatisation. [R] The evidence from Source D is “Subject-based banding is a step in the right direction.” and “The banding dismantle the stigma associated with streaming labels. This move represents the government’s recognition of the current education system’s shortcoming and a genuine intent to improve it.” [E] <u>This means that it is possible for Subject-based banding to eliminate the social stigma and for the society to move forward to be less stigmatising as the government acknowledges its policy of streaming has brought about negative impact and implemented Subject-based banding to mitigate this problem.</u> [E]</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Source D is <u>not useful</u> as evidence about the possibility of Subject-based banding in eliminating social stigma because Lionel Oh does not have any concrete evidence about the positive impact of the Subject-based banding in eliminating social stigma. [R] The evidence from Source D is “Subject-based banding is a step in the right direction.” and “The banding dismantle the stigma associated with streaming labels. This move represents the government’s recognition of the current education system’s shortcoming and a genuine intent to improve it.” [E] <u>This means that it is possible for Subject-based banding to eliminate the social stigma and for the society to move forward to be less stigmatising as the government acknowledges its policy of streaming has brought about negative impact and implemented Subject-based banding to mitigate this problem.</u> [E] However, the positive effects of the Subject-based banding is yet to be seen. Hence, it is unclear whether Subject-based banding is able to eliminate the social stigma brought about by streaming.</p> | [3] |
| L4 | <p>USEFUL / NOT USEFUL BASED ON CROSS-REFERENCING TO OTHER SOURCES, SUPPORTED</p> <p>Award a higher mark for a more developed answer.</p> <p><u>Example</u></p> | [4-5] |

| | | |
|----|---|-------|
| | <p>Source D is <u>useful</u> as evidence about the possibility of Subject-based banding in eliminating social stigma because Subject-based banding is a move for society to achieve de-stigmatisation. [R] The evidence from Source D is “Subject-based banding is a step in the right direction.” and “The banding dismantle the stigma associated with streaming labels. This move represents the government’s recognition of the current education system’s shortcoming and a genuine intent to improve it.” [E] <u>This means that it is possible for Subject-based banding to eliminate the social stigma and for the society to move forward to be less stigmatising as the government acknowledges its policy of streaming has brought about negative impact and implemented Subject-based banding to mitigate this problem.</u> [E] Furthermore, Source D is supported by Source C. [C] The evidence in Source C is “Even if parents try to compare and categorise students by their overall ability, it will be difficult to do so in the Subject-based banding system. They will not be confined to an ability category and labelled accordingly, unlike the case in Normal or Express streaming where students are placed into clear groupings, creating the perception of “us versus them”. [E] <u>This means that the Subject-based banding system would be able to effect a positive change in gradually eradicating the existing social stigmatisation as Subject-based banding makes it more difficult for parents to make direct comparison when students are not placed in distinct streams as before.</u> [E] Since Source D is supported by Source C, this means that Source D is reliable and hence <u>useful</u> as evidence about the possibility of Subject-based banding in eliminating social stigma. [Li + C]</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Source D is <u>not useful</u> as evidence about the possibility of Subject-based banding in eliminating social stigma because Lionel Oh does not have any concrete evidence about the positive impact of the Subject-based banding in eliminating social stigma. [R] The evidence from Source D is “Subject-based banding is a step in the right direction.” and “The banding dismantle the stigma associated with streaming labels. This move represents the government’s recognition of the current education system’s shortcoming and a genuine intent to improve it.” [E] <u>This means that it is possible for Subject-based banding to eliminate the social stigma and for the society to move forward to be less stigmatising as the government acknowledges its policy of streaming has brought about negative impact and implemented Subject-based banding to mitigate this problem.</u> [E] However, the positive effects of the Subject-based banding is yet to be seen. Hence, it is unclear to whether Subject-based banding is able to eliminate social stigma brought about by streaming. Furthermore, Source D is challenged by Source B. [C] The evidence from Source B is “There will be a replacement of one kind of stigma associated with streaming with another kind — that of subject combinations that students take in school. This might lead to a scenario where parents, or students, compare how many higher-level subjects they take, or aim for the maximum number of G3 (higher-level) subjects.” and “For the changes to have the intended effect, it has to take place together with a review of social attitudes.” [E] <u>This means that the change in educational policy from streaming to Subject-based banding is not going to effect a change in the existing social stigmatisation as people would still make comparison of students based on the subjects they took at different levels as there needs to be a shift in the mindsets in order for the social stigma to be eliminated in the society.</u> [E] Since Source D is challenged by Source B, this means that Source D is not reliable and hence <u>not useful</u> as evidence about the possibility of Subject-based banding in eliminating social stigma. [Li + C]</p> | |
| L5 | <p>EXTENT OF USEFULNESS BASED ON DEVELOPED PROVENANCE AND CONTEXT Award 6 marks for useful/not useful based on developed provenance, supported. Award 7 marks for useful based on developed provenance and context, supported.</p> <p>Example</p> <p>Source D is <u>not useful</u> as evidence about the possibility of Subject-based banding in eliminating social stigma because it is an argument put forth by Lionel Oh himself and his perspective does not represent the opinion of the rest of the Singaporeans. Furthermore, he does not have any concrete evidence about the positive impact of the Subject-based banding in eliminating social stigma. [R] The evidence from Source D is “Subject-based banding is a step in the right direction.” and “The banding dismantle the stigma associated with streaming labels. This move represents the government’s recognition of the current education system’s shortcoming and a genuine intent to improve</p> | [6-7] |

it.” [E] This means that it is possible for Subject-based banding to eliminate the social stigma and for the society to move forward to be less stigmatising as the government acknowledges its policy of streaming has brought about negative impact and implemented Subject-based banding to mitigate this problem. [E] However, the positive effects of the Subject-based banding is yet to be seen. Hence, it is unclear to whether Subject-based banding is able to eliminate social stigma brought about by streaming. **Therefore, Source D is not entirely useful as evidence about the possibility of Subject-based banding in eliminating social stigma because Lionel’s perspective is not representative/typical of the majority of the Singaporeans and he does not have any concrete positive effect of Subject-based banding.**

