

**2022 MYE Sec 4E5N SS LORMS**

<b>1</b>	<b>Why was Source A created? Explain your answer with details from the source.</b>	<b>[5]</b>
<b>L3</b>	<p><b>L2+ Purpose explained</b>  <i>Award 4 marks for no context/weak DO</i>  <i>Award 5 marks for full VAMDOC</i></p> <p>Source A was created <b>to</b> raise awareness/inform the global audience that SMEs, self-employed workers and entrepreneurs, are badly affected by the COVID-19 pandemic (message) <b>so that</b> relevant stakeholders such as government and employers to provide support structures to assist these companies, e.g. by providing tax breaks.(Intended impact) This is based on the context of the source, where multiple national lockdowns in 2020 slowed or even temporarily stopped the flow of raw materials and finished goods and reduced business activities and thus had disrupted the operations of companies worldwide. As shown in Source A, it says that “SMEs and their workers, as well as entrepreneurs and the self-employed are among those affected” and that “24.7 million jobs are at risk.” (evidence) This means that the pandemic had affected the ability of small companies to stay afloat and keep their profits running which thus affected the employability of the workers. (explain)</p>	<b>[4-5]</b>

<b>2</b>	<p><b>Study Source B and C.</b></p> <p><b>Do you think the software engineer in Source C would have agreed with the author in Source B? Explain your answer.</b></p>	<b>6</b>
<b>L1</b>	<p><b>Agree/Disagree based on source type/provenance only (not developed)/False Matching/Context/Timeframe</b></p> <p>The software engineer would have disagreed with the president of the palm oil company because one works in the IT sector and the other in the palm oil industry which earned more profits.</p>	<b>1-2</b>
<b>L2</b>	<p><b>Agree/Disagree based on Content</b>  <b>3 marks for weak explanation or lifting, or unclear comparison/common criteria.</b></p> <p>The software engineer in C would have disagreed with the author in B because he had been adversely affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. Based on the source, he was “laid off” in the middle of the pandemic and was not protected by the government. Thus he would not have agreed with the president of the palm oil company.</p>	<b>3-4</b>
<b>L3</b>	<p><b>Agree AND Disagree based on Content</b>  <i>Award 4m for weak CR</i>  <i>Award 5m for strong CR (or 2 Comparisons of Content)</i></p>	<b>5-6</b>

	<p>The software engineer in C would have agreed with the author in B that the COVID-19 pandemic had a negative impact on industries/economy. This is based on Source C where he was “laid off” from his IT startup company and described it as “a nightmare”. Similarly in Source B, the COVID restrictions had led to “a shortage of workers caused by border controls”. Even big companies such as the one in B was not spared from the negative effects of the COVID-19 pandemic.</p>	
<b>L4</b>	<p><b>L3+ Disagree based on Stance</b>  Award 6m for weak comparison of stance  Award 7m for strong comparison of stance</p> <p><u>Disagree:</u>  The software engineer in Source C would have disagreed with the author in Source B as they had different experiences from COVID-19. The author in Source B would have been of <b>the stand that COVID 19 had not completely adversely affected his livelihood</b>, while <b>the software engineer in a small startup company would have been badly affected [stance]</b>. Being the president of a prominent plantation company in Malaysia, his perspective would have been more optimistic of the impact of COVID-19 as compared to the displaced software engineer who would have a more pessimistic stance. As mentioned in Source B, the “palm oil industry appealed to the government authorities” and had received assistance while in Source C, it seemed that even though they were supposed to “receive payroll protection”, the software engineer had still been laid off which showed that he did not obtained government support after all.</p>	<b>7</b>

<b>3</b>	<b>Study Source D.</b>	
	<b>How useful is Source D in showing the effects of COVID-19 on big companies? Explain your answer.</b>	<b>[7]</b>
<b>L1</b>	<p><b>Did not answer Question [No mention of Usefulness in any of the paragraphs OR Merely describing]</b></p> <p>Source D showed that COVID-19 did not negatively affect big companies.</p>	<b>[1]</b>
<b>L2</b>	<p><b>Useful based on CONTENT</b>  Award 2 marks for weak support  Award 3 marks for strong support</p> <p><b>[Weak Support]</b> Source D is useful in showing that COVID-19 had a positive effect on/did not affect big companies negatively. This can be seen from the graph which showed the revenue earned by big companies which seemed to be rising which means that they made a lot of money.</p> <p><b>[Strong support]</b> Source D is useful in showing that COVID-19 had a positive effect on/did not affect big companies negatively. This can be seen from the graph which showed the cumulative profits of big companies such as Apple</p>	<b>[2-3]</b>

