



Index Number	Class	Name
--------------	-------	------



CHIJ ST JOSEPH'S CONVENT PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION



HUMANITIES

Paper 1 Social Studies

2272/01, 2273/01, 2274/01

Wednesday, 28 August 2019
1 hour 45 minutes

Secondary 4 Express/ 5 Normal Academic

Additional Materials: Writing paper

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

Write your index number, class and name on all the work that you hand in.
Write in dark blue or black pen.
Do not use staples, paper clips, highlighters, and glue or correction fluid.

Section A

Answer all parts of Question 1. Begin each question on a fresh page.

Section B

Answer only one question. Begin each question on a fresh page.

At the end of the examination, fasten all your work securely together.
Attach this Cover Page on top of all your answers.

The number of marks is given in brackets [] at the end of each question or part question.

FOR EXAMINER'S USE	
Section A	35
Section B	15
Total	50

BLANK PAGE

Section A (Source-Based Case Study)

Question 1 is **compulsory** for all candidates.

1 Being Part of a Globalised World

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

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

(a) Study Source A.

Why did the cartoonist draw this cartoon? Explain your answer, using details from the cartoon.

[5]

(b) Study Sources B and C.

How far would the author in Source B agree with the author of Source C? Explain your answer.

[6]

(c) Study Sources D and E.

Does Source E prove that the concerns raised in Source D about the travel ban are justified? Explain your answer.

[7]

(d) Study Source F.

How surprised are you by Source F? Explain your answer.

[7]

(e) 'The travel ban in America is advantageous for America.'

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

[10]

Is the travel ban in America making it a safer place from terrorism?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

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

When Republican¹ Presidential candidate Donald Trump became the 45th President of the United States of America in 2016, he promised to make America safer and stronger.

On 27 January 2017, President Trump signed an executive order² to stop all refugee admissions and temporarily barring entry into America for people from seven predominantly Muslim countries: Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria and Yemen. President Trump claimed that this would stop terrorists from infiltrating America from these listed countries and he had the support of most Republicans in America. The executive order was suspended shortly after it was implemented and President Trump appealed to the Supreme Court for its reinstatement.

As a country which originated from migrants and a champion of freedom and liberty, many Americans (especially those who support the Democrats) felt that the travel ban was a betrayal of the American spirit. They also felt it discriminated against the Muslims without necessarily making America safer. However, there were others who felt that the travel ban should have included countries like Saudi Arabia, Lebanon and Pakistan which have been known to shelter terrorists. They believed that the travel ban would keep America safe from terrorist attacks from organisations such as the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS). On 27 June 2017, the US Supreme Court reinstated the travel ban.

¹ *Republican Party* - Political parties in the United States are dominated by the Democratic Party and the Republican Party.

² *Executive order* - An order issued by the President of the United States which all American officers and agencies must follow.

Study the following sources to assess if the travel ban is making America a safer place from terrorism.

Source A: A cartoon posted online by an American newspaper about the impact of travel ban on America's security, 30 January 2017.



Source B: *Adapted from a letter written by Republican Attorney General* Jess Sessions and signed by 134 former American diplomats on the travel ban, March 2017.*

There is no doubt that it is important that we take preventive measures to protect America's security. However, the executive order will jeopardize our relationship with allies and partners. We rely on them for vital counterterrorism cooperation and information-sharing. To Muslims, including those victimized by or fighting against ISIS, it will send a message that reinforces the propaganda of ISIS and other extremist groups that falsely claim that the United States is at war with Islam. Welcoming Muslim refugees and travelers, by contrast, exposes the lies of terrorists and counters their twisted vision of Islam. The ban also goes against the very ideals of freedom and liberty that our country stands for.

**Attorney General*- refers to the head lawyer who gives legal advice to the government.

Source C: *Adapted from comments made by the Chief of Police and Public Security, Lieutenant General Dhahi Khalfan Tamim, of Dubai about America's travel ban in February 2017.*

Congratulations to President Trump for his brave decision. These people can only be dealt with through preventive measures to protect a country's security. Trump banned the citizens of countries allied with Iran and prevented the Iranians from entering, which is a sound decision. What would a Yemeni, Iraqi, Iranian, Somali or a Syrian do in America? They have destroyed their countries, they should not destroy America.

