

Marking Guide

Section A: Source-Based Case Study [35 marks]

1	<p>Study Source A.</p> <p>What is the message of the source? Explain your answer using details from the source.</p> <p>Target skill: Basic Inference</p>	[5]
Level	Descriptor	Mark
L1	<p>Description of the source only / Misinterpretation / No valid interpretation</p> <p><i>E.g. The message of this source is to tell young people that young people around the world likes to fish for followers instead of fishing.</i></p> <p><i>Other unacceptable answers:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>What we see on social media is fake/Social media gives others a false impression of users</i> • <i>Social media leads to unhappiness because</i> 	1
L2	<p>Answers based on literal interpretations of the source</p> <p><i>Award the higher mark for more fully developed answers.</i></p> <p><i>E.g. The message of Source A is to tell young people around the world that <u>there is an immense number of connections and influence that can be achieved through social media platforms [MESSAGE]</u>. The comic shows one individual holding a fishing rod connected to an Instagram logo and boasts, "I've got... 4.89 Billion." [EVIDENCE] This suggests that social media can amplify one's presence and influence to an unprecedented scale [EXPLANATION].</i></p> <p><i>Other possible inferences:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Social media allows us to make more friends more easily</i> • <i>Globalisation has benefited businesses like Instagram by increasing the number of users</i> • 	2 – 3
L3	<p>Answers based on valid interpretation of the source</p> <p><i>Award the higher mark for more fully developed answers.</i></p>	4 – 5

	<p>E.g. The message of Source A is to tell young people around the world that <u>social media platforms, like Instagram, have a massive influence and reach, overshadowing other means of connection</u> [MESSAGE]. The comic shows two individuals fishing, with one catching a single fish and exclaiming, "I've got ONE!", while the other holds a fishing rod connected to an Instagram logo and boasts, "I've got... 4.89 Billion." [EVIDENCE] This illustrates the idea that social media can connect billions of people effortlessly, compared to traditional, smaller-scale interactions. The exaggerated difference in the number of connections highlights how social media dominates and redefines the way people connect and interact globally. This suggests that while traditional methods of connection are still valued, they are vastly outmatched by the scale and power of social media platforms. [EXPLANATION].</p> <p>Other possible messages:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instagram has a significant hold/influence on young people (as seen from the person being caught as bait). 2. Social media leads to negative consequences like addiction 3. Social media affects teenagers' mental health 4. Social media leads to undue comparison between peers (because teenagers start to chase followers and likes), which may lead to loss of self-esteem* → Must be supported by correct evidence 	
--	---	--

Marker's Comments:

- Students were not able to see the comparison between the reach/influence of social media platforms as compared to others.
- Many students thought that "4.89 billion" refers to having 4.89 billion followers or that 4.89 billion people were addicted to Instagram which is not what the cartoon is suggesting
- Students were awarded full credit if they suggested that **Youths are too addicted to social media**. However, this had to be backed up with relevant evidence - the idea of being "hooked" like the person at the bottom of the river. It would not be enough to support the claim with just saying that Instagram has 4.89 Billion users.
 - Some students wrote that Youths are hooked onto Instagram/social media - but this is too literal as the idea of "hook" is seen in the picture. They were usually awarded 4m instead of 5m depending on the development of the answer
- Many students included an "intended outcome" (e.g. raise awareness of extent of addiction so that teenagers would be more aware of their screen time and choose healthier activities instead) in their answer, which is not required for this question

2	<p>Study Source B.</p> <p>Why did the minister make this speech? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Target skill: Infer purpose of the source</p> <p><i>Important Note: For 'why' purpose question, the question asks 'why' therefore only answers that provide a reason can be accepted. If students answer 'Source B tells me that...' and without the accurate phrasing from the question, they will be awarded zero</i></p>	[6]
Level	Descriptor	Mark
L1	<p>Description of the source only</p> <p><i>E.g. The minister made this speech to discuss the increasing amount of time young people spend on social media platforms and the resulting rise in anxiety, depression, and other mental health challenges. He also announces the government's commitment to making mental health a national priority, highlighting the launch of extensive research initiatives to gather data and insights on the effects of social media.</i></p>	1
L2	<p>Answers based on provenance, with explanation.</p> <p><i>E.g. Deputy Prime Minister Lawrence Wong made this speech because he is a minister in Singapore responsible for addressing important national issues, including the mental health of youths. <u>As a leader, it is his duty to ensure the well-being of the population, especially the younger generation.</u></i></p> <p>OR</p> <p>Answers based on context, with explanation.</p> <p><i>E.g. Deputy Prime Minister Lawrence Wong made this speech because there has been an increase in the number of cases of mental health related issues in Singapore. He wants people to be aware of that increase in these issues.</i></p>	2
L3	<p>Answers based on the intended outcome.</p> <p><i>The minister hopes that Singaporeans [AUDIENCE], will acknowledge [ACTION] the importance of addressing mental health issues related to social media and take proactive steps to implement effective interventions and support systems, ensuring a resilient and supportive environment for the youth [INTENDED OUTCOME].</i></p>	3
L4	<p>Answers based on what he wants to say i.e. addressing the impact of social media on youth mental health is a national priority.</p> <p><i>E.g. The minister seeks to persuade [VERB] Singaporeans [AUDIENCE], that it is crucial to prioritise mental health as a national issue and understand the impacts of social media on youth mental health [MESSAGE]. This is evident from his statement, "social media often perpetuates unrealistic standards and exposes</i></p>	4