	whose revenue increase by 39% from 2020 to 2021, while the revenue earned by Microsoft increased by 21% in one year.	
L3	<p><b>Useful/Not Useful based on RELIABILITY (CROSS-REFERENCING)</b>  <i>Award 4 marks for cross-referencing, unsupported.</i>  <i>Award 5 marks for cross-referencing, supported.</i></p> <p><u>Useful</u>  CR to Source B (Both Source B and D are about big companies being able to survive)</p> <p><u>Not Useful</u>  CR to C (BigTech vs SMEs, OR BigTech vs small tech)</p> <p><u>Cannot CR to:</u>  Source A, Source C, Source E and F. (can give if there is an attempt to make the link, e.g. in Source E)</p>	[4-5]
L4	<p><b>(can skip to Prov) Useful based on RELIABILITY (PURPOSE/ PROVENANCE)</b>  Award 6m for weak evaluation of Provenance</p> <p><u>Weak evaluation:</u>  It is statistics which is supposed to be neutral and merely seeks to publish data.</p> <p><u>Useful:</u>  Source D is useful as it is reliable based on Provenance. Being published by an independent company that analyses data, <b>the source would have done sufficient research to provide accurate data.</b> Furthermore, it is an independent company which means that <b>it is not affiliated to any organization or government, and hence able to provide unbiased data on the revenue performance of the BigTech companies/being a company that analyses data, it would have the expertise to acquire accurate data on the revenue earnings of these IT companies.</b> Thus being neutral, it is reliable and useful.</p> <p><u>Not Useful:</u>  While the source is from an independent company and is not likely to be affiliated with any organization, it also means that it is a third party source. <b>The company would not have an in-depth or comprehensive picture of the BigTech companies' overall performance,</b> such as employment rates, salary cuts etc. Thus by having a <b>limited perspective</b> of the performance, it is limited in reliability and therefore not useful.</p>	[6-7]

4	<b>Study Sources E and F.</b>  <b>After reading Source F, do you trust Source E? Explain your answer.</b>	
L1	<b>Describes / lifting of source content OR Misinterpret Source E OR evaluated Reliability of F ONLY.</b>  Source E can be trusted as it showed that the COVID-19 pandemic has had to fight for survival.	[1]
L2	<b>Reliable/Not Reliable based on CONTENT ONLY</b>  <b>[2m- if student interprets Source E as being badly affected by the pandemic without considering the positive message of the source]</b>  Source E cannot be trusted as it showed that the Singapore Tourism Board was able to tide over the negative effects of the pandemic on the tourism industry. This can be seen from the source where “Our tourism businesses has displayed immense resilience throughout this difficult period, reinventing themselves.” This showed that the tourism sector in Singapore, while having been affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, was able to restructure and innovate in order to survive the after-effects of the pandemic on travel.	[2-3]
L3	<b>Reliability based on CROSS REFERENCE</b> <i>Award 4 marks for weak support</i> <i>Award 5 marks for strong support</i>  [Weak CR] – Both sources Agreed After reading Source F, I <u>can trust</u> Source E as both sources showed that the tourism sector had been negatively affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. This can be seen from Source E where “Singapore’s tourism sector has had to fight for survival in 2020” which showed that COVID-19’s multiple lockdowns had led to a fall in demand in the tourism industry. Similarly in Source F, the cartoon depicted a tour agency waiting for an “indication from government on tourism industry restart”. Both sources showed that with less people travelling and due to multiple lockdowns across the globe, there had been no recourse for the travel industry.  [Strong CR] – Both sources Disagreed After reading Source F, I do not trust Source E. Both sources disagreed on the effects of COVID-19 on the tourism industry. While Source F showed that the tourism industry had been badly affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, Source E showed that not all were badly affected due to government support and their ability to re-innovate themselves. In Source E, it showed that the tourism sector in Singapore had benefitted from “various government support measures” and by “reinventing their business models”. Through effective marketing, Singapore’s tourism sector was able to survive the worse effects of COVID-19.	[4-5]
L4	<b>Reliability based on Provenance/Purpose(Based on Source E)</b> Award 6 marks for weak support (analyse provenance of at least 1 of the sources and logic is clear. If logic is not clear then we do not accept ) Award 7 marks for strong support	[6-7]

	<p>After reading Source F, I do not trust Source E. Source E is a media release from the Singapore Tourism Board which is a government statutory board. This means that it is inclined to <b>instill confidence in the citizens as well as tourism agencies, of the survivability of their tourism sector</b> using a one-sided tone “Our tourism businesses has displayed immense resilience” Based on the context that there has been multiple lockdowns around the word affecting employment across various industries, the Singapore Tourism Board might be releasing this media to encourage the travellers around the world that Singapore is a safe place to travel and would thus choose Singapore as their travel destination over the next three years, which might thus help to keep the tourism industry in Singapore to stay afloat. Being of a vested interest, I would not trust Source E.</p>	
--	---	--