As a counter-terrorism official in a Muslim country contending with a Jihadist* minority, I view President Trump as an ally in the war against terror. I am sure there are other countries that will feel the same way.

*Jihadist is a term used to describe terrorist who twist Islamic teachings to justify their violence.

Source D: *Adapted from a comment by an American student on the travel ban in 2017. She has relatives in her family on the travel ban.*

I know that a lot of people including myself feel that in ways we've been infiltrated by our government. There are others who feel that the ban targets the Muslims and this might make our country a bigger target to foreign terrorists. But I want a safer country for my children and future grandchildren. I am glad somebody is tightening the borders and they're going to properly vet these people, even if it means keeping most of them out, including the women and children. It gives me and many Americans a peace of mind.

However, tightening the borders is only one approach to security. The real challenge is dealing with people already in the United States- immigrants or native-born- who are radicalized to violence within its borders.

Source E: *Adapted from President Trump's Twitter account shortly after terrorist attacks in London on 3 June 2017.*

We need to be smart, vigilant and tough. We need the courts to give us back our rights. We need the travel ban as an extra level of safety! We must stop being politically correct and get down to the business of security for our people. If we don't get smart it will only get worse. We must stop those who threatened our safety from entering our country before more lives are lost!

The Justice Department needs to speed up the hearing of the watered down travel ban before the Supreme Court and seek a much tougher version! In any event we are conducting strict screening procedures on people coming in to the US in order to keep our country safe. The courts are slow and political!

Source F: *Adapted from comments made by Susan Richardson, an immigrant from England, on the travel ban in 2017. She is a Republican who supported Donald Trump in his presidential campaign in 2016.*

I came to the United States in 1965 and consider it an enormous honour. I support the travel ban because I believe that any sovereign country has the absolute right to protect its borders. I can understand this importance especially since September 11.

While many Americans agree that there should be a firm vetting process, we feel that allowances should be made for women, children and the elderly who are fleeing war-torn areas. The current travel ban seemed to stigmatize and isolate Muslims from particular countries and Muslims in general. We are alienating the very communities here in the United States whose cooperation we most need to detect and prevent homegrown terrorist attacks. I'm not anti-Muslim; I'm anti-violence.

Section B (Structured-Response Question)

Question 2 is **compulsory** for all candidates.

2 Exploring Citizenship and Governance

Study the extracts carefully, and then answer the questions.

Extract 1

Countries grant legal status of citizenship to individuals based on various reasons. In Singapore, citizenship is legally granted when a person is born in Singapore and either one of his/her parents is a Singapore citizen. Individuals can also become naturalized citizens when they marry a Singaporean and have stayed in the country for a number of years.

In 2017, the number of Singapore citizenship granted is about 22,000. Almost 50% of those granted citizenship is aged 30 years and below.

Extract 2

Other than legal status, citizenship is shaped by one's national identity. Having a sense of national identity will strengthen the sense of commitment one has to the country.

Extract 3

Another way to shape one's citizenship is through participation in public affairs. Singaporeans can participate towards building a better Singapore through individual or group involvement in working for the good of society.

- (a) Extract 1 states that almost 50% of the 22,000 new citizens granted Singapore citizenship in 2017 were aged 30 years and below.

In your opinion, why do you think almost 50% of the citizenship granted in 2017 were 30 years and below? Explain your answer using **two** reasons. [7]

- (b) Extracts 2 and Extract 3 reflect the role of national identity and participation in public affairs in shaping citizenship in Singapore.

Do you think national identity plays a more important role than participation in public affairs in shaping citizenship in Singapore? Explain your answer. [8]

- END OF PAPER -

Copyright Acknowledgements:

Source A : <https://www.mercurynews.com/2017/01/31/cartoons-donald-trumps-travel-ban/>
 Source B : <http://time.com/4168056/obama-gun-control-speech-transcript/>
 Source C : <http://www.atimes.com/article/middle-eastern-nations-support-trumps-immigration-halt/>
 Source D : <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump>
 Source E : <https://tinyurl.com/y6weadt6>
 Source F : <http://edition.cnn.com/interactive/2017/03/politics/travel-ban-supporters-cnnphotos/>

CHIJ ST JOSEPH'S CONVENT
SEC 4 EXPRESS/ 5 NORMAL ACADEMIC PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION 2019

SECTION A (SOURCE-BASED CASE STUDY)

1(a) Study Source A.

