Section A: Source Based Case Study

1a) Study Source A.

What does the source tell you about extremists? Explain your answer. [5]

Level	Examples
L1: Source Description [1]	Extremists will get their reward for killing people at various places of worship. .
L2: Valid message, literal interpretation OR not on extremists [2-3] **2m: unsupported** **3m: supported**	**Literal interpretation: The source tells me extremists will go to hell for killing people.** The cartoon shows extremists hoping to get their reward for killing people at various places of worship. On the other side, the Devil labelled hate and intolerance was anticipating the arrival of the extremists. This means the extremists will go to hell instead of receiving rewards for their actions.
L3: Inference on extremists, unsupported [4]	**Message: The source tells me extremists do not understand religion.**
L4: Inference on extremists, supported [5]	**Message: The source tells me extremists do not understand religion.** The cartoon shows extremists hoping to get their reward for killing people at various places of worship. On the other side, the Devil labelled hate and intolerance was anticipating the arrival of the extremists. The Devil says "You should see their faces when they realise they worship the same 'God'!" The extremists think that they should kill people as that is what their religion and their God wants them to do. However, the "God" that they truly worship is hate and intolerance. This shows that they do not understand religion at all.

b) Study Sources B and C.

Does Source B prove Source C wrong as evidence about the Sri Lankan Police Chief? Explain your answer. [7]

Level	Examples
L1: Answers based on description of provenance. [1m]	Source B does not prove Source C wrong because Source B is a statement from the Sri Lankan President, who is the leader of the government that had been criticised for its incompetence. He would naturally be biased against the Police Chief. Therefore, Source B does not prove Source C wrong.
L2: Comparison level [2-5] **Similarity or/and Difference identified [2-3]** **Similarity or/and Difference explained [4-5]** **OR**	Source B proves Source C wrong because it disagrees with Source C in terms of whether the Police Chief is to blame for failing to prevent the bomb attacks. According to Source B, the Police Chief is to blame. However, according to Source C, he is not to blame for failing to prevent the bomb attacks. This is evident in Source B as it states that "The Defence Secretary and Inspector General of Police failed to inform the President about the intelligence agency letter from a friendly foreign country sent on 4 April 2019, warning about possible attacks on churches and places of public gathering". This means the Police Chief also knew about the warning but kept silent; he didn't even inform his superior – the President. As a result, no actions were taken to prevent the attack. Thus, the Police Chief is to blame. In contrast, Source C states that "He claimed that the President excluded him from attending the National Security Council and had asked the Head of State Intelligence Service (SIS) – Sri Lanka's spy agency – to report to him directly on matters of national security." This means the Police Chief is not at fault as he was excluded from the National Security Council, which means he may have not been kept in the loop about the impending attack. Thus, he is not to blame for failing to prevent the attack. Since Source B contradicts Source C in terms of whether the Police Chief is to blame for failing to prevent bomb attacks in Sri Lanka, it does not prove Source C wrong. Similarity: Source B proves Source C right because both agree that the Police Chief was fired due to intelligence failure in preventing the bomb attacks.

L2: Message + CR [4] **Uncritical rejection of Source B based on content + CR**	**See L3 & L4**
L3: Answer is based on Source B's unreliability **Provenance explained** **Using either Source Analysis or Context-Motive [6m]**	*In order to attain this level, students must:* *(i) Take a stand and messages from both sources should be indicated* *(ii) Explain why the provenance makes the source not credible* *(iii) Explain main message* *(iv) Explain why what the Police Chief said is not reliable (SA or C/M)* *(v) Link to why it does not prove Source C wrong* Source B does not prove Source C wrong as Source B says the Police Chief is to blame for failing to prevent the bomb attacks in Sri Lanka but Source C says he is not to blame (i). Source B is a statement from the Sri Lankan President who is the leader of the government that had been criticised for its incompetence. He would naturally be biased against the Police Chief. Therefore, Source B does not prove Source C wrong (ii). This is evident in Source B where it states that "The Defence Secretary and Inspector General of Police failed to inform the President about the intelligence agency letter from a friendly foreign country sent on 4 April 2019, warning about possible attacks on churches and places of public gathering". This means the Police Chief also knew about the warning but kept silent; he didn't even inform his superior – the President. As a result, no actions were taken to prevent the attack. Thus, the Police Chief is to blame (iii). (SA) However, his statement is one-sided as he intentionally ignores the fact that all the different departments are under his management, and given that the intelligence unit reports to him directly, there is no way he was completely unaware of the impending attack. He would have known about the activities of a local extremist group too as he has access to all the intelligence information. Thus, his view is skewed and unreliable. (C) Moreover, the President was criticised by the public for failing to react fast enough to the bomb warning, and thus, he would push the blame to the Police Chief so that he will not appear incompetent and (M) the public does not demand that he steps down as the President. With this motive, his view is skewed and unreliable (iv). Since, he is unreliable, this source cannot prove Source C wrong (v).
L4: L3 + Cross reference [7m]	My stand is supported by the Background Information that also says the Police Chief is not to blame. It states, "The Sri Lankan leader quickly came under fire for his failure to act on a detailed warning sent by their intelligence unit about the NTJ's plans to attack". This means the President was the one to blame for failing to prevent the attacks, not the Police Chief. Since B.I contradicts Source B, it reduces the reliability of Source B. Hence, Source B cannot prove Source C wrong.

c) Study Source D.