Source D is useful as evidence about the possibility of Subject-based banding in eliminating social stigma because Subject-based banding is a move for society to achieve de-stigmatisation as Lionel Oh is a researcher from one of the best universities. The information included in his article would be factually correct and well-supported with his findings. Hence, he would most likely be reliable. **He understands the government’s intention in introducing streaming based on the context in the past and acknowledges the government’s initial intention for the policy of streaming and the unintended negative impact of social stigma (context), as well as appreciates the government’s attempt to mitigate stigmatisation by introducing Subject-based banding.** [R] The evidence from Source D is “Streaming worked when Singapore’s focus was on efficiency, and providing different tiers from which students could graduate to benefit the workforce. However, the context of the present and demands of the future no longer adhere with the circumstances of the past. Streaming is straining Singapore’s social cohesion.” and “This move represents the government’s recognition of the current education system’s shortcoming and a genuine intent to improve it.” [E] This means that the author recognises that streaming was necessary in the past to ensure students have a basic level of education to effectively contribute to the workforce and economy and streaming is no longer relevant in the present context where many are pursuing academic excellence. The author also mentioned that the government acknowledges streaming has caused unnecessary competition and social divisions over the years. It shows that Lionel has an in-depth knowledge of this topic and portrays an objective view of the Subject-based banding. [E] **Furthermore, he addresses and cautions against Singaporeans’ attitude about using a different yardstick based on the number of subjects taken at a higher and lower level to measure the ability of a student in the new Subject-based banding system.** The evidence from Source D is “It is vital that the shift to banding must not be taken superficially. It should not simply be a new terminology fit into the existing way of measuring success. Taking all subjects at G3 level cannot be perceived as the epitome of academic achievement – this would be missing the point.” [E] This means that the author has a good understanding of the Singaporeans as he acknowledges that there might be a possibility that Singaporeans continue to measure and categorise students based on their banding. Hence, he cautions people in his article that Subject-based banding would not change the existing stigma if people still chose to believe that the child is academically better based on the number of subjects taken at a higher level. [E] **As Lionel acknowledges the past and present contexts, as well as presents an objective and fairly accurate view of the topic with a good understanding of the Singaporeans, this source is reliable and useful as evidence about the possibility of Subject-based banding in eliminating social stigma.**

(d) Study Sources E and F.

After reading Source E, are you surprised by Source F? Explain your answer.

[7]

Question Target: Hybrid Skill – Comparison + Reliability Skills

| | | |
|----|--|-------|
| L1 | <p>NOT SURPRISED/ SURPRISED BASED ON UNDEVELOPED PROVENANCE OR NOT SURPRISED/ SURPRISED BASED ON CONTENT, UNSUPPORTED</p> <p><u>Example</u></p> <p>After reading Source E, I am <u>surprised</u> by Source F because Source F is adapted from a commentary by Jee Leong Koh, the founder of Singapore Unbound which upholds freedom of expression. <i>[answer based on undeveloped provenance]</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p>After reading Source E, I am <u>not surprised</u> by Source F because they are both <u>similar</u> in stating that streaming has resulted in negative social impacts. [ATQ] <i>[not surprised based on content, unsupported]</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p>After reading Source E, I am <u>surprised</u> by Source F because they are both <u>different</u> in their support for Subject-based banding. [ATQ] <i>[surprised based on content, unsupported]</i></p> | [1] |
| L2 | <p>NOT SURPRISED/ SURPRISED BASED ON CONTENT, SUPPORTED Similarity or/and Difference in content identified [Award the higher mark in the level for more fully developed answers]</p> <p><u>Example</u></p> <p>After reading Source E, I am <u>not surprised</u> by Source F because they are both <u>similar</u> in stating that streaming has resulted in negative social impacts. [ATQ] The evidence from Source E is “Streaming separates education into different courses, and we put students into each course. So each course is like a big jar. You can put different cookies into the jar, but when you close and label the jar as pineapple tarts, all the goodies in it get labelled as pineapple tarts too, accurately or inaccurately.” [E] <u>This means that streaming has resulted in negative social impacts as students are labelled according to the streams that they belong to.</u> [E] The evidence from Source F is “Singapore Unbound supports the abolition of streaming, which has undermined and stigmatized students by labelling them as Express, Normal (Academic) and Normal (Technical).” [E] <u>This means that streaming has resulted in students to be negatively impacted with the social labels that are attached to the streams they are studying.</u> [E] <i>[not surprised based on content, supported]</i></p> <p>OR/AND</p> <p>After reading Source E, I am <u>surprised</u> by Source F because they are both <u>different</u> in their support for Subject-based banding. [ATQ] The evidence from Source E is “Subject-based banding changes this fundamentally. Essentially, we break the jar, students come out of it, take subjects of varying difficulty, based on their academic ability. Taking one or two subjects at the Foundation level is not equivalent to labelling the child.” [E] <u>This means that Subject-based banding is supported because it is effective in removing the social labels that is tagged to the streams that the student belongs to as students are now able to take on subjects at different levels based on their proficiency in various subjects.</u> [E] The evidence from Source F is “The change must be cultural, starting with the people. Otherwise, any change in the educational system will be twisted from its good intentions by its implementation and reception. Sadly, it is hard to see a change in societal attitudes in the near future.” [E] <u>This means that Subject-based banding is not supported because any educational policy including Subject-based banding is not effective in removing the social labels that is attached to the banding if the societal mindsets and behaviours still does not change.</u> [E] <i>[surprised based on content, supported]</i></p> | [2-3] |