	<p>youths to cyberbullying, negatively impacting their well-being...We are launching extensive research initiatives to gather comprehensive data and insights. By doing so, we can develop targeted interventions that are grounded in evidence... We will also train 28,000 more individuals to provide mental health support within the community" [EVIDENCE]. This tells me that the government recognises the urgent need to address these challenges through evidence-based policies and community support [EXPLANATION].</p>	
L5	<p>Answers based on the intention of the minister i.e. L3 + L4</p> <p>Award the higher mark for more fully developed answers.</p> <p>E.g. The minister seeks to persuade [VERB] Singaporeans [AUDIENCE], that it is crucial to prioritise mental health as a national issue and understand the impacts of social media on youth mental health [MESSAGE]. This is evident from his statement, "social media often perpetuates unrealistic standards and exposes youths to cyberbullying, negatively impacting their well-being...We are launching extensive research initiatives to gather comprehensive data and insights. By doing so, we can develop targeted interventions that are grounded in evidence... We will also train 28,000 more individuals to provide mental health support within the community" [EVIDENCE]. This tells me that the government recognises the urgent need to address these challenges through evidence-based policies and community support [EXPLANATION].</p> <p>Through his message, the minister hopes that Singaporeans [AUDIENCE], will acknowledge [ACTION] the importance of addressing mental health issues related to social media and take proactive steps to implement effective interventions and support systems, ensuring a resilient and supportive environment for the youth [INTENDED OUTCOME].</p> <p><u>Alternative Author's Intention</u></p> <p>Author – Minister Audience – Singaporeans Verb – Persuade Message – Mental health is an important issue / government is putting in effort to tackle the issue of mental health in Singapore. Intended Outcome – Hopes that individuals will work with the government to tackle the issues OR Hopes that individuals will support the government's efforts by being trained / volunteering / advocating for / raise awareness of mental health issues in youth</p>	5 – 6

Marker's Comments:

- Most candidates were able to give a valid message with an audience stated, thus achieving L4
- Only a handful of students were able to achieve L5, whereby they were able to give a valid and relevant intended outcome (intention of minister)
- Many students **did not mention any intended outcome at all**
- For those who did attempt an intended outcome, **they did not present their I.O. as a specific action by the audience** (e.g. stating how Singaporeans feel assured / calm / at ease / youths are more aware / wary of social media / should not believe everything online = **all not accepted**)
- Candidates are also reminded that their audience **MUST** be specific (e.g. public / people / us = **too vague**) These were, however, accepted, in this exam
- Candidates are also reminded of proper structuring of their answer according to the question requirement. **For candidates who place their message or I.O. within the explanation, it will not be rewarded.**

- Students are also reminded that they should **use relevant verbs (e.g. convince / persuade / warn / alert)** and **not verbs such as tell, inform, educate, show, hint, convey**
- For other points to note, see items in yellow below

Note: For message taken from a candidate's explanation - not accepted (candidates are reminded to phrase the author's message accurately)

Note: For answers with valid message but no clear audience, drop to L2/2

Note: For answers with misinterpretation of source's purpose = L1/1

Candidates are reminded to be specific with their audience (e.g. us = vague) (accepted for this exam)

#1 Alternative Author's Intention:

Author - Minister

Audience - Youths facing mental health issues

Verb - convince

Message - help is available

Intended Outcome - be more inclined to seek help as there is support for them

#2 Alternative Author's Intention:

Author - Minister

Audience - Singaporeans

Verb - convince

Message - (minister is critical of social media as) social media negatively impacts youths in Singapore

Intended Outcome - Singaporeans will understand the danger and severity of the impacts towards Singaporean youths and would thus stop or limit youths from using it

#3 Alternative Author's Intention:

Author - Minister

Audience - Singaporeans

Verb - persuade

Message - government taking mental health seriously / taking social media very seriously as a threat to Singapore's youths' well-being

Intended Outcome - The minister wanted Singaporeans to understand the threat that social media has on youths and take precautions against it

#4 Alternative Author's Intention:

Author - Minister

Audience - Youths

Verb - warn

Message - social media negatively impacts youths in Singapore / has a huge impact on their mental health / to be careful when using social media

Intended Outcome - youths are more aware of the consequences social media brings so that they are able to prevent such consequences from occurring / recognise the dangers of social media and moderate the amount of time using it / use it with caution / stay alert of the signs of damaged mental health / stop using social media / **be aware about it and learn more and understand the impacts that social media has on their mental health (X - no action stated)**

#5 Alternative Author's Intention:

Author - Minister

Audience - parents

Verb - raise awareness

Message - ongoing concerns of teenagers (X)

Intended Outcome - more aware of their children's behaviour and take faster action if they do see their children getting addicted towards social media

#6 Alternative Author's Intention:

Author - Minister

Audience - Singaporean parents of youths

Verb - convince

Message - decrease numbers of youth on social media (X)

Intended Outcome - lessen their youth's usage of social media

3	Study Sources C and D. Having read Source C, do you find Source D surprising? Explain your answer. Target skill: Higher Order SBCS Question	[7]
Level	Descriptor	Mark
L1	Answers using source content of Source C / Source D but failing to address element of surprise	1
L2	Identifies what is and/or is not surprising in Source D, but no explanation of why <i>E.g. Source D is surprising in telling me that social media can lead to adverse outcomes such as addiction and isolation when used excessively or negatively.</i> OR Not surprising / surprising based on provenance of Source D only <i>E.g. Source D is not surprising because it is from an interview with a 17-year-old student who is offering a first-hand account of his personal experience with social media and gaming addiction during the COVID-19 pandemic.</i> OR Not surprising based on the context of the pandemic <i>E.g. Source D is not surprising. Given the context of the pandemic, where many young people faced increased isolation and a shift to online activities, it is not surprising that someone like Josiah would experience heightened negative effects from excessive social media use.</i> OR Not surprising based on context of the source provenance <i>E.g. Having read Source C, I do not find Source D surprising because they come from different contexts. Source C is from America, while Source D is from</i>	2

