

SOCIAL STUDIES 4E5N Prelims 2019
LORMS

Section A – Source Based Case Study

1 (a) Study Source A.

What can you infer about the POFMA law? Explain your answer.

[5]

Level	Level Descriptor and Rubrics	Marks
L1	Uncritical answers based on description of source content. E.g. I can infer that the POFMA law ensures that people do not do anything that affects the public's confidence.	1m
L2	Inferences, unsupported. <i>Award higher mark in the level for stronger inference, unsupported</i> <i>OR 2 valid inferences, unsupported.</i> E.g. I can infer that the POFMA law results in a negative impact. [2m] OR E.g. I can infer that the POFMA law is not very clear. [3m]	2-3m
L3	Valid inference, supported with evidence. <i>Award higher marks in the level for a more developed answer.</i> E.g. I can infer that the POFMA law could potentially be misused / abused by the government. From the source, I can see that “a minister can have a lot of power” and that “there is a possibility that a government official could be excluded from prosecution for potentially spreading falsehoods”. This shows that there are very real fears that this POFMA law could be used to protect ministers and can be used to their advantage to take down information online they deem as threatening.	4-5m

(b) Study Source B.

Why was this infographic posted on the website? Explain your answer.

[6]

Level	Level Descriptor and Rubrics	Marks
L1	Uncritical answers based on description of source content/provenance E.g. I can infer that many people have seen fake news on social media.	1m
L2	Weak inference with no reference to the need of having the law. E.g. The infographic was posted on the website to show that there is a danger that many Singaporeans cannot identify what is fake or real news.	2m
L3	Valid inference with reference to the need of having the law. <i>Award higher marks in the level for a more developed answer.</i> E.g. The infographic was posted on the website to show that there are many people who may not be able to identify falsehoods posted online. From the source, I can see that 77% of Singaporeans have come across fake news on social media platforms, 33% felt that most people would not be able to recognize fake news and 50% were not confident of being able to recognize fake news. Therefore, this law is important to protect them.	3-4m
L4	Purpose, supported with evidence. <i>Award higher marks in the level for a more developed answer (clear impact and explanation of source).</i> E.g. The infographic was posted on the website in order to convince critics of the POFMA law that it is an important law to have in Singapore. From the source, I can see that 77% of Singaporeans have come across fake news on social media platforms, 33% felt that most people would not be able to recognize fake news and 50% were not confident of being able to recognize fake news. This shows that there is quite a large number of people who may fall victim to falsehoods they see online. Hence, this is posted to allow	5-6m

	Singaporeans to understand why there is a need for such a law and to stop opposing it.	
--	--	--

(c) Study Sources C and D.

Having read Source C, are you surprised by Source D? Explain your answer.

[7]

Level	Level Descriptor and Rubrics	Marks
L1	<p>Answers that refer to only 1 source (either C or D) / failed attempts at hidden agenda</p> <p>E.g. I am surprised by Source C because it shows me that the citizen cannot get help through the POFMA and is directed to the POHA. [1]</p> <p>OR</p> <p>E.g. I am not surprised by Source D because the MP is trying to protect the POFMA law. [2]</p>	1-2m
L2	<p>Surprised OR Not Surprised based on comparison of content of Sources C and D.</p> <p><i>Award higher marks in the level for more developed answers.</i></p> <p>E.g. I am not surprised by Source D because it shows that the POFMA law was created to address more serious problems as quickly as possible. From the source, I can see that “POFMA is about public interest, riots and racial disharmony” and that the Government needs to move fast before more serious things happen”. Similarly, from source C, I can see that the weapons available in the law mart for POFMA are high tech and very powerful ones. This shows that stronger force is needed to address serious public matters and the government is ready to employ these powerful forces.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>E.g. I am surprised by Source D because it shows that the POFMA is meant to help the public as efficiently as possible and that most people did not have to worry as long as they were careful what they said online. From the source, I can see that “Individuals who like to give their opinions on issues – and do so without wrongful intentions – should not have to worry” and that “public interest matters...have</p>	3-4m