| | | |
|----|--|-------|
| L3 | <p>NOT SURPRISED/ SUPRISED BASED ON DEVELOPED EVALUATION OF SOURCE E, EXPLAINED THROUGH</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EVALUATION OF THE CONTENT OF SOURCE E [who, what and why] - CROSS-REFERENCING TO OTHER SOURCES/ CONTEXTUAL KNOWLEDGE - CRITICAL EVALUATION OF SOURCE E'S PROVENANCE <p>[Award the higher mark in the level for more fully developed answers]</p> <p>OR</p> <p>SURPRISED BASED ON EVALUATION OF SOURCE F</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CROSS-REFERENCING TO OTHER SOURCES/ CONTEXTUAL KNOWLEDGE (source F is less reliable) - CRITICAL EVALUATION OF SOURCE F'S PROVENANCE (source F is less reliable) <p>OR</p> <p>SURPRISED BASED ON DIFFERENCE IN PURPOSE OF SOURCES E AND F, SUPPORTED</p> <p>[Award the higher mark in the level for more fully developed answers]</p> | |
| | <p>Example</p> <p>After reading Source E, I am <u>not surprised</u> by Source F because Source E is less reliable. Source E is one-sided as it only highlights the benefits of the Subject-based banding. [ATQ] The evidence from Source E is "Subject-based banding changes this fundamentally. Essentially, we break the jar, students come out of it, take subjects of varying difficulty, based on their academic ability. Taking one or two subjects at the Foundation level is not equivalent to labelling the child. We continued to reap the benefits of customisation of education, but minimised the downsides of labelling." [E] This means that Subject-based banding is supported because it is effective in removing the social labels that is tagged to the streams that the student belongs to as students are now able to take on subjects at different levels based on their proficiency in various subjects. [E] As Mr Ong Ye Kung only highlights the positive impact of eliminating social stigma, it is one-sided and hence not reliable. [not surprised based on evaluation of the content of Source E]</p> <p>OR</p> <p>After reading Source E, I am <u>not surprised</u> by Source F because Source E is less reliable as Subject-based banding cannot remove social stigma since it is challenged by Source A. [ATQ] Source E states that Subject-based banding would mitigate social stigma among students from different streams. The evidence from Source E is "Subject-based banding changes this fundamentally. Essentially, we break the jar, students come out of it, take subjects of varying difficulty, based on their academic ability. Taking one or two subjects at the Foundation level is not equivalent to labelling the child. We continued to reap the benefits of customisation of education, but minimised the downsides of labelling." [E] This means that Subject-based banding is supported because it is effective in removing the social labels that is tagged to the streams that the student belongs to as students are now able to take on subjects at different levels based on their proficiency in various subjects. [E] However, Source E is challenged by Source A. [Cross-reference to another source to check reliability] The evidence from Source A is "The students are labelled as "EXPRESS" or "NORMAL" by the factory worker before the Subject-based banding and the students are still labelled as "G1", "G2" or "G3" even after the Subject-based banding is implemented." [E] This means that Subject-based banding cannot completely eradicate social stigma as the changes in the education system will not make any difference since students are still labelled according to the different bands in the new Subject-based banding system. [E] Since Source A challenges Source E, Source E is less reliable and hence I am not surprised by Source F. [not surprised based on cross-referencing of Source E to other sources]</p> <p>OR</p> <p>After reading Source E, I am <u>surprised</u> by Source F because Source E is more reliable as Subject-based banding can remove social stigma since it is supported by Source C. [ATQ] Source E states that Subject-based banding would mitigate social stigma among students from different streams. The evidence from Source E is "Subject-based banding changes this fundamentally. Essentially, we break the jar, students come out of it, take subjects of varying difficulty, based on their academic ability. Taking one or two subjects</p> | [4-5] |

at the Foundation level is not equivalent to labelling the child. We continued to reap the benefits of customisation of education, but minimised the downsides of labelling.” **[E]** This means that Subject-based banding is supported because it is effective in removing the social labels that is tagged to the streams that the student belongs to as students are now able to take on subjects at different levels based on their proficiency in various subjects. **[E]** Furthermore, Source E is supported by Source C. **[Cross-reference to another source to check reliability]** The evidence in Source C is “Even if parents try to compare and categorise students by their overall ability, it will be difficult to do so in the Subject-based banding system. They will not be confined to an ability category and labelled accordingly, unlike the case in Normal or Express streaming where students are placed into clear groupings, creating the perception of “us versus them”.” **[E]** This means that the Subject-based banding system would be able to effect a positive change in gradually eradicating the existing social stigmatisation as Subject-based banding makes it more difficult for parents to make direct comparison when students are not placed in distinct streams as before. **[E]** **Since Source C supports Source E, Source E is more reliable and hence I am surprised by Source F.** *[surprised based on cross-referencing of Source E to other sources]*

OR

After reading Source E, I am not surprised by Source F because **Source E is less reliable.** It is a speech by Mr Ong Ye Kung, the Education Minister. As the Education Minister, he is more likely to portray the efforts by the Singapore government in a positive light and highlight the positive impacts of the Subject-based banding. Furthermore, he said this during a debate on his ministry’s budget in Parliament. **[ATQ]** Mr Ong Ye Kung **[A]** aims to convince **[V]** the ministers in the Parliament **[A]** that Subject-based banding is beneficial and would reduce social stigma **[M]** so that the ministers in the Parliament would support the policy for Subject-based banding and approve the budget for the Ministry of Education. **[I]**. The evidence from Source E is “Subject-based banding changes this fundamentally. Essentially, we break the jar, students come out of it, take subjects of varying difficulty, based on their academic ability. Taking one or two subjects at the Foundation level is not equivalent to labelling the child. We continued to reap the benefits of customisation of education, but minimised the downsides of labelling.” **[E]** This means that Subject-based banding is supported because it is effective in removing the social labels that is tagged to the streams that the student belongs to as students are now able to take on subjects at different levels based on their proficiency in various subjects. **[E]** **As Mr Ong Ye Kung has an agenda in hoping that the budget for his ministry can be approved, he is not objective and hence less reliable.** *[not surprised based on critical evaluation of the provenance of the base source]*

OR

After reading Source E, I am surprised by Source F because **Source E is more reliable.** It is a speech by Mr Ong Ye Kung, the Education Minister. As the Education Minister, he has the responsibility for Singapore’s education landscape and he have to implement educational policy that is beneficial to the students. He cannot implement the Subject-based banding when it is no difference from streaming. **[ATQ]** The evidence from Source E is “Subject-based banding changes this fundamentally. Essentially, we break the jar, students come out of it, take subjects of varying difficulty, based on their academic ability. Taking one or two subjects at the Foundation level is not equivalent to labelling the child. We continued to reap the benefits of customisation of education, but minimised the downsides of labelling.” **[E]** This means that Subject-based banding is supported because it is effective in removing the social labels that is tagged to the streams that the student belongs to as students are now able to take on subjects at different levels based on their proficiency in various subjects. **[E]** **As Mr Ong Ye Kung is the Education Minister, he is under the scrutiny of the Singaporeans and he needs to be sure that the policy of Subject-based banding is indeed more beneficial than streaming or at least mitigate the problem of stigmatisation due to streaming, otherwise he would suffer a backlash from the general public.** *[surprised based on critical evaluation of the provenance of the base source]*