	Singapore. Given the different contexts of the countries the sources are based on, Source D is not surprised for me after I have read Source C.	
Note: For L3, L4 & L5 reason(s) given must be consistent with the stand of Surprised/Not Surprised.		
L3	Not surprising or surprising based on reasons internal to D only	3
L4	<p>Not Surprising / Surprising based on similarity OR difference in source content</p> <p><i>Award the higher mark for more fully developed answers.</i></p> <p><i>E.g. Having read Source C, I do not find Source D surprising because both sources consistently highlight the potential negative impacts of social media on mental health. Source C states, "negative experiences, such as cyberbullying or excessive comparison, can be detrimental." This suggests social media can potentially lead to events which may be detrimental to the mental wellbeing of young people. Similarly, Source D acknowledges the negative impact of social media on mental health, stating, "However, during the COVID-19 pandemic, my social media and gaming addiction spiraled out of control" and "I felt isolated and started to avoid my family, even rejecting offers to go out for my favourite meals." Both sources point out how social media can be detrimental to the mental health of young people. Hence, I do not find Source D surprising after reading Source C.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>E.g. However, having read Source C, I find Source D surprising because they differ in their emphasis on the impacts of social media on mental health. Source D focuses mainly on the negative effects of social media, highlighting Josiah's experience of addiction and isolation during the COVID-19 pandemic. Josiah states, "My social media and gaming addiction spiraled out of control. I was spending six to seven hours a day on my devices... I felt isolated and started to avoid my family, even rejecting offers to go out for my favorite meals." This suggests a predominantly adverse impact of social media on his mental health. On the other hand, Source C provides a more balanced view, acknowledging both positive and negative effects of social media. It mentions, "Recent research suggests that the link between social media use and the mental health of young people is complex and not solely negative... some findings highlight that social media can enhance social connections and provide emotional support." This suggests that social media can also contribute positively to mental well-being, which contrasts with the entirely negative portrayal in Source D. Since Source C refutes Source D on the emphasis of the impacts of social media by presenting a more nuanced view that includes potential benefits, therefore Source C makes Source D surprising.</i></p>	4 – 5
L5	<p>Not Surprising / Surprising based on similarity AND difference in source content</p> <p><i>Award the higher mark for more fully developed answers.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p>Not Surprising / Surprising based on cross-referencing to one other source from the case study / background information</p>	5 – 6

L6	<p>Not Surprising based on different contexts</p> <p><i>Award the higher mark for more fully developed answers.</i></p> <p><i>E.g. Having read Source C, I do not find Source D surprising, considering their different contexts. Source C, from an article by the American Psychological Association, provides a broad, research-based perspective on the impacts of social media on adolescent mental health. It acknowledges that social media can have both positive and negative effects, highlighting that while some studies show no significant correlation with adverse mental health outcomes, others indicate that social media can enhance social connections and provide emotional support. In contrast, Source D presents a specific case of a 17-year-old student, Josiah, who experienced severe negative effects from social media and gaming addiction during the COVID-19 pandemic. Josiah's account focuses on the detrimental impacts, such as isolation and family conflict. The broad, generalized findings of Source C naturally encompass a range of outcomes, including the specific negative experience detailed in Source D. Given that Source C outlines the potential for both positive and negative impacts, it is not surprising to find an individual case like Josiah's that emphasizes the adverse effects. Therefore, when considering the different contexts—general research versus a specific personal experience—Sources C and D align and are not surprising.</i></p>	6 – 7

Marker's Comments:

- Most candidates were able to attain L4 as they gave a valid comparison (similarity or difference between Source C and D)
- While candidates are able to give a valid comparison, they are reminded that their reasoning needs to be present and clear (e.g. there has to be a logical reason as to why they have compared C and D → in order to address the question of whether they are surprised or not) This could come in the form of:
 - **Surprised because they are different in terms of... / contradict each other in terms of...**
 - **Not surprised because they are similar in terms of... / support each other in terms of...**
- For candidates they made an attempt to compare C & D, but it was not valid = L1/1
- Candidates are also reminded that their stand should be the first sentence of their answer for clarity, and should be phrased the same way as the question is phrased
- A handful of students were able to give BOTH a valid similarity and a difference between C & D, achieving L5
- The handful of candidates who attempted a cross-referencing paragraph were not able to achieve L5 (cross-reference) due to its invalid nature. For a higher-order question, the demand for cross-referencing is that it requires **all 3 sources to be mentioned for it to be valid**
- A small number of candidates attempted a comparison in contexts, with some achieving L6 = **well done!** The quality of these candidates' answers, however, can be further developed
- Candidates should be **encouraged to attempt a paragraph either in cross-referencing or critical analysis of sources**
- A small number of candidates used the **wrong terms (reliability / credibility / prove)** and mixed this up with reliability skill - this is incorrect. Candidates are reminded to be clear of the requirement of the question and the skill assessed.