5	<p>“Globalisation has made the global economy more vulnerable to crisis.”</p> <p>Using the sources in this case study, explain how far you would agree with this statement. Explain your answer.</p>	10						
L1	No valid source use	1						
L2	<p>Valid source use, one-sided</p> <p>Award 2m for 1 valid source</p> <p>Award 3m for 2 valid sources</p> <p>Award 4m for 3 valid sources</p>	2-4						
L3	<p>Two-sided answer with valid source use</p> <p>Award 5m for 2 valid sources (1A + 1D)</p> <p>Award 6m for 3 valid sources</p> <p>Award 7 – 8m for 2A + 2D</p> <p>+ 2m for Bonus Level (Balanced Conclusion)</p> <p>Agree: Sources A, C, F</p> <p>Disagree: B, D, E</p> <table><tr><td>Agree</td><td>Disagree</td></tr><tr><td>A: Globalisation has made SMEs and the self-employed more vulnerable to crisis such as the COVID-19 pandemic, due to the disruption in the industries worldwide which affected the livelihood of workers in SMEs.</td><td>B: Globalisation has not made big companies vulnerable to crisis such as the COVID-19 pandemic as big companies in the palm oil industry were able to earn more profits from the rising demand in COVID-19 essentials such as soaps and detergents.</td></tr><tr><td>C: People who are employed in small companies are vulnerable to crisis because crisis such as the COVID-19</td><td>D: BigTech companies not as vulnerable to crisis as they could still earn more sales and garner more</td></tr></table>	Agree	Disagree	A: Globalisation has made SMEs and the self-employed more vulnerable to crisis such as the COVID-19 pandemic, due to the disruption in the industries worldwide which affected the livelihood of workers in SMEs.	B: Globalisation has not made big companies vulnerable to crisis such as the COVID-19 pandemic as big companies in the palm oil industry were able to earn more profits from the rising demand in COVID-19 essentials such as soaps and detergents.	C: People who are employed in small companies are vulnerable to crisis because crisis such as the COVID-19	D: BigTech companies not as vulnerable to crisis as they could still earn more sales and garner more	5-10
Agree	Disagree							
A: Globalisation has made SMEs and the self-employed more vulnerable to crisis such as the COVID-19 pandemic, due to the disruption in the industries worldwide which affected the livelihood of workers in SMEs.	B: Globalisation has not made big companies vulnerable to crisis such as the COVID-19 pandemic as big companies in the palm oil industry were able to earn more profits from the rising demand in COVID-19 essentials such as soaps and detergents.							
C: People who are employed in small companies are vulnerable to crisis because crisis such as the COVID-19	D: BigTech companies not as vulnerable to crisis as they could still earn more sales and garner more							

	<p>could affect small companies who have less resources to restructure, and thus affect the livelihood of the workers, such that even though they had sufficient qualification it is not sufficient to be retained.</p>	<p>profits, amidst the global pandemic, probably due to possessing sufficient resources to restructure and transform their products and services.</p>	
	<p>F: Tourism industry, being a part of globalization, are vulnerable to crisis such as the COVID-19 pandemic as multiple lockdowns had affected people's ability to travel, which led to a decline in the demand for tourist services.</p>	<p>E: Tourism sector less vulnerable when there are government support measures to help the industry transform themselves and restructure their services, and therefore able to stay resilient in the midst of the decline in travel.</p>	

6	<p><b>Extract 1 shows the response of Singaporeans to foreigners entering Singapore.</b></p> <p><b>In your opinion, why is there unhappiness over increasing the flow of immigrants to Singapore? Explain your answer by providing two reasons.</b></p>	7m
L1	<p><b>Describes the topic without focusing on the question</b> Award 1 mark for each detail, up to a maximum of 2 marks.</p>	1-2
L2	<p><b>Identifies and/or describes reasons</b> Award 2m for identifying reason only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Description is vague (no specific examples)</li> </ul> <p>Award 3m for identifying 2 reasons or elaboration of 1 reason</p> <p>Award 4m for elaboration of 2 reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 1 factual detail for Elaboration</li> </ul>	2-4
L3	<p><b>Describes and explains reason(s)</b> Award 5m for 1 PEEL (acceptable or strong) Award 6m for 2 acceptable PEELS or 1 strong PEEL Award 7m for 1 strong + 1 weak PEEL</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns over Standard of Living: Jobs</li> <li>Concerns over Standard of Living: Living Space and Infrastructure</li> </ul>	5-7