OR

After reading Source E, I am surprised by Source F because Source F is **less reliable as Subject-based banding would remove social stigma since it is challenged by Source C**. Source F states that Subject-based banding would not mitigate social stigma. [ATQ] The evidence from Source F is “The belated change to Subject-based banding is an improvement.” but “The change must be cultural, starting with the people. Otherwise, any change in the educational system will be twisted from its good intentions by its implementation and reception. Sadly, it is hard to see a change in societal attitudes in the near future.” [E] This means that Jee Leong Koh acknowledges that the Subject-based banding is a progress from streaming, but it is still not effective in removing the social labels that is attached to the banding if the societal mindsets and behaviours still does not change. [E] Furthermore, Source F is challenged by Source C. **[Cross-reference to another source to check reliability]** The evidence in Source C is “Even if parents try to compare and categorise students by their overall ability, it will be difficult to do so in the Subject-based banding system. They will not be confined to an ability category and labelled accordingly, unlike the case in Normal or Express streaming where students are placed into clear groupings, creating the perception of “us versus them”.” [E] This means that the Subject-based banding system would be able to effect a positive change in gradually eradicating the existing social stigmatisation as Subject-based banding makes it more difficult for parents to make direct comparison when students are not placed in distinct streams as before. [E] **Since Source C challenges Source F, Source F is less reliable and hence I am surprised by Source F.** *[surprised based on cross-referencing of Source F to other sources]*

OR

After reading Source E, I am surprised by Source F because Source F is **less reliable** [ATQ] Source F is a commentary by Jee Leong Koh, the founder of Singapore Unbound which upholds freedom of expression. As the founder of Singapore Unbound, Jee Leong Koh is likely to speak freely about the negative impacts of Subject-based banding. **Hence, he might give a biased perspective of the ineffectiveness of the Subject-based banding in reducing social stigma for students from various academic backgrounds.** Furthermore, the tone of the author is slightly critical and pessimistic/negative. The evidences from the source are “undermined”, “belated” and “sadly”. [E] The choice of words used by the author shows that he might not be very objective and has formed a fixed view about the effectiveness of Subject-based banding. **As Jee Leong Koh might be biased and has a fixed view about the effectiveness of the Subject-based banding, hence Source F is less reliable.** [E] *[surprised based on critical evaluation of Source F's provenance]*

OR

After reading Source E, I am surprised by Source F because **both sources differ in their purpose**. [ATQ] Mr Ong Ye Kung [A] aims to convince [V] the ministers in the Parliament [A] that Subject-based banding is beneficial and would reduce social stigma [M] so that the ministers in the Parliament would support the policy for Subject-based banding and approve the budget for the Ministry of Education. [I]. The evidence from Source E is “Subject-based banding changes this fundamentally. Essentially, we break the jar, students come out of it, take subjects of varying difficulty, based on their academic ability. Taking one or two subjects at the Foundation level is not equivalent to labelling the child. We continued to reap the benefits of customisation of education, but minimised the downsides of labelling.” [E] This means that Subject-based banding is supported because it is effective in removing the social labels that is tagged to the streams that the student belongs to as students are now able to take on subjects at different levels based on their proficiency in various subjects. [E] While Jee Leong Koh [A] aims to criticise [V] the Singapore government [A] that Subject-based banding is not effective in removing the social stigmatisation [M] so that the Education Minister, Mr Ong Ye Kung would review the educational policy of Subject-based banding and come up with more effective policy to reduce social stigma [I]. The evidence from Source F is “The change must be cultural, starting with the people. Otherwise, any change in the educational system will be twisted from its good intentions by its implementation and reception. Sadly, it is hard to see a change in societal attitudes in the near future.” [E] This means that Subject-based banding is not supported because any educational policy including Subject-based banding is not effective in removing the social labels that is attached to the banding if the societal