4	Study Source E.	
---	-----------------	--

	<p>How useful is the source in providing recommendations to reduce the risks brought about by the prevalent use of social media? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Target skills: Evaluate usefulness of a source</p>	[7]
Level	Descriptor	Mark
L1	<p>Makes assertions using source evidence / Repeats information from the source</p> <p>Note: Answers without root word (useful) will be awarded 0 marks.</p>	1
L2	<p>Useful / Not useful, based on provenance, with explanation</p> <p><i>E.g. Source E is useful [ATQ] as in providing recommendations to mitigate the risks brought about by the prevalent use of social media because it is extracted from the U.S. Surgeon General's Advisory on social media and youth mental health. As the U.S. Surgeon General, the advisory represents authoritative guidance based on extensive research and expert analysis. This provenance ensures that the information is reliable and grounded in comprehensive public health research, making it a credible and useful source for understanding the necessary measures to address the mental health challenges posed by social media use among youth. [EXPLANATION].</i></p>	2
L3	<p>Useful/ Not useful based on critical evaluation of source content</p> <p><i>Award the higher mark for more fully developed answers.</i></p> <p><i>L3(i) E.g. Source E is useful [ATQ] as in providing recommendations to mitigate the risks brought about by the prevalent use of social media. From Source E, I can infer that the advisory emphasizes both preventive and corrective measures to address the mental health challenges associated with social media use [INFERENCE]. This is evident from the detailed recommendations such as "enforceable age limits for social media use, enhancing platform designs to reduce harm, and promoting digital literacy" [EVIDENCE]. Additionally, the specific recommendation of "implementing health and safety labels on social media platforms to inform users of potential risks, like tobacco warning labels" provides a clear, actionable step towards mitigating harm [EVIDENCE]. This suggests that the advisory not only identifies the problems but also provides practical solutions that can be implemented to protect youth mental health [EXPLANATION]. Since Source E offers comprehensive and specific measures to mitigate the risks associated with social media use, it is hence useful in telling me about the recommendations to address these issues.</i></p> <p>Note: Reason to justify the stand is not compulsory if the stand is useful. All students need to do is to support the stand with inference about the recommendations to mitigate the risks brought about by the prevalent use of social media (supported with evidence & explanation).</p> <p><i>L3 (ii) E.g. Source E is not useful [ATQ] in telling me about the recommendations to mitigate the risks brought about by the prevalent use of social media. From Source E, I can infer that while it provides general recommendations, it lacks specific details on how these recommendations will be implemented and their potential effectiveness [INFERENCE]. This is evident from statements like "enforceable age limits for social media use" and "enhancing platform designs to reduce harm," which are broad and do not offer concrete steps or examples of successful implementation [EVIDENCE]. Moreover, the source mentions the need for "increased research to better understand these impacts" but does not provide existing data or research findings to support its claims [EVIDENCE]. This suggests that while the recommendations are well-intentioned, they lack the practical details and evidence necessary to evaluate their feasibility and impact [EXPLANATION].</i></p>	3 – 4

	<p>Therefore, I find the source not useful in telling me about the recommendations to mitigate the risks of social media use, as it lacks specific implementation strategies and supporting data [REASON].</p> <p>Note: Reason to justify the stand is compulsory if the stand is not useful. There is a need to explain why the source is not useful by providing a reason e.g., what the source fails to provide.</p>	
L4	Both aspects of L3 i.e. useful L3 (i) AND not useful L3 (ii)	5
L5	<p>Useful/ Not useful based on Cross-reference of Source E to contextual knowledge and/or other source(s)</p> <p>Award the higher mark for more fully developed answers.</p> <p>E.g. When I cross-reference Source E to Source B, I find that Source E supports Source B. From Source E, I can infer that the advisory stresses the importance of implementing practical measures to mitigate the risks of social media use [INFERENCE FROM B], such as "enforceable age limits for social media use" and "health and safety labels on social media platforms". This is evident from Source E's emphasis on actionable steps to protect youth mental health [EVIDENCE]. Similarly, Source B, a speech by Deputy Prime Minister Lawrence Wong, emphasizes the government's commitment to making mental health a national priority and mentions launching "extensive research initiatives to gather comprehensive data and insights" to develop targeted interventions [CR INFERENCE]. <u>Both sources highlight the necessity of concrete actions and research to address the mental health challenges posed by social media use.</u> Since Source B supports Source E, Source E is thus reliable and therefore Source E is useful [ATQ] in providing recommendations to mitigate the risks brought about by the prevalent use of social media [LINK].</p> <p>Note: CR must match the inference focus of the root source.</p> <p>Other possible CR: Support (Source B & D)</p> <p>Note: Causation words must be given to show the logic of the conclusion. Must establish cause and effect in the concluding statement i.e. Since Source X support/does not support Source Y, Source Y is hence reliable/not reliable.... therefore useful/not useful.</p> <p><u>Other accepted routes:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CR to <u>Source B</u> which shows that social media has many harmful effects. Therefore, the recommendations in limiting social media use by Source E are relevant and helpful because of the harmful effects of social media mentioned in Source B → More reliable and useful CR to <u>Source F</u> which <u>contradicts</u> Source E on how social media should be used. Source F suggests that social media use should be promoted as it can also help raise awareness and create communities which help mental health, which contradicts recommendations by Source E which suggest that social media use is negative and should be limited. Less reliable → Recommendations less relevant → Less useful CR to <u>Source C</u> which <u>supports</u> Source E in saying that more research should be done (last sentence) <p><u>Not accepted:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CR to <u>Source C</u> which says "no significant correlation between social media use and adverse mental health outcomes" because Source C concludes "relationship between social media use and mental health is not straightforward and requires further investigation" 	5 – 6