Why did the cartoonist draw the cartoon? Explain your answer, using details from the cartoon.

[5]

Question target: Drawing inference about purpose

Note: Answers must be phrased as reasons. To award 0m for answers that are not phrased as reasons.

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	<p>Answers by describing the source, with no valid interpretation</p> <p>e.g. The cartoonist drew this cartoon <u>because/ as</u> he wants to show a line of men waiting to sign up with ISIS.</p>	[1]
OR	Misinterpretation of source	
OR	<p>Infers messages <u>unrelated</u> to the impact of America's travel ban on America's security</p> <p>e.g. The cartoonist drew this cartoon <u>because/ as</u> he wants to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • show that he is critical of the travel ban • mock Donald Trump's travel ban • show that the travel ban is ineffective 	
L2	<p>Because of context</p> <p>e.g. The cartoonist drew this <u>because</u> President Trump issued an executive order on 27 January 2017 and he is trying to show how he feels about the travel ban and the urgency to address it.</p>	[2]
OR	<p>Infers sub-messages about the impact of America's travel ban on America's security</p> <p>e.g. The cartoonist drew this because he wanted to convince Americans that the travel ban will have an adverse impact on America's security.</p> <p><u>Other possible sub-messages:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ban will endanger America's security • Travel ban has made terrorism grow even more 	[2-3]

L3	<p>Because of the outcome that he hopes for (i.e. impact of the cartoon)</p> <p>e.g. The cartoonist drew the cartoon to rally Americans' support to campaign against the travel ban so that Trump will reverse it.</p>	[3]
L4	<p>Infers message (i.e. about the impact of America's travel ban having an adverse impact on America's security as it will make US more vulnerable)</p> <p><i>Award 4m for overall message, supported with evidence and well-explained.</i></p> <p><i>Following ideas should be present:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Ineffective as security of US is threatened</i> • <i>Recruitment of more ISIS sympathisers</i> <p>e.g. The cartoonist drew the cartoon <u>to show that America's travel ban will not be effective in ensuring the security of the country as it will draw more ISIS sympathisers that may threatened America's security.</u> This is evident as the cartoonist shows two bearded men dressed in an Arabian fashion sit in a stand which says "Join now! Make ISIS great again" and they point towards a portrait of President Trump who is seen holding a sign saying "refugee ban". The two bearded men also remark "best recruitment poster ever". This tells me that the cartoonist believes that President Trump's travel ban will help ISIS garner more recruits to their cause thus showing that President Trump is an incompetent leader as he validates ISIS' claim that the West is at war with the Islamic world. Hence with the rise in ISIS' numbers, this would make America less safe as now there are more terrorists to contend with.</p>	[3-4]
L5	<p>Infers purpose of the cartoon (i.e. L2 + L3 OR L4 + L3) + Context</p> <p><i>Award 4m for answers that detect</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>sub-message + impact + context</i> • <i>main message + impact (w/o awareness of context)</i> <p><i>Award 5m only for answers that detect:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>main message + impact + context</i> <p>The cartoonist drew the cartoon on 30 January 2017 shortly after the introduction of the Executive order by President Trump [Context] because he wanted to convince [V] Americans [A] that <u>the travel ban introduced by President Trump will be ineffective in ensuring security in America as will draw more ISIS sympathizers who will target the country.</u> This is evident as the source shows two bearded men dressed in an Arabic fashion sit in a stand which says "Join now! Make ISIS great again" and they are pointing towards a portrait of President Trump who is seen holding a sign saying "travel ban". The two bearded men also remark "best recruitment poster ever". This suggests that Trump's travel ban will help ISIS garner more recruits to their cause as they target America. Hence, the cartoonist drew the cartoon (answer the</p>	[4-5]

question by repeating the question stem) so that Americans would see the flaw in the ban and campaign against it in hopes that President Trump will reverse the travel ban. [I]