| | | |
|----|--|-------|
| | mindsets and behaviours still does not change. [E] Hence, both sources are different in purpose. <i>[surprised based on difference in purpose]</i> | |
| L4 | <p>NOT SURPRISED BASED ON DEVELOPED EVALUATION OF SOURCE F, EXPLAINED THROUGH</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EVALUATION OF THE CONTENT OF SOURCE F [who, what and why] (Source F is more reliable) - CROSS-REFERENCING TO OTHER SOURCES/ CONTEXTUAL KNOWLEDGE (source F is more reliable) - CRITICAL EVALUATION OF SOURCE F'S PROVENANCE (source F is more reliable) - RELATIVE RELIABILITY [Award the higher mark for the reliability of Source F] <p>Example</p> <p>After reading Source E, I am <u>not surprised</u> by Source F because Source F is more reliable. Source F is providing an objective view of the Subject-based banding as he acknowledges that the Subject-based banding is a positive change from the previous educational policy of streaming and he also raises the limitation of the policy in eradicating social stigma. The evidence from Source F is "The belated change to Subject-based banding is an improvement." but "The change must be cultural, starting with the people. Otherwise, any change in the educational system will be twisted from its good intentions by its implementation and reception. Sadly, it is hard to see a change in societal attitudes in the near future." [E] <u>This means that Jee Leong Koh acknowledges that the Subject-based banding is a progress from streaming, but it is still not effective in removing the social labels that is attached to the banding if the societal mindsets and behaviours still does not change.</u> [E] <u>As Source F provides an objective view of the Subject-based banding by acknowledging that it has both pros and cons, Source F is more reliable.</u> <i>[not surprised based on evaluation of the content of source F]</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p>After reading Source E, I am <u>not surprised</u> by Source F because Source F is more reliable as Subject-based banding would not remove social stigma since it is supported by Source B. Source F states that Subject-based banding would not mitigate social stigma. [ATQ] The evidence from Source F is "The belated change to Subject-based banding is an improvement." but "The change must be cultural, starting with the people. Otherwise, any change in the educational system will be twisted from its good intentions by its implementation and reception. Sadly, it is hard to see a change in societal attitudes in the near future." [E] <u>This means that Jee Leong Koh acknowledges that the Subject-based banding is a progress from streaming, but it is still not effective in removing the social labels that is attached to the banding if the societal mindsets and behaviours still does not change.</u> [E] Furthermore, Source F is supported by Source B. [Cross-reference to another source to check reliability] The evidence from Source B is "There will be a replacement of one kind of stigma associated with streaming with another kind — that of subject combinations that students take in school. This might lead to a scenario where parents, or students, compare how many higher-level subjects they take, or aim for the maximum number of G3 (higher-level) subjects." and "For the changes to have the intended effect, it has to take place together with a review of social attitudes." [E] <u>This means that the change in educational policy from streaming to Subject-based banding is not going to effect a change in the existing social stigmatisation as people would still make comparison of students based on the subjects they took at different levels as there needs to be a shift in the mindsets in order for the social stigma to be eliminated in the society.</u> [E] <u>Since Source B supports Source F, Source F is more reliable and hence I am surprised by Source F.</u> <i>[not surprised based on cross-referencing of Source F to other sources]</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p>After reading Source E, I am <u>not surprised</u> by Source F because Source F is more reliable [ATQ] Source F is a commentary by Jee Leong Koh, the founder of Singapore Unbound which upholds freedom of expression. As the founder of Singapore Unbound, he is expected to freely express an honest opinion of the Subject-based banding. The evidence from Source F is "The belated change to subject-based banding is an improvement." and</p> | [6-7] |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>“Sadly, it is hard to see a change in societal attitudes in the near future.” [E] This means that Jee leong Koh acknowledges that there is a change for the better but it is still very difficult to change the social labelling associated with a child’s ability to produce good academic results and get into a better band. [E] As Jee Leong Koh does not have an agenda, he would be able to give an honest perspective of the effectiveness of the Subject-based banding in reducing social stigma among students from various academic backgrounds. Hence, Source F is more reliable. <i>[not surprised based on critical evaluation of Source F’s provenance]</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p>After reading Source E, I am <u>not surprised</u> by Source F because Source F is more reliable [ATQ] Jee Leong Koh is more reliable because she is the founder of Singapore Unbound which upholds freedom of expression who would provide an honest view of the Subject-based banding and he acknowledges the positive changes while mentioning the negative perspective of the Subject-based banding. The evidence from Source F is “The belated change to Subject-based banding is an improvement.” but “The change must be cultural, starting with the people. Otherwise, any change in the educational system will be twisted from its good intentions by its implementation and reception. Sadly, it is hard to see a change in societal attitudes in the near future.” [E] <u>This means that Jee Leong Koh acknowledges that the Subject-based banding is a progress from streaming, but it is still not effective in removing the social labels that is attached to the banding if the societal mindsets and behaviours still does not change.</u> [E] As Jee Leong Koh is providing an objective view of the Subject-based banding, Source F is more reliable. However, Source E is a speech by Mr Ong Ye Kung, the Education Minister. As the Education Minister, he is more likely to portray the efforts by the Singapore government in a positive light and highlight the positive impacts of the Subject-based banding. Furthermore, he said this during a debate on his ministry’s budget in Parliament. [ATQ] Mr Ong Ye Kung [A] aims to convince [V] the ministers in the Parliament [A] that Subject-based banding is beneficial and would reduce social stigma [M] so that the ministers in the Parliament would support the policy for Subject-based banding and approve the budget for the Ministry of Education. [I]. The evidence from Source E is “Subject-based banding changes this fundamentally. Essentially, we break the jar, students come out of it, take subjects of varying difficulty, based on their academic ability. Taking one or two subjects at the Foundation level is not equivalent to labelling the child. We continued to reap the benefits of customisation of education, but minimised the downsides of labelling.” [E] <u>This means that Subject-based banding is supported because it is effective in removing the social labels that is tagged to the streams that the student belongs to as students are now able to take on subjects at different levels based on their proficiency in various subjects.</u> [E] Source F is one-sided as Mr Ong Ye Kung only highlights the positive impact of Subject-based banding in eliminating the social stigma and he is likely to have an agenda, he is not reliable. Hence, Source F is more reliable than Source E. <i>[not surprised based on relative reliability of Source F and Source E]</i></p> | |
|--|--|--|

- (e) 'Subject-based banding is for the good of society.'

Using sources in this case study, explain how far the sources support this statement. [10]