L6	<p>Useful based on Developed Provenance</p> <p><i>Award the higher mark for more fully developed answers.</i></p> <p><i>E.g. Source E is useful [ATQ] as in providing recommendations to mitigate the risks brought about by the prevalent use of social media. The source is an advisory by the U.S. Surgeon General, a leading public health authority in the United States, which suggests that the information is based on extensive research and expert analysis. This is evident from the detailed recommendations provided, such as "enforceable age limits for social media use," "enhancing platform designs to reduce harm," and "implementing health and safety labels on social media platforms" to inform users of potential risks. The advisory also emphasizes the need for "increased research to better understand these impacts" and for tech companies to share relevant data with independent researchers. <u>The authoritative provenance of the U.S. Surgeon General lends credibility to the recommendations, ensuring they are grounded in rigorous scientific research and public health expertise. This suggests a comprehensive and well-informed approach to mitigating the risks associated with social media use.</u> [PROVENANCE EXPLAINED] making the source reliable and hence useful in providing actionable insights and reliable strategies for safeguarding youth mental health.</i></p>	6 – 7
-----------	--	--------------

Marker's Comments:

- Students were able to evaluate usefulness based on source content by providing clear reasons such as "source E gives specific/multiple/concrete examples of actions that could be taken"
- Analysis of **purpose** for L6 was also accepted. Intended outcome is to persuade the government to implement stricter policies to regulate social media use, so that use is reduced. Because the source is written for the **good of the public and not for personal gain**, it is reliable and hence useful
- For critical analysis of provenance, students need to go beyond what was already given in the provenance to be awarded marks. For example, Source E was published by the Surgeon General's office...recommendations on various health issues. **Its goal is to serve the public good and it would thus need to conduct rigorous research and consider various perspectives on the issue to back up its recommendations before releasing them to the public. Thus, this makes the source more reliable and hence more useful.**

5	<p>Social media is bad for the young people in Singapore.'</p> <p>Using the sources in the case study, explain how far you would agree with the statement.</p>	[10]
----------	--	-------------

	Target Skill: Evaluative and drawing conclusion					
Level	Descriptor	Mark				
L1	Writes about statement, no valid source use	1				
L2	Yes / No, supported by valid source use <i>Note:</i> 1 Source 2m 2 Sources 3–4m 3 Sources 4m	2 – 4				
L3	Yes + No, supported by valid source use <i>i.e. Both elements of L2.</i> <i>Note:</i> 2 Sources 5m 3 Sources 6m 4 Sources 7–8m 5 Sources 8m <i>Unbalanced treatment of sources: L3/6</i> 1Y + 3N 1Y + 4N 4Y + 1N 1Y + 5N <i>(Maximum marks = 6m)</i> Note: A. Lumping of sources – consider an attempt on 1 source/once B. For repeated reason (explanation) for each source – considered an attempt on 1 source C. Evidence can be direct quotation, paraphrase, or summary. D. Explanation should be an extension of the evidence and not just a paraphrase or summary of the evidence. <table><tr><td>Agree</td><td>Disagree</td></tr><tr><td>A, B, C, D, E</td><td>A, C, F</td></tr></table> <u>Agree: Social media is bad for the young people in Singapore</u> <i>E.g. When I consider Source A, I agree with the view that social media is bad for young people in Singapore. [STAND] The comic shows a stark contrast between the single fish caught by one figure and the 4.89 billion followers claimed by the other figure with the Instagram logo. [EVIDENCE] This exaggerated difference highlights the overwhelming dominance of social media connections over real-life interactions, implying that <u>social media can distort young people's perception of relationships and self-worth</u> by <u>valuing quantity over quality</u>. [EXPLANATION] Therefore, Source A suggests that social media can negatively impact young people's social interactions and mental well-being.</i> <i>E.g. When I consider Source B, I agree with the view that social media is bad for young people in Singapore. [STAND] Source B states, "Social media often perpetuates unrealistic standards and exposes youths to cyberbullying, negatively impacting their well-being" [EVIDENCE] This tells me that <u>social media emphasises on standards which are unrealistic for young people, and this caused them to lose confidence and</u></i>	Agree	Disagree	A, B, C, D, E	A, C, F	5 – 8
Agree	Disagree					
A, B, C, D, E	A, C, F					