e.g. The cartoonist drew the cartoon because he wanted to convince [V] President Trump [A] that the travel ban introduced by him will be ineffective in ensuring security in America as will draw more ISIS sympathizers who will target the country. This is evident as the source shows two bearded men dressed in an Arabic fashion sit in a stand which says "Join now! Make ISIS great again" and they are pointing towards a portrait of President Trump who is seen holding a sign saying "travel ban". The two bearded men also remark "best recruitment poster ever". This suggests that Trump's travel ban will help ISIS garner more recruits to their cause as they target America. Hence, the cartoonist drew the cartoon (answer the question by repeating the question stem) on 30 January 2017 **shortly after the introduction of the Executive order by President Trump** [Context] so that President Trump will reverse his decision and suspend/ abolish the travel ban. [I]

1(b) Study Sources B and C.

How far would the author in Source B agree with the author of Source C? Explain your answer.

[6]

Question target : Drawing comparison

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	<p>Agree/ Disagree, answers based on provenance/ topic</p> <p>e.g. The author in Source B would agree with the author of Source C as both of them are talking about America's travel ban.</p>	[1]
OR	<p>Agree/ Disagree, use of content but no valid match or misinterpretation of sources</p> <p>e.g. The author in Source B would agree with the author of Source C as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • both of them agree that preventive measure implemented by Trump (i.e. travel ban) was necessary (i.e. misinterpretation of Source B) • both authors support having the travel ban 	
L2	<p>Agree/ Disagree, based on <u>superficial</u> matches</p> <p>e.g. Source B would agree with Source C as both sources tell me that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • security is important to America/ fighting terrorism is important • good relations between America and other countries are important to fight terrorism • measures must be put in place to protect US security <p>e.g. Source B would not agree with Source C as Source B does not support the travel ban while Source C does → attempts to justify reason(s) for support are <u>invalid/ inaccurate</u>.</p>	[2]
L3	<p>Agree OR Disagree, based on content of sources</p> <p><i>Award 3m for a valid match in similarity <u>or</u> difference in content of sources and 3m for relevant support provided and explained.</i></p> <p>e.g. The author in Source B <u>would agree</u> with the author of Source C as <u>they are similar in saying that it is important to adopt preventive measures to ensure America's security</u>.</p> <p>e.g. The author in Source B <u>would not agree</u> with the author of Source C as <u>they have different views about the impact that the travel ban can have on America's relationship with her allies</u>. The author in Source B thinks that it will adversely affect America's relationship with her allies but Source C seems to suggest that it will enhance America's relations with other countries.</p> <p><i>Unacceptable inferences from Source B:</i></p>	[3-4]

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Muslims support the travel ban 	
L4	<p>Agree AND Disagree, based on content of sources</p> <p><i>Award 4m for a valid match in similarity and difference in content of sources and 5m for support for both matches.</i></p>	[4-5]
L5	<p>Disagrees, based on the difference in <u>point of view</u> of the authors</p> <p><i>Award 5m for a match in point of view with justification of reason in the explanation. Award 6m for more fully developed answers with matching justifications.</i></p> <p>e.g. The author in Source B would not agree with Source C as they do not share the same level of support for the travel ban.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The author in Source B is an <u>opponent</u> (or critical/ disapproving) of the travel ban <u>as it will threatened the security of America</u>. • The author in Source C is a <u>supporter</u> (or supportive/ approving) of the travel ban as <u>it will help to ensure security of America</u>. <p>e.g. Source B: pessimistic- the travel ban will not work in ensuring US's security vs Source C: optimistic – travel ban will work to ensure US's security</p>	[5-6]

1(c) Study Sources D and E.

Does Source E prove that the concerns raised in Source D about the travel ban are justified? Explain your answer.

[7]