Question Target: Evaluation Skill

| | | |
|----|---|-------|
| L1 | <p>WRITE ABOUT STATEMENT, NO VALID SOURCE USE</p> <p><u>Example</u></p> <p>Subject-based banding is an educational policy introduced by the Singapore government.</p> | [1] |
| L2 | <p>YES/ NO, SUPPORTED BY VALID SOURCE USE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 source: 2m - 2 sources: 2-4m - 3 sources or more: 4m <p><u>Example</u></p> <p>Sources C, D and E supports the statement that subject-based banding is for the good of society. [ATQ] The evidence in Source C is "The new Subject-based banding system can go a long way to reduce stigma. Even if parents try to compare and categorise students by their overall ability, it will be difficult to do so in the Subject-based banding system. They will not be confined to an ability category and labelled accordingly, unlike the case in Normal or Express streaming where students are placed into clear groupings, creating the perception of "us versus them". [E] <u>This means that Subject-based banding is for the good of society as it would be able to effect a positive change in gradually eradicating the existing social stigmatisation as Subject-based banding makes it more difficult for parents to make direct comparison when students are not placed in distinct streams as before. As Subject-based banding is able to make the society less stigmatising, it is for the good of society.</u> [E] The evidence from Source D is "Subject-based banding is a step in the right direction." and "The banding dismantle the stigma associated with streaming labels. This move represents the government's recognition of the current education system's shortcoming and a genuine intent to improve it." [E] <u>This means that Subject-based banding is for the good of society because it is possible for Subject-based banding to eliminate the social stigma and for the society to move forward to be less stigmatising. Also, the government acknowledges its policy of streaming has brought about negative impact and implemented a national wide approach of Subject-based banding to mitigate this problem, highlighting that the government and citizens are working for the good of society.</u> [E] The evidence from Source E is "Subject-based banding changes this fundamentally. Essentially, we break the jar, students come out of it, take subjects of varying difficulty, based on their academic ability. Taking one or two subjects at the Foundation level is not equivalent to labelling the child. We continued to reap the benefits of customisation of education, but minimised the downsides of labelling." [E] <u>This means that Subject-based banding is for the good of society because it is effective in removing the social labels that is tagged to the streams that the student belongs to as students are now able to take on subjects at different levels based on their proficiency in various subjects. As Subject-based banding is able to make the society less stigmatising, it is for the good of society.</u> [E] Thus, Sources C, D and E supports the statement that subject-based banding is for the good of society. [ATQ]</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Sources A, B and F do not support the statement that subject-based banding is for the good of society. [ATQ] The evidence from Source A is "The students are labelled as "EXPRESS" or "NORMAL" by the factory worker before the Subject-based banding and the students are still labelled as "G1", "G2" or "G3" even after the Subject-based banding is implemented." [E] <u>This means that Subject-based banding is not for the good of society because it cannot completely eradicate social stigma as the changes in the education system will not make any difference since students are still labelled according to the different bands in the new Subject-based banding system. As the Subject-based banding is going to perpetrate this trend of stigmatising students based on their banding, it is not for the good of the society.</u> [E] The evidence from Source B is "There will be a replacement of one kind of stigma associated with streaming with another kind — that of subject combinations that students take in school. This might lead to a scenario where parents, or students, compare how many higher-level subjects they take, or aim for the maximum</p> | [2-4] |

| | | |
|--|--|-------|
| | <p>number of G3 (higher-level) subjects.” and “For the changes to have the intended effect, it has to take place together with a review of social attitudes.” [E] This means that Subject-based banding is not for the good of society because the change in educational policy from streaming to Subject-based banding is not going to effect a change in the existing social stigmatisation as people would still make comparison of students based on the subjects they took at different levels as there needs to be a shift in the mindsets in order for the social stigma to be eliminated in the society. [E] The evidence from Source F is “The change must be cultural, starting with the people. Otherwise, any change in the educational system will be twisted from its good intentions by its implementation and reception. Sadly, it is hard to see a change in societal attitudes in the near future.” [E] This means that based banding is not for the good of society because any educational policy including Subject-based banding is not effective in removing the social labels that is attached to the banding if the societal mindsets and behaviours still does not change. As the Subject-based banding is going to mitigate this trend of stigmatising students based on their banding, it is not for the good of the society. [E] Thus, Sources A, B and F do not support the statement that subject-based banding is for the good of society. [ATQ]</p> | |
| L3 | <p>YES + NO, SUPPORTED BY VALID SOURCE USE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2 sources: 5m (1 ‘yes’ & 1 ‘no’) - 3 sources: 6m (1 ‘yes’ & 2 ‘no’ OR 2 ‘yes’ & 1 ‘no’) - 4 sources or more: 7-8m (2 ‘yes’ & 2 ‘no’) - 5 sources or more: 8m (2 ‘yes’ & 3 ‘no’) OR (3 ‘yes’ & 2 ‘no’) | [5-8] |
| <p>Note: Consideration on number of sources used and quality of analysis in deciding on marks in L2 & L3.</p> | | |
| | <p>BOTH ELEMENTS OF L2 ** To score additional 2 marks, candidates can take any one of these 3 routes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through analysing at least one source in relation to its reliability, utility or sufficiency e.g. <u>Sources A do not support the statement that subject-based banding is for the good of society. [ATQ]</u> The evidence from Source A is “The students are labelled as “EXPRESS” or “NORMAL” by the factory worker before the Subject-based banding and the students are still labelled as “G1”, “G2” or “G3” even after the Subject-based banding is implemented.” [E] This means that Subject-based banding is not for the good of society because it cannot completely eradicate social stigma as the changes in the education system will not make any difference since students are still labelled according to the different bands in the new Subject-based banding system. As the Subject-based banding is going to perpetrate this trend of stigmatising students based on their banding, it is not for the good of the society. [E] This source is not reliable. The cartoon was published by a cartoonist to portray the views of the Subject-based banding in a satirical manner. The cartoonist might have an agenda to generate similar sentiments about the topic from other Singaporeans. Furthermore, the view of the cartoonist is not representative of other Singaporeans towards the Subject-based banding system. Hence, this source is unreliable. • By sharing example(s) from their contextual knowledge e.g. <u>Source B do not support the statement that subject-based banding is for the good of society. [ATQ]</u> The evidence from Source B is “There will be a replacement of one kind of stigma associated with streaming with another kind — that of subject combinations that students take in school. This might lead to a scenario where parents, or students, compare how many higher-level subjects they take, or aim for the maximum number of G3 (higher-level) subjects.” and “For the changes to have the intended effect, it has to take place together with a review of social attitudes.” [E] <u>Source B highlights that Subject-based banding is not for the good of society because the change in educational policy from streaming to Subject-based banding is not going to effect a change in the existing social stigmatisation as people would still make comparison of students based on the subjects they took at different levels as there needs to be a shift in the mindsets in order for the social stigma to be eliminated in the society. [E] This sentiment is true based on my contextual knowledge.</u> Tankoktim, a writer who provides alternative perspectives also echoed this view. He said it is up to the society, parents and schools to change their mindsets and practices to avoid stigmatising the new labels (G1, G2 and G3). He acknowledges that any categorising | +2 |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>comes with group labels and the risk of stigmatisation. The government can only do so much to encourage mixing across labels and to get schools to create diverse class experiences that mix students with different academic strengths. The rest are based on the society and their attitudes. Hence, it is true based on my contextual knowledge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By giving a balanced conclusion/resolution <p>e.g. On one hand, subject-based banding is for the good of society because it aims to eradicate the social stigma that arises due to streaming in the long term. It hopes that the society would progress socially by not labelling students based on their academic strengths and weaknesses. This cultivates a more cohesive and understanding society. On the other hand, some thinks that the subject-based banding is not for the good of society because it is difficult to change people's entrenched mindsets and behaviours as streaming was practiced for four decades. Many generations of parents were brought up in the system of streaming, which made it hard to change their attitudes. The sources show that there are two perspectives and each perspective is valid and reasonable. Singaporeans need to be more conscious of their attitude and they can shift their mindsets in their own capacity. By changing their individual perspectives and influencing others to be the same, the social stigma would significantly decline in the near future. In the long term, Singapore can move towards a more socially cohesive society where Singaporeans can appreciate each other for their strengths and focussed lesser on their weaknesses.</p> <p>Note: Consideration on number of sources used and quality of analysis in deciding on marks in L2 & L3.</p> | |
|--|--|--|