	to be dealt with much faster". However, in Source C, I can see that when an innocent looking citizen reports fake news, they are directed to the POHA whereas the executive can come straight up to the law mart and is given a large machine gun. This shows that the POFMA may not be actually used to protect but could be used instead as a weapon that may harm others. Therefore, showing that POFMA may not really help the public as it Source D claims.	
L3	<p>Surprised OR Not surprised based on cross-reference. <i>Award the higher mark in the level for a more developed answer.</i></p> <p>E.g. I am not surprised by Source D because it shows that the POFMA law was created to address more serious problems as quickly as possible. From the source, I can see that "POFMA is about public interest, riots and racial disharmony" and that the Government needs to move fast before more serious things happen". Similarly, from source C, I can see that the weapons available in the law mart for POFMA are high tech and very powerful ones. This shows that stronger force is needed to address serious public matters and the government is ready to employ these powerful forces. These two ideas are further supported by Source F which shows that the government is trying to protect Singaporeans both individually and nationally with the POHA and POFMA laws. Source F also confirms that the POFMA is "designed not to be censorious except in serious cases".</p> <p>Note: If CR is made to another source without the mention of Source C or D, L1/1. This question is a hybrid question which require students to do a comparison of both sources in their answers before even bringing in another source.</p>	5-6m
L4	<p>Not surprised based on hidden agenda</p> <p>E.g. I am not surprised by Source D because it was from Cedric Foo, a People's Action Party MP. This would mean that he might have had a hand in creating this bill. Therefore, he would have vested interest in the passing of the bill and will defend it. In Source D, he talks extensively of how the POFMA is very useful and allows the government to take fast action against online offenders to protect the public.</p>	7m

(d) Study Source E.

**How useful is this source in showing the impact on Singapore having a POFMA?
Explain your answer. [7]**

Level	Level Descriptor and Rubrics	Marks
L1	<p>Useful OR Not Useful based on provenance, unexplained.</p> <p>E.g. Source E is not useful because it is from the Human Rights Watch director.</p>	1m
L2	<p>Useful OR Not Useful based on provenance.</p> <p>E.g. Source E is useful because it is from quite an authoritative figure in the Human Rights Watch. He could be looking at the potential effects of the law quite clearly as an outsider and might have seen the effects of such a law in another country. Hence, it might be useful.</p>	2m
L3	<p>Useful based on source content.</p> <p><i>Award higher marks in the level for a more developed answer.</i></p> <p>E.g. Source E is useful because it shows how the POFMA would result in the loss of a freedom of speech and that it would enable to Singapore government to cover up certain information that would deceive the citizens. From the source, I can see that "Singapore's leaders have crafted a law that will have a chilling effect on internet freedom throughout Southeast Asia" and that "they try to impose their narrow version of 'truth' on the wider world". This shows that the POFMA would result in an ignorant and quiet citizen.</p>	3-4m
L4	<p>Useful or Not Useful based on cross-reference.</p> <p><i>Award higher marks in the level for a more developed answer.</i></p> <p>Not Useful</p> <p>E.g. Source E is not useful as it states that the POFMA law would severely affect the freedom of speech and robs the people of their rights to post their opinion online. From the source, I can see that "Singapore's new fake news law is a disaster for online expression by ordinary Singaporeans" and that it affects the "independence of many online news portals they rely on to get real news about their country" which is challenged by Source F which is written by a professor of law who says that this law is actually not blocking the freedom of speech. From Source F, I can see that it "strikes an even-handed approach between protecting responsible speech and clamping down on false speech in a no-nonsense manner" and that it is "designed not to be censorious except in serious cases". This shows that there is a certain level of freedom of</p>	5-6m

	<p>opinion and not at all as exaggerated by Source E. Since Source F challenges Source E, Source E is not reliable and hence not useful.</p> <p>Accept CR to D for not useful. Accept CR to C for useful.</p>	
L5	<p>Not Useful, <i>based on biasedness of the source / agenda.</i></p> <p>E.g. Source E is not useful because it is an overly emotional post that carries quite a lot of biasedness. This source is a Twitter post by a director of the Human Rights Watch hence he/she would naturally be supporting the idea of freedom of speech. In his post, he uses words like “chilling effect”, “hammer blow against” and even accuses the Singapore government of “imposing their narrow version of ‘truth’”. These words are very emotional which discredits the source, making it not very reliable and hence not useful.</p>	7m

(e) “Singaporeans should welcome the POFMA law.”