Question target : Evaluating reliability

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	<p>Proves/ Does not prove, based on unexplained provenance of <u>both</u> sources</p> <p>Source E does not prove that the concerns raised in Source D about the travel ban are justified as it is from President Trump while Source D is a comment from an America student and they would therefore, have completely different perspectives about the travel ban.</p>	[1]
OR	<p>Proves/ Does not prove, based on content of Source D (i.e. lifts from source), but no comparison with Source E</p> <p>e.g. Source E does not prove that the concerns raised in Source D about the travel ban are justified as the latter states that ‘tightening the borders is only one approach to security.’</p>	
Or	<p>Does not prove, undeveloped use of provenance without inference</p> <p>e.g Source E does not prove as it is by Donald Trump → he introduced the Executive Order, so he will likely be biased and support the travel ban. (no use of source content at all)</p>	
L2	<p>Proves/ Does not prove, based on understanding of the concerns that were raised by Source D but no comparison to Source E</p> <p>(i.e. only answers only uses the content in Source D)</p> <p>e.g. Source E proves that the concerns raised in Source D about the travel ban are justified as: [i.e. Concerns are justified]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is understandable that security in America may be threatened if extremists see the travel ban as being anti-Muslim and hence, retaliate against the US. • The ban will not be effective in protecting America against home-grown terrorists/ self-radicalized individuals already living in the US. 	[2]
OR	<p>Source E does not prove anything about Source D because they are completely different (i.e. uses content in both sources but no valid match or false matching)</p> <p>e.g. Source E does not prove that the concerns raised in Source D about the travel ban are justifiable as the latter (i.e. Source D) highlights how the travel ban is inadequate in ensuring security against those radicalized within America (i.e. internal threats) while Source E talks about how the travel ban can prevent terrorists from launching an attack on America.</p>	

L3	<p>Does not prove, attempt at critical analysis of Source E <u>without</u> awareness of <u>context</u> in which Source E is created.</p> <p>Does not prove, uses tone</p> <p>e.g. Source E does not prove → unreliable → by Donald Trump who introduced the travel ban → expected of him to justify the need for the travel ban in ensuring America's security → win support for the travel ban that he is trying to enforce</p>	[3-4]
L4	<p>Does not prove, based on <u>difference</u> in content</p> <p>e.g. Source E <u>does not prove</u> that the concerns raised in Source D about the travel ban are justifiable (i.e. difference/ contrasting view) as they have different views about the effectiveness of the travel ban in ensuring America's security:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source D shows that the imposing the travel ban will not be effective in ensuring America's security (worry) as it does not eliminate the threats to security that are internal. • Source E shows travel ban is effective in ensuring America's security as terrorist acts can be stopped. <p>e.g. Source E <u>does not prove</u> that the concerns raised in Source D about the travel ban are justifiable as they have different views about the effective of the travel ban in ensuring America's security:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source D tells me that security in America may be threatened (worry) if extremists see the travel ban as being anti-Muslim and hence, retaliate against the US. • Source E shows security in America will be strengthened as terrorist acts can be stopped. <p>e.g. Source E does not prove that → refuted by Source D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source D: Travel ban does not deter external threats to America's security (Idea that US will become a bigger target to terrorists as a result of the ban) • Source E: Travel ban deters external threats to America's security 	[4-5]

L5	<p>Does not prove, critical analysis of Source E (i.e. Context: vested interest of President Trump in the light of the impending ruling by the Supreme Court regarding the <u>reinstatement</u> of the travel ban; making use of recent London attacks)</p> <p>Note: MUST have outcome (gain support for travel ban or reinstatement of ban)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Context: 3 June 2017 – London attacks + order has been suspended and Supreme Court is debating the reinstatement of the travel ban • Award 6m - Only identifies London attacks <u>OR</u> suspension of Executive Order • Award 7m – Identifies both London attacks <u>AND</u> suspension of Executive Order and explains how Trump is capitalizing on the recent attacks to urge the reinstatement of the Executive Order <p>e.g. Source E <u>does not prove</u> that concerns raised in Source D about the travel ban is Source D are justified. This is because Source D is by President Trump and it is expected of him to justify the need for the travel ban so that Americans will support his executive order. In Source D, he highlighted the need for the travel ban to ensure the security of America. This is evident as he said, 'We need the travel ban as an extra level of safety! ... We must stop those who threatened our safety from entering our country before more lives are lost!'</p> <p>e.g. Source E <u>does not prove</u> that the support for the travel ban is Source D is justified. This is because Source D is by President Trump and it is expected of him to be supportive of the travel ban as it was his idea to impose the ban in 2017 after he took office in 2016. In Source D, he highlighted the need for the travel ban to ensure the security of America. This is evident as he said, 'We need the travel ban as an extra level of safety! ... We must stop those who threatened our safety from entering our country before more lives are lost!' Thus, he was trying <u>to capitalize on the recent terror London attack</u> (i.e. context) to rally for Americans' support and stress the urgency for the Supreme Court to <u>reinstate the travel ban</u>. (i.e. context)</p>	[6-7]
----	---	-------