Are you surprised by what the source says about the terrorists' socio-economic background? Explain your answer. [7]

Level Descriptors	Answers
L1: Not Surprised, stating provenance [1-2]	I am not surprised by what the source says about the terrorists' socio-economic background as this comes from The Wall Street Journal. It is a reputable news source and I expect it to have confirmed the information before publishing so as to maintain its reputation. [1] I am not surprised by what the source says about the terrorists' socio-economic background since this information is from the investigation report on the bombers so I expect it to report the truth. [2]
L2: Answers based on source evidence [3-4] **3m: Provides a logical reason for S/NS** **4m: Explains the reason for S/NS**	I am surprised by the source saying that the terrorists come from high socio-economic background. Source D states, "Two sons of a wealthy spice trader in Sri Lanka were among the bombers. One of the remaining bombers - Abdul Latheef Mohamed Jameel, pledged allegiance to the ISIS. Jameel studied engineering in London for a year in 2006". One will not expect that anyone from such privileged backgrounds with bright futures ahead of them would sacrifice their lives and careers to be terrorists. There is too much to lose. Therefore, I am surprised to learn that the terrorists come from high SES.
L3: S or NS, CROSS-REFERENCE to sources, supported [5-6m] **S / NS: 5m** **Se / NSe: 6m**	I am surprised by Source D saying that the terrorists come from high SES background as this is contradicted by the Background Information that says they come from low SES background. Source D states, "Two sons of a wealthy spice trader in Sri Lanka were among the bombers. One of the remaining bombers - Abdul Latheef Mohamed Jameel, pledged allegiance to the ISIS. Jameel studied engineering in London for a year in 2006". Therefore, I am surprised to learn that the terrorists come from high SES. This is contradicted by the Background Information that states, "Factors like poverty, neglect, discrimination coupled with weak governance in countries like Sri Lanka have also encouraged people to turn to extreme ideologies". This means people with disadvantaged backgrounds were more likely to be drawn to terrorism, not the privileged ones. Since the Background Information contradicts Source D, I am surprised by what it says about the terrorists' SES background. I am not surprised by Source D in saying that the terrorists come from high SES background as this is supported by Source E that also says they come from high SES background. Source D states, "Two sons of a wealthy spice trader in Sri Lanka were among the bombers. One of the remaining bombers - Abdul Latheef Mohamed Jameel, pledged allegiance to the ISIS. Jameel studied engineering in London for a year in 2006". This is supported by Source E that states, "In 2016, The Sri Lankan government acknowledged that 32 Muslims from "well-educated and elite" families had gone to Syria to join ISIS". This means people from

	privileged background were also drawn to terrorism. Since Source E supports Source D, I am not surprised by what it says about the terrorists' SES background.
L5: NS, CK Expected [7]	**Success Criteria:** **i) Stand – not surprised and message** **ii) Explain message using evidence** **iii) Link evidence to CK (similar cases)** **iv) Link CK to why it is expected that high SES people can be radicalised too** I am not surprised by Source D in saying that the terrorists come from high SES background (i). Source D states, "Two sons of a wealthy spice trader in Sri Lanka were among the bombers. One of the remaining bombers - Abdul Latheef Mohamed Jameel, pledged allegiance to the ISIS. Jameel studied engineering in London for a year in 2006" (ii). This means they came from well-to-do families and are well-educated. This is not surprising as they could have been radicalised during his study in London. ISIS terrorist who beheaded an American journalist - Jihadi John graduated with a degree in computer programming from well-to-do family in London. Even women and teenagers were willing to leave behind the comfort of their home in developed Western countries to join ISIS. Some of the notorious figures like Osama bin Laden, leader of Al-Qaeda was the son of a rich Saudi construction magnate (iii). Since ISIS or extremist propaganda spreads throughout the world – especially so in the era of the Internet; anyone, anywhere, from any SES background could be influenced to join. Therefore, I am not surprised by Source D (iv). **Note:** *Students are not required to state specific names but there could be a general argument on why people from well-to-do families and countries join terrorist organisations. These ideas are taught during lesson.*

d) Study Source F.