Assumption English School
Preliminary Examination
2019

Subject: Humanities (Social Studies)

Level/Stream: Secondary 4 Express and Secondary 5 Normal (Academic)

Date: 27 August 2019

Time: 0750 - 0935

Duration: 1 hour 45 minutes

SRQ LORMS

Section B: Structured Response Question (15 Marks)

2 Exploring Citizenship and Governance

- (a) Extract 1 states that the hawker food culture has strengthened our national identity.

In your opinion, how can Singapore continue to preserve our hawker food culture? Explain your answer using **two** ways. [7]

| | | |
|---------|--|-----------|
| Level 1 | DESCRIBES THE TOPIC (i.e. hawker food culture) | 1 mark |
| | Example Hawker food culture demonstrate Singapore's vibrant cultural identity and the distinctive local dishes that Singaporeans enjoy have form an important part of our food heritage. | |
| Level 2 | IDENTIFIES/DESCRIBES WAYS <i>[Award 2 marks for identifying one way and 3 marks for identifying two ways]</i> <i>[Award 3 marks for describing one way and 4 marks for describing two ways]</i> | 2-4 marks |
| | Example <p>One way that Singapore can continue to preserve our hawker food culture is to promote Singapore's unique hawker food culture. [P] Singapore can generate greater interest in local hawker food culture by organising events such as the "Hawker Food Festival" at Singapore's iconic landmarks such as Marina Bay Sands or Sentosa. It can be organised like a night market for the entire month. Local hawker stalls offering a variety of authentic local dishes like char kway teow, prata, satay, chicken rice and chilli crab. The "Hawker Food Festival" allows locals and tourists to explore our diverse and vibrant hawker food culture. There is also a section that explains the history of our hawker food culture and highlights some of the local hawker scene. [E]</p> <p>OR/AND</p> <p>Another way that Singapore can continue to preserve our hawker food culture is to provide support to our hawker businesses. [P] The survival of local hawker food culture can be ensured by encouraging younger Singaporeans to learn the skill and be a part of the hawker scene. It can be done through a mentorship programme where we impart skills to the younger generation. For example, Timbre Group was appointed by the National Environment Agency (NEA) as Yishun Park hawker Centre's managing agent and the hawker centre will be managed on a not-for-profit basis. Timbre+ Hawkers is expanding its Hawkerpreneurs Incubation Programme at Yishun Park Hawker Centre to provide more support for hawkerpreneurs. This programme offers a low startup investment with \$1,300 all-inclusive monthly rental for Singaporeans who are 35 years and below and has aspirations in food and beverages business. Hawkerpreneurs would also receive mentorship through a six-month programme. [E]</p> | |
| Level 3 | EXPLAINS WAYS <i>[Award 5-6 marks for explaining one way]</i> <i>[Award 6-7 marks for explaining two ways]</i> | 5-7 marks |
| | Example <p>One way that Singapore can continue to preserve our hawker food culture is to promote Singapore's unique hawker food culture. [P] Singapore can generate greater interest in local hawker food culture by organising events such as the "Hawker Food Festival" at Singapore's iconic landmarks such as Marina Bay Sands or Sentosa. It can be organised like a night market for the entire month. Local hawker stalls offering a variety of authentic local dishes like char kway teow, prata, satay, chicken rice and chilli crab. The "Hawker Food Festival" allows locals and tourists to explore our diverse and vibrant hawker food culture. There is also a section that explains the history of our hawker food culture and highlights some</p> | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>of the local hawker scene. [E] As a result, Singaporeans are reminded of our distinctive hawker food culture and they would better appreciate and support our local hawker food culture. Tourists will be able to try these authentic local food and soak in the unique Singapore hawker food culture. The Hawker Food Festival is held at iconic landmarks would allow locals and tourist to visit and appreciate these historic places. Singaporeans could also educate their children about the preservation of our hawker food culture and promote this iconic cultural food heritage to foreigners. In the long term, our hawker culture can be preserved with greater interest and appreciation. [E] Therefore, one way that Singapore can continue to preserve our hawker food culture is to promote Singapore's unique hawker food culture. [L]</p> <p>OR/AND</p> <p>Another way that Singapore can continue to preserve our hawker food culture is to provide support to our hawker businesses. [P] The survival of local hawker food culture can be ensured by encouraging younger Singaporeans to learn the skill and be a part of the hawker scene. It can be done through a mentorship programme where we impart skills to the younger generation. For example, Timbre Group was appointed by the National Environment Agency (NEA) as Yishun Park hawker Centre's managing agent and the hawker centre will be managed on a not-for-profit basis. Timbre+ Hawkers is expanding its Hawkerpreneurs Incubation Programme at Yishun Park Hawker Centre to provide more support for hawkerpreneurs. This programme offers a low startup investment with \$1,300 all-inclusive monthly rental for Singaporeans who are 35 years and below and has aspirations in food and beverages business. Hawkerpreneurs would also receive mentorship through a six-month programme. [E] <u>As a result, hawker enthusiasts who are interested in starting a business are able to experience it with a reduced operating cost and mentorship. This would attract passionate young hawkers to work in the hawker industries and continue this hawker food culture. It would also ease them into the hawker businesses, especially with direct competition from bigger and more established food chain. The survival and sustainability of these hawker businesses is essential in preserving the hawker food culture in Singapore.</u> [E] Therefore, another way that Singapore can continue to preserve our hawker food culture is to provide support to our hawker businesses. [L]</p> | |
|--|---|--|

- (b) Extracts 2 and 3 highlight the role of government in working for the good of society.