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

[10]

- A- No
- B- Yes
- C- No
- D- Yes
- E- No
- F- Yes

Level	Level Descriptor and Rubrics	Marks
L1	<p>Writes about statement, no valid source use.</p> <p>E.g. I think Singaporeans should welcome the POFMA law.</p>	1m
L2	<p>Yes / No, supported by valid source use.</p> <p><u>Yes</u> <i>Award 2m for use of 1 source, explained well.</i> <i>Award 3-4m for use of 2 sources, explained well.</i> <i>Award 4m for use of 3 or more sources, explained well.</i></p> <p>E.g.</p> <p>Firstly, I would agree that Singaporeans should welcome this law because there are statistics to show that there is an actual threat of the spreading of fake news. From Source B, 77% claimed that they have</p>	2-4m

	<p>come across fake news before but only 50% were actually confident of their ability to identify fake news and only 33% felt that most Singaporeans could identify fake news. This shows that there is a need for the POFMA law to help the public identify fake news quickly and take them down before they have damaging effects on the public.</p> <p>Secondly, I would agree with the statement because the POFMA helps to protect against clear threats to our safety that could go out of hand with the spreading of online falsehoods. From Source D, POFMA deals with “public interest matters” and “if there are serious grounds for concern...a take-down action is crucial”. With a law protecting the harmony of Singapore, we would not be troubled by problems like riots being incited by negative news floating online.</p> <p>Lastly, I would agree with the statement because it is a law which shows that the Singapore government is attempting to protect its people. The spread of fake news is a global problem and according to Source F, POFMA is a fairly “even-handed approach” and the professor clearly states that “it would be irresponsible of governments not to do anything or to respond inadequately to this collective challenge”. This shows that the Singapore government is trying to protect its citizens and that it is a law that is quite fair unless the content being spread is detrimental to the society.</p> <p><u>No</u> <i>Award 2m for use of 1 source, explained well.</i> <i>Award 3-4m for use of 2 sources, explained well.</i> <i>Award 4m for use of 3 sources, explained well.</i></p> <p>E.g. Firstly, I would not agree with the statement because the POFMA law could be potentially misused by politicians. From Source A, “the law is sweeping, broad and contains vague wording” and that the wording “suggests that the government can exempt anybody from this act that they want”. Hence there is a danger that this POFMA law has not been crafted properly which may result in the government officials having too much power over what is being said online.</p> <p>Secondly, I would not agree with the statement because POFMA could be potentially misused by executives and do not actually serve to protect the average citizen. From Source C, there is a lady who is reporting about the spread of fake news and the man at the counter is directing her to the POHA. The weapons depicting POHA and POFMA are vastly different with POFMA being a lot stronger than the catapult. Even then, she has to wait for the approval of the catapult to be made before it can work for her. Hence, this shows that the POFMA act is actually</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>something that is useful for authoritative figures to use as a weapon as opposed to protecting the citizens which is its said main purpose.</p> <p>Lastly, I would not agree with the statement because Source E shows that with the POFMA law in place, it robs citizens of potential online sources of information which would make them easier for the government to control. From Source E, citizens would not be able to get “real news about their country beyond the ruling People’s Action Party political filter” and that it is easier for the PAP “to impose their narrow version of ‘truth’”.</p>	
L3	<p>Yes + No, supported by valid source use. <i>Award higher marks in the level for a more developed answer.</i> (1:1) = 5m (2:1 OR 1:2) = 6m (2:2) = 7-8m (2:3 OR 3:2) = 8m</p> <p>Both elements of L2.</p>	5-8m
	<p>** To score additional 2 marks, candidates can take any one of these 3 routes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>Through analyzing at least one source in relation to its reliability, utility or sufficiency E.g. Source F is a reliable source as it is from an opinion column written by Eugene Tan, an Associate Professor of Law at Singapore Management University. His position would allow him to have extensive knowledge about the law and he would have been able to study the POFMA act. His account seems reliable as it carries an objective tone as it presents both the strengths and weaknesses of the new law. He even suggests how to minimize the negative impact of ministers abusing the law.</p> <p>By sharing example(s) from their contextual knowledge E.g. Fake news is a pressing issue in Singapore as well as in around the rest of the world. With the increased usage of technology and the speed at which information reaches from one end of the world to the other, people believing fake news is a real concern. Many youths my age are online every day and many easily believe what is said online especially when the person writing / talking about issues are influencers. Without discerning online readers and tensions easily arising from societal problems being blown up online, the POFMA might be an appropriate law to help curb these threats.</p> 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By giving a balanced conclusion / resolution E.g. From the case study presented, the intention of the POFMA is clearly one that aims to protect citizens against online falsehoods that may result in rioting or disharmony, a damaging consequence to our small, multi-cultural society. However, there are also some weaknesses to the POFMA law that needs to be clearly addressed and monitored such that it is not unfairly used. 	
--	---	--