	<p><u>even impose the standards on others. When others do not meet the standards perpetuated on social media, they will end up being targeted by others, making them feel even worse about themselves. This could potentially lead to young people having mental health issues like anxiety and depression [EXPLANATION].</u></p> <p>E.g. When I consider Source C, I agree with the view that social media is bad for young people in Singapore. [STAND] Source C discusses the complex impact of social media, noting that "negative experiences, such as cyberbullying or excessive comparison, can be detrimental" [EVIDENCE]. This highlights that despite potential benefits, the risks associated with social media use, such as cyberbullying and self-comparison, can significantly harm young people's mental health. <u>When young people compare themselves with others online, they will feel inferior if they cannot meet the expectations perpetuated online and this will in turn reduce their self-esteem and affect their mental health negatively [EXPLANATION].</u></p> <p>E.g. When I consider Source D, I agree with the view that social media is bad for young people in Singapore. [STAND] The personal account from Josiah, a 17-year-old student, describes how his social media and gaming addiction led to isolation and family conflict during the COVID-19 pandemic. Josiah states, "I felt isolated and started to avoid my family, even rejecting offers to go out for my favourite meals... I even use my phone during meals and while crossing the road" [EVIDENCE]. This suggests that excessive social media use by young people can lead to addiction to social media. This addiction causes young people to be glued to the screen and not pay attention to their surroundings. This in turn puts them in dangerous situations which could potentially harm them physically [EXPLANATION].</p> <p>When I consider Source E, I agree with the view that social media is bad for young people in Singapore. [STAND] The U.S. Surgeon General's Advisory emphasizes the risks of social media, including "increased rates of mental health challenges among youth" [EVIDENCE]. This shows that social media can contribute to significant mental health issues, such as anxiety and depression, among young people. <u>The advisory's recommendation for enforceable age limits and health and safety labels further highlights the need for strict regulations to protect young users from these harmful effects [EXPLANATION]</u>. By emphasizing these serious risks and suggesting concrete actions, Source E clearly supports the view that social media has a detrimental impact on the mental health of young people in Singapore</p> <p><u>Disagree: Social media is not bad for the young people in Singapore</u></p> <p>E.g. When I consider Source A, I disagree with the view that social media is bad for young people in Singapore. [STAND] The comic shows the figure with the Instagram logo claiming to have "4.89 billion" connections, highlighting the vast opportunities for social interaction and influence that social media provides [EVIDENCE]. This suggests that social media can facilitate extensive social networks and global connections, which can be beneficial for young people in terms of socialization and networking. Therefore, Source A implies that social media can have positive impacts on young people in Singapore. These connections can foster a sense of community and belonging on a global scale [EXPLANATION].</p> <p>E.g. When I consider Source C, I disagree with the view that social media is bad for young people in Singapore. [STAND] Source C highlights the complex nature of social media's impact, stating that "social media can enhance social connections and provide emotional support, contributing to positive mental well-being" [EVIDENCE]. This suggests that social media offers young people a valuable platform to build and sustain meaningful relationships, particularly in cases where they might feel isolated or</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>disconnected in their physical environments. By enabling connections with like-minded individuals or supportive communities online, social media fosters a sense of belonging and emotional security, which can significantly reduce feelings of loneliness [EXPLANATION]. When loneliness is alleviated, young people experience enhanced mental well-being, leading to greater overall happiness and resilience, countering the notion that social media is inherently harmful.</p> <p>E.g. When I consider Source F, I disagree with the view that social media is bad for young people in Singapore. [STAND] Source F emphasizes the positive aspects of social media, such as enhancing mental well-being, providing social connections, and promoting mental health awareness. Dr. Victor Kwok, Senior Consultant at Private Space, states, "Platforms like Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter provide opportunities for social connection, especially for individuals who might feel isolated" [EVIDENCE]. This suggests that social media plays a vital role in combating loneliness by connecting young people to supportive communities and friends, which can be especially valuable for those who may feel isolated in their daily lives. When loneliness is reduced, it not only improves mental well-being but also fosters a sense of belonging and security, which are essential for healthy development and resilience [EXPLANATION].</p> <p>Note: Consideration on number of sources used and the quality of analysis in deciding on marks in L2 and L3.</p> <p>**To score additional 2 marks, candidates can take any one of these 3 routes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● thorough analysing at least one source in relation to its reliability, utility or sufficiency ● by sharing example(s) from their contextual knowledge ● by giving a balanced conclusion/ resolution <p><u>1. Analysing at least one source in relation to its reliability, utility or sufficiency:</u></p> <p>E.g. When I examine Source B, I initially agree that social media is bad for young people in Singapore. Source B highlights the negative impacts of social media on youth mental health, such as increased anxiety, depression, and exposure to cyberbullying, as presented in a speech by Deputy Prime Minister Lawrence Wong. He emphasizes that "Young people are spending more time on these platforms, which can lead to heightened anxiety, depression, and other mental health challenges" [Evidence]. Upon closer inspection of the source's provenance, I note that it is an official speech delivered in Parliament by a high-ranking government official. As the Deputy Prime Minister of Singapore, Lawrence Wong's statements are based on comprehensive data, research, and consultations with experts in the field. This enhances the credibility of the information presented in Source B, as it reflects the government's official stance and concern regarding the mental health impacts of social media on young people. This reliability strengthens the conclusion that social media can indeed have significant negative impacts on young people's mental health in Singapore. Thus, when evaluating all the sources, the credible and authoritative nature of Source B reinforces the view that the detrimental effects of social media on youth mental health are a serious concern that warrants attention and action.</p> <p><u>2. Sharing examples from contextual knowledge:</u></p> <p>E.g. When I consider Source C in light of my contextual knowledge, I agree that social media has both positive and negative impacts on young people in Singapore. Source C states that "social media can enhance social connections and provide emotional support," while also acknowledging that "negative experiences, such as cyberbullying or excessive comparison, can be detrimental." My contextual knowledge supports this balanced view, as seen during the COVID-19 pandemic when social media played a crucial role in maintaining social interactions and providing emotional support amid physical distancing measures. For example, initiatives like virtual support groups and online mental health resources became vital for many during lockdowns. Conversely, documented cases like the increase in cyberbullying incidents and the rising mental health concerns among youths reported by organizations such as the World Health</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Organization (WHO) underscore the risks associated with social media use. Therefore, Source C's balanced perspective aligns with my understanding that while social media can be harmful, it also provides valuable benefits when used appropriately. This reinforces the idea that the impact of social media is complex and multifaceted, requiring policies that maximize benefits while mitigating risks.</p> <p><u>3. Giving a balanced conclusion / resolution:</u></p> <p><i>E.g. When I consider the perspectives offered in this case study about the impacts of social media on young people in Singapore, I notice that social media has both positive and negative impacts. Sources A, B, C, D, and E highlight the negative aspects, such as addiction, increased anxiety, depression, and cyberbullying. For instance, Source B discusses the government's concerns about social media's role in mental health challenges, while Source D shares Josiah's personal experience with social media addiction and its detrimental effects. On the other hand, Sources A, C, and F suggest that social media can provide significant benefits, such as enhancing social connections, providing emotional support, and promoting mental health awareness. Source F, for example, emphasizes the positive aspects of social media, such as its potential to combat loneliness and raise awareness about mental health issues. These sources collectively show that social media has a multifaceted impact on young people, with both substantial risks and considerable benefits. Therefore, while acknowledging the potential negative effects, I agree that the impact of social media on young people can be beneficial if managed appropriately, with measures in place to mitigate the risks and maximize the positive outcomes.</i></p>	
--	---	--