1(d) Study Source F.**How surprised are you by Source F? Explain your answer.****[7]**

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	<p>Did not answer question with element of surprise (Valid inference from Source F)</p> <p>e.g. Source F tells me that the immigrant supported the travel ban.</p>	[1]
L2	<p>Surprised/ Not surprised, based on content of Source F</p> <p>e.g. I am surprised by Source F as it shows how the immigrant from England supports the travel ban in America.</p>	[2]
L3	<p>Surprised/ Not surprised, based on reasoning internal to Source F</p> <p><i>Award 3m for answers that explain idea of surprise based on reasoning internal to Source F.</i></p> <p><i>Award 4m for answers that explain idea of surprise based on analysis of provenance (but not detecting even-handedness of source F)</i></p> <p>e.g. I am surprised by Source F as it shows how an immigrant supporting America's travel ban. This is evident Source F says 'I came to the United States in 1965 and consider it an enormous honour. I support the travel ban because I believe that any sovereign country has the absolute right to protect its borders and stop immigrants from entry.' This is surprising as it is unthinkable that someone who had migrated from another country would be agreeable to a travel ban that denies others like her entry into America.</p> <p>e.g. I am not surprised → author in Source F wants a safer country especially after Sept 11 → would support travel ban as it reduces the risk of a terror attack</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Surprised, on who the author is</p> <p>e.g. Surprised → Source F is by a Republican who voted for Trump in the last elections in 2016 → expected her to support Trump's travel ban → saying that the ban will ensure America's security → however, she is critical as she highlighted the flaws in the travel ban which will put USA at a higher risk of a terrorist attack.</p> <p>Note: Award L3/3 for answers who explains 'surprised' w/o a valid inference.</p>	[3-4]
L4	<p>Surprised/ Not surprised, based on cross-reference to other source(s)</p> <p><i>Award 5m for a weak match in cross-reference that is poorly supported.</i></p> <p><i>Award 6m for a valid match that is well-supported and explained.</i></p>	[5-6]

e.g. I am **surprised** by Source F surprising as it is refuted by Source Source E.

- Source F tells me that Americans feel that the travel ban targets Muslims
- Source E tells me that Americans feel that the travel ban does not target the Muslims. This is evident as the source says 'The ban does not target any particular group- Muslims or non-Muslims. It gives me and many Americans a peace of mind.' This suggests that Americans are supportive of the travel ban which they feel does not target any particular group, including Muslims.

OR

e.g. I am **not surprised** by Source F as it is supported by Source E (or Source A).

- Source F tells me that as the travel ban may not be effective in ensuring America's security.
- Source E (and Source A) also tells me that the travel ban may not be effective in ensuring America's security.

e.g. I am **not surprised** by Source F as it is supported by the Background Information.

- Source F tells me that the travel ban targets Muslims.
- BI also tells me that the travel ban is seen by many to target Muslims.

e.g. I am **not surprised** by Source F as it is supported by Source B.

- Source F: Collaborating with Muslims is important in countering terrorism.
- Source B: Collaborating with Muslims is important in countering terrorism. "Welcoming Muslims refugees and travelers, by contrast, exposes the lies of terrorists and counters their twisted vision of Islam."

e.g. I am **not surprised** by Source F as it is supported by Source D.

- Source F: importance of defending against self-radicalised individuals in America
- Source B: importance of defending against self-radicalised individuals

e.g. Use of Source F to show **travel ban will make America a safer country from terrorism** – Students must quote 2 pieces of evidence 'I support the travel ban becauseesp since Sept 11.'