Do you think the role of government in providing goods and services for the public is more important than safeguarding the interests of citizens? Explain your answer. [8]

| | | |
|---------|---|-----------|
| Level 1 | WRITES ABOUT THE TOPIC BUT WITHOUT ADDRESSING THE QUESTION (i.e. good of society) | 1-2 mark |
| | Example <p>The government plays an important role in making decisions and shaping policies for the good of society by ensuring the needs and interests of all citizens are addressed.</p> | |
| Level 2 | DESCRIBES THE ROLE OF FACTORS <i>[Award 3 marks for describing one factor]</i> <i>[Award 4 marks for describing both factors]</i> | 3-4 marks |
| | Example <p>Providing goods and services for the public is an important role of the government in contributing to the good of society. [P] Governments devote significant resources to improving the well-being of their citizens. In their daily lives, citizens enjoy benefits from the provision of goods and services for the public. These goods and services are provided for or subsidised by governments so that all citizens can have access to them. An example of a service provided for the public is transportation. The Circle Line (CCL) is going to be completed in 2025 with 33 stations and 12 interchanges to connect to all existing MRT lines and the future Thomson-East Coast Line. In addition, Land Transport Authority (LTA) is purchasing 12 new trains from Alstom to cater for the expected increase in passenger when the CCL is fully operational. Singapore, the government has worked towards developing a people-centred public transport system, which has amongst others, more connections and better services. [E]</p> <p>OR/AND</p> <p>Safeguarding the interests of citizens is an important role of the government in contributing to the good of society. [P] The government safeguards the interests of citizens in various ways such as ensuring that there is no abuse by employers as well as a sense of security in old age. For example, the government introduced the WorkRight Initiative to help both employees and employers understand their rights and responsibilities respectively. The WorkRight Initiative creates awareness of employment rights amongst low-wage workers and ensure their retirement security. Another example is the Central Provident Fund (CPF) which helps Singaporeans prepare for their retirement. CPF enables Singaporeans to finance their housing and healthcare needs, and have a source of lifelong income in retirement. As life expectancy increases in Singapore, having a source of lifelong income in retirement becomes more important. CPF LIFE was therefore introduced in 2009 to provide Singaporeans with a lifelong monthly payout in retirement to give them greater peace of mind. [E]</p> | |
| Level 3 | EXPLAINS THE ROLE OF FACTORS <i>[Award 5-6 marks for explaining one factor]</i> <i>[Award 6-7 marks for explaining both factors]</i> | 5-7 marks |
| | Example <p>Providing goods and services for the public is an important role of the government in contributing to the good of society. [P] Governments devote significant resources to improving the well-being of their citizens. In their daily lives, citizens enjoy benefits from the provision of goods and services for the public. These goods and services are provided for or subsidised by governments so that all citizens can have access to them. An example of a service provided for the public is transportation. The Circle Line (CCL) is going to be completed in 2025 with 33 stations and 12 interchanges to connect to all existing MRT lines and the future Thomson-East Coast Line. In addition, Land Transport Authority (LTA) is</p> | |

| | | |
|----------------|--|------------|
| | <p>purchasing 12 new trains from Alstom to cater for the expected increase in passenger when the CCL is fully operational. Singapore, the government has worked towards developing a people-centred public transport system, which has amongst others, more connections and better services. [E] <u>As a result, when the government provides goods and services for the public, it contributes to the good of society because it improves their standard of living by providing more accessibility and convenience for the people that is essential for the well-being of all citizens. When the people feel that their needs are looked after by the government, they will develop a sense of belonging to the country and be willing to contribute to the country, leading to the stability and continued progress of the country.</u> [E] Therefore, providing goods and services for the public is an important role of the government in contributing to the good of society. [L]</p> <p>OR/AND</p> <p>Safeguarding the interests of citizens is an important role of the government in contributing to the good of society. [P] The government safeguards the interests of citizens in various ways such as ensuring that there is no abuse by employers as well as a sense of security in old age. For example, the government introduced the WorkRight Initiative to help both employees and employers understand their rights and responsibilities respectively. The WorkRight Initiative creates awareness of employment rights amongst low-wage workers and ensure their retirement security. Another example is the Central Provident Fund (CPF) which helps Singaporeans prepare for their retirement. CPF enables Singaporeans to finance their housing and healthcare needs, and have a source of lifelong income in retirement. As life expectancy increases in Singapore, having a source of lifelong income in retirement becomes more important. CPF LIFE was therefore introduced in 2009 to provide Singaporeans with a lifelong monthly payout in retirement to give them greater peace of mind [E] <u>As a result, when the government safeguards the interests of citizens, it contributes to the good of society because it ensures that their needs and interests are protected and they have a sense of security when living in Singapore. The government protects citizens' rights at work and ensure their retirement security in future. When people feel secure about working and living in the country even after their retirement age, they will develop a sense of belonging to the country and be willing to contribute to the country, leading to greater stability and continued progress of the country.</u> [E] Therefore, safeguarding the interests of citizens is an important role of the government in contributing to the good of society. [L]</p> | |
| Level 4 | <p>BOTH ASPECTS IN L3 PLUS EXPLAINS THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF EACH ROLE</p> <p><u>Example</u></p> <p>Safeguarding the interests of citizens is a <u>more important</u> role of the government than providing goods and services for the public in contributing to the good of society. It is the government's responsibility to provide goods and services for the general public such as the provision of infrastructure and resources for the citizens to improve their quality of life. However, the government have to cater to different needs and wants from different groups of citizens in the society. It is impossible to address all the needs and wants. Hence, the government have to prioritise some of the needs of the vulnerable members of the society such as families from the lower social-economic strata and the ageing elderly. These groups of citizens would be left behind if the government overlook their need and they would not be able to benefit from these goods and services if their concerns are unaddressed. Hence, it is of utmost importance for government to safeguard the interests of citizens by effectively addressing their needs before they can fully trust the government and develop a stronger sense of attachment to the nation. Hence, safeguarding the interests of citizens is a <u>more important</u> role of the government than providing goods and services for the public in contributing to the good of society.</p> | [8] |