Marker's Comments:

- To agree with the given statement, most students selected Sources B and D. To disagree with the statement, most students selected Sources C and F.
- Students who have done well for this question are able to use the source evidence quoted to explain the impact brought about by social media and how social media has led to the impact stated.
- There is a significant number of students who simply quote the evidence and expect the evidence to explain itself. They are reminded in the question paper that they will still need to explain what they have quoted in relation to the given statement as one of the assessment objectives for this question is to construct good explanations i.e. the connection between the source evidence and the given statement has to be explicit and not assumed.
- There are still quite a handful of students who wrote their answers in their own way which demonstrate they lack the understanding of what this question is trying to assess. Subject teachers should remind students about the assessment objectives:
 - a. Demonstrate understanding of the different perspectives presented by the sources in the case study by quoting the accurate evidence in relation to the statement (agree AND disagree).
 - b. Construct good explanations by showing explicit and unassumed links between the evidence they have quoted and the statement given in the question.
- Overall, the performance of this question is over a spectrum, showing an uneven and diverse understanding of the demand of this question.
- There is a small group of students who have attempted to conclude by checking the reliability of one of the sources used. However, the attempt was unsuccessful because the reliability check was not based on critical analysis of the source.

Marking Guide

Section B: Structured Response Question [15 marks]

6	<p>Extract 1 shows that Singapore's diversity of nationalities is a result of its openness to foreigners, which addresses manpower needs, economic growth, and mitigates low birth rates and an ageing population.</p>	
---	---	--

	In your opinion, how does Singapore's openness to foreigners impact Singaporeans? Explain your answer using two consequences.	[7]
Level	Descriptor	Mark
L1	<p>Describes the topic (i.e. Singapore's openness to foreigners without mention of any specific consequence of such openness)</p> <p>Note: Candidates who only quote from and/or describe the extract will not be awarded this level.</p>	1m
L2	<p>Identifies/ Describes consequence</p> <p>Award 2m for identifying one consequence and 3m for identifying two consequences. Award 3m for describing one consequence and 4m for describing two consequences.</p> <p>e.g. See below</p> <p>Note: A valid description will provide additional details about the consequence identified.</p>	2–4m
L3	<p>L2 + Explains consequence</p> <p>Award 5–6 marks for explaining one consequence. Award 6–7 marks for explaining 2 consequences.</p> <p><i>E.g. One positive impact of Singapore's openness to foreigners is the promotion of cultural exchange and appreciation [IDENTIFY]. Such cultural exchanges would result in a fusion of cultures. One example of cultural fusion can be seen in home furnishing products. Mr Mike Tay is a Singaporean designer and founder of design studio Onlewo. In his home furnishing products, such as curtains, wallpaper and fabrics, he uses patterns inspired by the heritage, places and cultures of various communities in Singapore and Asia. [DESCRIBE]. By embracing diversity, Singaporeans gain a broader understanding of the world and develop empathy and respect for different cultures, which enhances social cohesion and unity within the country [EXPLAIN].</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>E.g. However, Singapore's openness to foreigners also brings about competition for resources, which can negatively impact Singaporeans [IDENTIFY]. The influx of migrants and immigrants can lead to increased competition for jobs, housing, and public services. For instance, some Singaporeans may feel that foreigners are taking away job opportunities or driving up the cost of housing. The government has implemented policies such as the Fair Consideration Framework to ensure that Singaporeans are given fair consideration for job opportunities before hiring foreign talent [DESCRIBE]. Despite these measures, the perception of increased competition for limited resources can create social tension and resentment among locals, potentially undermining social harmony and inclusiveness in Singapore [EXPLAIN].</i></p>	5–7m

	Note: A valid explanation will address how the consequence identified is the outcome of Singapore's openness to foreigners.	
--	---	--

Marker's Comments:

- *Candidates were able to address the question adequately by providing a description and relevant explanation. They were able to do so by talking about the context of the problem, impact of the identified consequence, or the significance of the issue.*
- *Some candidates have an incorrect understanding of the impact that foreigners have on Singapore – they say that foreigners help Singapore to increase the birth rate. Candidates should be reminded that foreigners help to mitigate the effects of a low birth rate through their involvement in the labour market, and not through their forming of families with Singaporeans.*
- *Excellent responses were able to use connectors effectively to connect their ideas together in a logical manner.*
- *Weak responses had their description and explanation all over the place, without a clear flow of ideas.*

7	<p>Extracts 2 and 3 discuss the role of individuals and government in managing socio-cultural diversity in Singapore.</p> <p>In building a more socially inclusive society in Singapore, do you think the role of individuals is more significant than the role of government? Explain your answer.</p>	[8]
Level I	Descriptor	Mark
L1	<p>Writes about building a more socially inclusive society in Singapore but without addressing the question.</p> <p>Award 2 marks for answers that address other stakeholders to build a more socially inclusive society in Singapore without addressing the given roles.</p>	1–2m
L2	<p>Describes the role of individuals and/or government in building a more socially inclusive society.</p> <p>Note: A valid description will address the Who, Where, When and the Where</p> <p>Note: Answers must show clearly that the candidate understands the chosen factor.</p> <p>Award 3 marks for describing one role. Award 4 marks for describing both roles.</p> <p><i>e.g. See below</i></p> <p><i>* Examples and descriptions ought to be relevant to the Question Focus about building a socially inclusive society.</i></p>	3–4m
L3	<p>Explains the role of individuals and/or government in building a more socially inclusive society.</p> <p>Note: A valid explanation will address the Why and the How</p> <p>Award 5–6 marks for explaining one role. Award 6–7 marks for explaining both roles.</p> <p><i>E.g. The role of individuals is significant in building a socially inclusive society in Singapore due to their capacity to address issues arising from socio-cultural diversity directly [POINT]. For instance, community leaders and volunteers often engage in initiatives to promote understanding and tolerance among different cultural groups. Activities such as intercultural dialogues, community events, and social media campaigns led by individuals help to foster mutual respect and understanding. For example, local community groups have organized events like cultural festivals and heritage walks, where participants learn about the traditions and histories of different ethnic groups in Singapore [ELABORATION / EXAMPLE]. These events provide platforms for meaningful interactions and discussions, breaking down barriers and building bridges between different communities. This grassroots approach ensures that social cohesion is built from the ground up, through personal connections and community involvement, thereby directly contributing to a socially inclusive society</i></p>	5–7m