L5

Surprised, based on the even-handedness/ impartiality of the author in Source F

[6-7]

*Award 6m for answers that are poorly supported with relevant evidence.
Award 7m for answers that are well-supported with evidence and*

	<p><i>explained.</i></p> <p><i>Note: Award L3/3-4m for answers that fail to detect the impartiality of Source F.</i></p> <p>e.g. I am surprised by what Source F says about the travel ban. Source F acknowledges <u>that screening of migration into America is needed to ensure America's security but travel ban introduced may not be effective in doing so.</u> This is surprising as Source F is comments made by a Republican who supported Donald Trump in his presidential campaign in 2016 [Who]. One would expected her to continue to support Donald Trump in his push for the travel ban. However, she is <u>impartial</u> in her view about the ban as she also highlighted the potential pitfalls of Trump's travel ban which seems to target Muslim groups and may lead to America being made more vulnerable to attacks.</p>	
--	--	--

1(e) 'The travel ban in America is advantageous for America.' Using the sources in this case study, explain how far you would agree with this statement. [10]

Question target: Evaluation

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Writes about the statement, no valid source use e.g. I agree that America should restrict the movement of people so as to ensure its national security as national security is very important.	[1]
L2	Yes <u>OR</u> No, supported by <u>valid</u> source use <i>Award the following marks for the valid use of:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 source – 2 marks • 2 sources – 3-4 marks • 3 or more sources – 4 marks Valid answer must have the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear stand (i.e. America should or should not restrict movement) 2. Evidence as support 3. Explanation can take either of the following thinking frame: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive or adverse impact of travel ban on America 	[2-4]
L3	Yes + No, supported by valid source use i.e. Both elements of L2 <i>Award the following marks for:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 sources (1Y + 1N) – 5 marks • 3 sources (1Y + 2N or 2Y + 1N) – 6 marks • 4 sources (2Y + 2N) – 7-8 marks • 5 sources (2Y + 3N or 3Y + 2N) – 8 marks Note: <i>Students must explain evidence and link back to question even if evidence is self-explanatory.</i>	[5-8]

Source	Yes, the travel ban is advantageous	No, America the travel ban is not advantageous.	Possibility to question reliability
A		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The travel ban may incite more terrorist sympathisers to plot attacks against USA, especially since the ban is seen as being anti-Muslim, thus may make America more vulnerable to terrorist attacks. 	X
B		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The travel ban may incite more terrorist sympathisers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They may to plot attacks against USA, especially since the ban is seen as being anti-Muslim, thus may make America more vulnerable to terrorist attacks. The travel ban violates the values that America stand for – challenges the identity of what being American mean America may lose its allies from Islamic countries as a result of the travel ban as the latter is deemed to be anti-Muslim – cannot access intelligence to counter terrorism 	Reliable – expect him to support the executive order as he is a Republican himself and ought to support his party/ President Trump. However, he is in fact, questioning the order and its effectiveness in ensuring America's security.
C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The travel ban is a preventive measure that stops the movement of terrorists into America – they cannot carry out attacks on American soil 		X
D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The travel ban stops the movement of terrorists into America and prevent the loss of lives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The travel ban will only fuel homegrown terrorism; will make US more vulnerable to terrorism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reliable – balanced argument
E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The travel ban stops the movement of terrorists into America and prevent the loss of lives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unreliable Note: Do not credit if critical analysis is used in part c
F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The travel ban protects American border and deters an attack on American soil 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alienate groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reliable; speaking up against the executive order

			despite being a supporter of Trump; able to be objective in rationalizing the benefits and costs of the ban
--	--	--	---

**** To score additional 2 marks, candidates can take any one of these 3 routes:**

***Through analyzing at least one source in relation to its reliability, utility or sufficiency**

***By sharing examples from their contextual knowledge**

***By giving a balanced conclusion / resolution**

SECTION B (SRQ)

- (a) Extract 1 states that almost 50% of the 22,000 new citizens who granted Singapore citizenship in 2017 were aged 30 years and below.

In your opinion, why do you think almost 50% of the citizenship granted in 2017 were 30 years and below? Explain your answer using two reasons. [7]

L1 Describes the topic, i.e. citizenship in Singapore

[1]

L2 Identifies/ Describes reason(s)

[2-4]

*Award 2m for identifying one reason and 3m for identifying two reasons.
Award 3m for describing one reason and 4m for describing two reasons.*

Acceptable reasons:

- Ageing population (to balance the ration of young to old)
- Sustain economic growth (boost manpower in the workforce)

L3 L2 + Explains reason(s)

[5-7]

Award 5-6 marks for explaining one reason.