	<p>One reason for unhappiness over increasing the flow of immigrants to Singapore is due to competition over jobs. Foreigners who own Employment Pass, S Pass or Work Permits are eligible to work in Singapore and are likely to hold PMET positions which create more competition for white-collar Singaporean workers. Not only that, many foreigners are also employed as lower-skilled workers in construction and shipping. Furthermore, Singaporeans who are at the receiving end of such competition felt that employers preferred to hire foreign workers due to lower salary, as employers need not pay for CPF contributions or worry about NS obligations for their foreign employees. Therefore, this explains why there is unhappiness over increasing the flow of immigrants in Singapore as locals who already found it difficult to find employment would feel that their needs are not considered by the government and their jobs not protected. Over the long term, it might even lead to Singaporeans looking overseas to migrate and seek better employment opportunities.</p> <p>Another reason for unhappiness over increasing the flow of immigrants to Singapore is due to competition over living space and infrastructure. Singaporeans are concerned over an increasingly congested public transport system, competition over healthcare resources as well as public housing. The release of the 2013 Population White Paper projecting a total population of between 6.5 and 6.9 million for example, did not sit well with Singaporeans. They felt that this would worsen infrastructural issues such as increasing competition for housing, and reliability of public transport and overcrowding. Thus, this explains why there is unhappiness over increasing the flow of immigrants in Singapore as Singaporeans would have felt their quality of life being affected by rising immigration. Being taxpayers themselves, Singaporeans would have felt that it was unfair to face competition over rental spaces and the negative effects of overcrowding. Thus, this would affect the social harmony in Singapore and might lead to Singaporeans feeling an even greater sense of prejudice towards foreigners.</p>	
--	---	--

7	<p><b>Extracts 2 and 3 depicts different benefits of welcoming immigrants in Singapore.</b></p> <p><b>Do you think that exchange of skills and knowledge between immigrants and Singaporeans brings more benefits to society than exchange of culture? Explain your answer.</b></p>	8m
<b>L1</b>	<p><b>Describes the topic without focusing on the question</b> Award 1 mark for each detail, up to a maximum of 2 marks.</p>	1-2
<b>L2</b>	<p><b>Elaboration only</b> Award 2m for 1 factor weakly described Award 3m for 1 factor well described or 2 factors weakly described Award 4m for 1 factor weakly described and 1 factor well described</p>	2-5

	Award 5m for 2 factors well described	
<b>L3</b>	<p><b>Elaboration and Explanation</b></p> <p>Award 5m for 1 factor explained Award 6m for 1 factor weakly explained and 1 factor well explained Award 7m for 2 factors well explained</p> <p>One of the benefits of welcoming immigrants is in the exchange of skills and knowledge between immigrants and Singaporeans. Singapore is in great need of experts in the area of research and development. Foreign scientists would be able to share their knowledge and expertise to strengthen research competencies and collaboration with Singaporeans. For example, the Biomedical Research Council (BMRC) of the Agency for Science, Technology and Research (A*STAR) funds and supports public research initiatives in Singapore. Under BMRC, internationally renowned scientists with the expertise and knowledge to jump-start the country's biomedical sciences moved to Singapore and mentored local scientists. This has brought benefits to society intellectually and had paved the way for further advancements in scientific research and discoveries in Singapore. Openness to collaborate with overseas scientists had led to significant discoveries made in Singapore such as the H1N1 flu vaccine. Singapore as nation is thus able to benefit from such exchanges in skills and knowledge over the long term as our society progresses and are able to modernize further.</p> <p>Another benefit of welcoming immigrants is in the exchange of culture. With the interaction between Singaporeans and immigrants from various countries, many opportunities are created for us to learn from other cultures and create fusion between local cultures and foreign ones. For instance, fashion is one beneficiary of the interaction between local and foreign cultures. Designers Priscilla Shunmugam and Hayden Ng created fashion wear inspired by cross-cultural influences. Priscilla Shunmugam's cheongsams featured multiple representations of culture such as the kimono and the batik. In another example, Krsna and Govin Tan are part of an ensemble that plays Western and Eastern genres of music. They are also proficient in playing Indian classical instruments. Such exchange of culture has benefited Singapore by putting the nation on the world map in arts and culture. Beyond that, it has also led to a greater integration of different cultures in Singapore, which would lead to better understanding of other races and their customs. This would in turn reduce prejudices and misconceptions and strengthen the social fabric of Singapore.</p>	5-8
<b>L4</b>	<p><b>L3/6 + 1 (must hit 6 marks to get +1)</b></p> <p><u>Evaluation:</u> Exchange of skills and knowledge might bring more benefits to society than exchange of culture. This is because while exchange of culture is important in creating a melting pot in Singapore and ensuring that younger generations grow up being more open and tolerant towards a diversity of races and nationalities, its long-term impact is less quantifiable. In comparison, with the exchange of skills and knowledge to Singapore, locals benefit from the R&amp;D and could use them to strengthen Singapore's intellectual pool, making Singapore companies more competitive in the global economy and beneficial for our long term survival.</p>	7-8