	<p>[EXPLANATION]. Thus, the role of individuals in promoting inclusivity is crucial in building a socially cohesive society in Singapore [LINK].</p> <p>E.g. The role of the government is also significant in managing socio-cultural diversity through structured policies and programs [POINT]. For example, the bilingual policy mandates that students learn both English and their mother tongue, which helps preserve cultural heritage while fostering a common language for communication. By learning their mother tongue, students retain a strong sense of their cultural roots and heritage, which fosters pride and respect for their own cultural identity. At the same time, proficiency in English allows for seamless interaction and understanding across different communities, promoting mutual respect, and reducing cultural biases. [ELABORATION / EXAMPLE] As a result, diversity is acknowledged and valued, and individuals from different backgrounds can connect and collaborate effectively. Thus, the government's implementation of the bilingual policy plays a crucial role in building a socially inclusive society in Singapore [LINK].</p>	
L4	<p>Both aspects of L3 plus explains the relative importance of the roles.</p> <p>E.g. L3 + In weighing the relative importance of the roles of individuals and the government in building a socially inclusive society in Singapore, <u>both roles are undeniably significant and complementary</u>. The government's structured policies and programs, such as the bilingual policy, <u>provide a foundational framework for inclusivity</u>. These policies ensure that cultural heritage is preserved while facilitating communication and understanding across different ethnic groups, thereby promoting social cohesion on a national scale. On the other hand, the role of individuals is equally critical as <u>they directly engage with their communities through grassroots initiatives</u>. By participating in intercultural dialogues, community events, and social media campaigns, individuals foster personal connections and mutual respect among diverse groups, thereby addressing socio-cultural issues at a more immediate and personal level. <u>While the government's role is essential for creating systemic change and providing resources, the active involvement of individuals ensures that inclusivity is practiced and reinforced in everyday interactions</u>. Therefore, a socially inclusive society in Singapore is best achieved through a synergistic approach where both the government and individuals actively contribute to promoting social cohesion and mutual respect.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>While both the roles of the government and individuals are crucial in building a socially inclusive society in Singapore, <u>the role of individuals is arguably more important</u>. This is because individual actions have a direct and immediate impact on fostering social cohesion and understanding within communities. When individuals engage in initiatives like intercultural dialogues, community events, and social media campaigns, they create personal connections and mutual respect among diverse groups. These grassroots efforts address socio-cultural issues at a personal level, breaking down barriers and building bridges between different communities. Furthermore, individual actions can adapt more quickly to the unique needs and dynamics of local communities, making them highly effective in promoting inclusivity. <u>Although the government's structured policies and programs provide a necessary framework for social cohesion, the active involvement of individuals ensures that these principles are practiced and reinforced in everyday interactions</u>. Therefore, the proactive and direct involvement of individuals is more impactful and central to building a socially inclusive society in Singapore.</p>	8m

	<p>OR</p> <p>While the roles of both the government and individuals are essential in building a socially inclusive society in Singapore, <u>the role of the government is arguably more important.</u> <u>The government has the authority and resources to implement comprehensive and structured policies that ensure widespread impact and sustainability.</u> For instance, the bilingual policy mandates that students learn both English and their mother tongue, preserving cultural heritage while fostering a common language for communication. This policy not only promotes mutual respect and understanding across different communities but also ensures that these values are ingrained from a young age, creating a strong foundation for social cohesion. Additionally, government initiatives like the Ethnic Integration Policy (EIP) in public housing and the Singapore Citizenship Journey for new citizens provide systemic and long-term solutions to promote integration and unity among diverse populations. <u>While individual actions are important, they often lack the scope and consistency needed to address socio-cultural diversity on a national scale.</u> Individual efforts can be sporadic and localized, making it challenging to achieve the same level of sustained and comprehensive impact that government policies can. Therefore, the government's structured and far-reaching approach makes its role more impactful and central to building a socially inclusive society in Singapore, while the role of individuals, though valuable, is less significant in creating widespread and lasting change.</p>	
--	---	--

Marker's Comments:

- **Most candidates were able to address the question adequately by providing a description and relevant explanation of the given factors.**
- **Candidates need to be aware that their examples provided must be relevant to the question focus of 'socio-cultural diversity' and 'social inclusiveness'. There were those who gave examples about poverty and meeting the needs of those with low SES – these were clearly not relevant to the question and hence not accepted.**
- **Candidates also need to be aware that the explanation needs to connect the description (including the example) to the question focus for a coherent and logical train of thought. Excellent responses were able to use connectors to effectively show these critical connections. In the same way, weak responses either had their description and explanation presented in a non-coherent manner, or the link between the example and explanation had missing links. Given that the question focus is centred on social inclusiveness, candidates should not land their answers on people's emotions/ understanding but rather, on the effect of positive/negative emotions and/or understanding on social inclusiveness in society.**