Section B: Structured-Response Question

Question	Answer	Marks
2 (a)	<p>Extract 1 describes the results of a survey done amongst young Singaporeans.</p> <p>In your opinion, what are some reasons why local Singaporeans are not so welcoming of foreigners? Explain your answer using two reasons.</p> <p>L1 Describes the topic i.e. talking about foreigners in Singapore [1]</p> <p><i>e.g Every year more foreigners enter our society to live, work and play. Many local citizens are unhappy about this happening.</i></p> <p>L2 Identifies reasons. [2-4]</p> <p>Award 2 marks for identifying one reason and 3 marks for identifying two reasons. Award 3 marks for describing one reason and 4 marks for describing two reason.</p> <p><i>e.g. One reason is that when foreigners enter Singapore, they bring competition of jobs. When the government opened their doors to foreign talents, many skilled and white collared jobs were taken up. People of high net worth entered Singapore, worked high paying jobs and took up executive positions. They took up positions in many different sectors like banking, IT and research and development.</i></p> <p>L3 L2 + Reasons explained. [5-7]</p> <p>Award 5-6 marks for explaining one reason. Award 6-7 marks for explaining two reason.</p>	7m

Note: An explanation is showing how the presence of foreigners bring a negative impact to the locals' lives.

*e.g. One reason is that when foreigners enter Singapore, they bring competition of jobs. When the government opened their doors to foreign talents, many skilled and white collared jobs were taken up. People of high net worth entered Singapore, worked high paying jobs and took up executive positions. **This caused local university graduates who were fresh graduates or may be not as experienced as these foreign talents to not be able to take up better paying positions. With the already competitive job market, adding more to the pool might cause companies here to favour these foreign talent over our own people. Hence, local workers would become unhappy as they are not able to compete fairly with the foreign talent brought in.***

*Secondly, another reason could be that cultural differences could cause locals to be unhappy with the influx of foreigners. In Singapore, we encourage integration and not assimilation. This means that when foreigners come in, they are allowed to retain their cultural identity and religious practices. **This would result in unhappiness as many locals feel that foreigners should learn to blend in with the Singaporeans and to live the Singapore way. Some undesirable habits that are not so 'Singaporean' could be brought in and this would lead to a greater feeling of resentment amongst locals.** [7]*

Note: Accept any reasonable answers. Examples need not come from the textbook. Part (a) encourages students' own ideas and experiences.

Question	Answer	Marks
2 (b)	<p>Extracts 2 and 3 describes two ways in which new citizens have been integrated into the Singapore society.</p> <p>Do you think the government is more effective than the local community in integrating foreigners turned new citizens into the Singapore society? Explain your answer.</p> <p>L1 Writes about the topic (i.e. integration) but without addressing the question. [1-2]</p> <p><i>e.g. Many foreigners have been coming into Singapore mostly for work and education. More and more are intending to stay</i></p>	8m

and make Singapore their home and have been converted to citizens.

L2 Describes government / local community initiatives. [3-4]

Award 3 marks for describing one.
Award 4 marks for describing both.

L3 Explains the effectiveness of government / local community initiatives. [5-7]

Award the 5-6 marks for explaining one.
Award the 6-7 marks for explaining both.

Note: An explanation is showing how each factor helps integrate these new citizens.

*e.g. The government has implemented many policies to help new citizens integrate more effectively into the Singapore society. One way is the Singapore Experiential Tour which is a half day tour which brings new citizens to key historical landmarks and national institutions where they learn about Singapore's history and the management of transport, water resources, security and defence. **With this tour, new citizens would be able to understand better how Singapore has developed over the years and achieved its success. They would also be able to appreciate what the government has done as well as the need to prepare for the future. The new citizens would then be able to understand that they have a part to play in Singapore's continued success and in the future, contribute to the society.***

*(As above plus) e.g. Local community initiatives play a crucial role in ensuring citizens are able to integrate effectively into Singapore society. Under the Community Integration Fund, many ground-up initiatives have been organized by locals to welcome foreigners. Block parties and orientation tours have been organised by locals to reach out to new citizens. **With such programmes, new citizens would be able to gain access to information and resources they may need to settle down. In addition, these programmes become platforms for interaction and promotes a sense of mutual***

understanding. With this positive effect, these new citizens might feel a more emotional connection to Singapore.

L4

Both aspects in L3 plus evaluates effectiveness of these factors.

[8]

(Both examples above plus) e.g. I think that both levels of support go a long way in ensuring new citizens feel welcome and stay in Singapore for the long term. However, having strong local community initiatives could be more effective than government initiatives. The government may come up with fancy and wide-scale events to encourage bonding between locals and foreigners however if the local community is not welcoming and not receptive, these new citizens would not have a positive experience in Singapore and may choose to leave.