Award 6-7 marks for explaining two reasons.

Note: An explanation is showing how the reason leads to the granting of citizenship to those aged 30 years and below.

e.g. One reason why more than 40% of the 20,000 new citizens granted in 2013 were aged 30 years and below is **to improve age-balance (ratio of young to old) in Singapore**. This is because of Singapore's low fertility (or birth) rates. Currently, the BR in Singapore is very low at around 1.2 children per woman. The birth rates have remained low since the 1980s when the government introduced population control policies to discourage large families. Since then, the birth rates have remained below the replacement level of 2.1. As a result of this, the population is expected to shrink over time since Singaporeans cannot replace themselves. This increase in proportion of elderly will also lead to greater burden on the working population to support their needs. By granting citizenship to those aged 30 years and below, it is hoped that ratio of young versus old will be balanced. This move will increase the number of younger people in the population and reduce the stress imposed on the working population supporting an ageing population.

e.g. Another reason is that those aged 30 years and below are **more employable and therefore able to contribute more to Singapore's economy**. Singapore's birth rates have been on the decline since the 1980s and this has led to a smaller pool of workers available in the workforce. In the long run, this shrinking workforce will have detrimental impact on Singapore's growth and the older workers may have to work for longer number of years to help sustain the country's development. By allowing a younger pool of people to take up citizenship in Singapore, this problem of a shrinking pool of manpower can be addresses. Singapore's current retirement age is 62 years old. With a younger

pool of people in the workforce, it would mean that they are able to contribute to Singapore's economy for a longer period of time. They will also have more opportunities to upgrade their skills before they reach retirement age. This will help them remain relevant and contribute actively to Singapore's economy, helping her to remain competitive.

(b) Extracts 2 and Extract 3 reflect the role of national identity and participation in shaping citizenship in Singapore.

Do you think having a sense of national identity plays a more important role than participation in public affairs in shaping citizenship in Singapore? Explain your answer.

[8]

L1 Writes about the topic (i.e. citizenship in Singapore) without addressing the question [1-2]

L2 Describes national identity and participation n. [3-4]
Award 2m for describing one role and 3m for describing both roles.

L3 Explains how national identity and participation in public affairs shape citizenship in Singapore [5-7]
Award 5-6 marks for explaining one role.
Award 6-7 marks for explaining both roles.

e.g. Having a sense of national identity can contribute toward shaping citizenship in Singapore. A sense of national identity can be fostered through common practices such as the singing the National Anthem and taking the National Pledge. Events such as National Day are also celebrated by Singaporeans. Through participation in such practices, it helps to foster a sense of belonging to the country and Singaporeans will come to share a common belief that we belong to the same country. Many Singaporeans also feel that they can identify with one another based on a common language, Singlish. Whenever they hear people speaking Singlish when we are abroad, we will be able to identify them as Singaporeans. By being able to speak a common language that is easily understood mainly by Singaporeans only, Singaporeans feel that we are unique. This uniqueness binds us together, leading to feel a part of Singapore society and, as such, citizens of Singapore.

Note: Students can also make use of examples like Singapore being a food haven as an example.

Participation in public affair also contribute to shaping citizenship in Singapore. Public affair refers to issues that are if general interest or concern to most people in society. Citizens can participate and contribute towards the good of society either as individuals or through organised groups. Often, citizens participate and contribute in areas they are passionate about, thus contributing toward greater ownership and commitment towards the causes

they are involved in. For example, Mr Jeremy Chua started the SG Haze Rescue movement during the haze period in June 2013. He appealed to Singaporeans for them to donate excess masks to be given out to fellow Singaporeans who are in need. Participation in public affairs contribute to shaping citizenship in Singapore because by contributing to the needs of society, Singaporeans will feel a greater affinity to fellow Singaporeans. They will develop a greater sense of belonging to Singapore as they feel that they have a greater stake in the progress and development of society. As a result, they will that they are a part of Singapore.

L4 Both aspects of L3 plus explains the relative importance of each factor [8]

e.g. L3 + national identity plays a more important role in shaping citizenship in Singapore as it influences our willingness to participate. Having a sense of national identity can strength our sense of belonging towards Singapore. This would motivate us to contribute through participating in meaningful causes to work towards the good of society.