Why was this cartoon published? Explain your answer. [6]

Level	Examples
L1: Source Description [1m]	The cartoon was published to talk about terrorism and religious hatred.
L2: Message/ Impact identified **2m: M; 3m: I**	**Message:** This cartoon tells people that terrorist attacks can take place in any country. **Impact:** The cartoon was published so that governments / international community will beef up their national security.
L3: Message/ Impact supported **[4-5]** **4m: Me** **5m: Ie**	Refer to L4.
L4: Purpose [6m] *(i) 3As + M* *(ii) Mevi + Mexp* *(iii) Context* *(iv) Change in mind set of people impact*	**Purpose:** The cartoon was published to (i) convince the international community that terrorist attacks can take place in any country [M] so that governments will beef up the national security measures [AO]. (ii) This is evident in the source where a shark symbolising terrorism and religious hatred swims past Sri Lanka, claiming "I know no borders" and there in an explosion in Sri Lanka. This means that the global nature of terrorism makes it very challenging to manage as terrorist attacks can happen anywhere. (iii) At this point in time, many governments think that since their homelands are far away from the ISIS in Syria, they would not be affected by extremists' actions. Upon seeing the cartoon, (iv) the international community will realise that any country can be the target as terrorist attacks can happen anywhere. Governments will then beef up the security measures to prevent more of such attacks in the future.

e) Study all sources.

"Sri Lanka is able to manage terrorism." Using sources from this case study, explain how far you would agree with this statement. [10]

Marks	Descriptors/ Examples
L1: Describes sources and does not	I agree that Sri Lanka is able to manage terrorism as this is supported by Sources B, D and E.

answer the question. [1m]	I disagree that Sri Lanka is able to manage terrorism as this is supported by Sources A, C, and F.
L2: Explains either A or NA **2-3m: 1Ae or 1De** **4m: 2Ae or 2De**	**Success Criteria:** **i) Stand (I agree / I disagree)** **ii) Reason for being able to manage** **iii) Link reason to how this shows that terror attacks will <u>increase OR can be prevented [look fors]</u> using evidence and explanation** **iv) Link to stand** **Agree, supported by sources** I agree that Sri Lanka is able to manage terrorism (i) as Source B shows that security measures are upgraded to prevent another attack in the future (ii). The source states that "He added that an appropriate process will be implemented while completely reorganising the security services including the State Service and Intelligence Units". This shows that Sri Lanka is improving on its security measures to avoid similar intelligence failure which could cost hundreds of lives in the future. With a more organised and responsive team, they can take swift action to evacuate people before a bomb explodes. <u>As a result, more lives would be saved with an efficient and effective intelligence service</u> (iii). Therefore, I agree that Sri Lanka is able to terrorism (iv). **S.D:** Able because authorities can detect/track the terrorists' movement and syndicates from messaging apps arrest them in time prevent attack **S.E:** Able because intelligence can come up with sophisticated online campaign to compete with ISIS can help to de-radicalise social media users they will not join terrorist groups reduce possible attacks **Not Agree, supported by sources** I disagree that Sri Lanka is able to manage terrorism (i) as Source F shows the global nature of terrorism (ii). The source shows a shark symbolising terrorism and religious hatred swims past Sri Lanka, claiming "I know no borders" and there in an explosion in Sri Lanka. This means that the global nature of terrorism makes it very challenging to manage as terrorists can come from anywhere and it could be anyone. Sri Lanka would easily be caught off guard again and future terrorist attacks cannot be avoided (iii). Therefore, I disagree that Sri Lanka is able to manage terrorism (iv). **S.A:** Extremely difficult to police people's feelings of intolerance and hatred as they are ingrained cannot stop people from being radicalised more terrorist attacks in the future. **S.C:** Lack of cooperation between different government agencies slow to react to terrorist threats terrorist attacks cannot be avoided.

L3: Explains both Ae and De [5-8]	**Award 5 marks for explaining from 2 sources [1Ae + 1De]** **Award 6 marks for explaining from 3 sources [2Ae + 1De or 1Ae + 2De]** **Award 7-8 marks for explaining from 4 sources [2Ae + 2De]** ***Take note, if students highlight 2 perspectives from the same source, it is still considered as 2 sources.**
	Consideration on number of sources used and the quality of analysis in deciding on marks in L2 and L3. ***To score additional 2m, candidates can take on any of these three routes:*** - ***Through analysing at least one source in relation to its reliability, utility or sufficiency*** I disagree that Sri Lanka is able to manage terrorism based on Source B. This comes from the President who had been criticised for failing to prevent bomb attacks in Sri Lanka. He might be biased towards his own government. Even though the President in Source B says that there will be better security measures to be implemented. This is because he only said this after he came under fire for failing to respond to early bomb warning. He would have said this to appease the mass and stop them from calling him out to step down as the President. - ***By sharing example(s) from their contextual knowledge*** I disagree that Sri Lanka is able to manage terrorism based on Source E. However, this is highly unlikely. This country did not have basic security measures like checks in hotels etc. despite such measures being prevalent and practised all over the world since September 11 attacks. Given that this country is so backdated in technology since it may not even have scanners at hotels, it is highly unlikely that it would be able to effectively tap on technology to counter extremism. Thus, I disagree that Sri Lanka is able to manage terrorism. - ***By giving a balanced conclusion / resolution*** Overall, I agree that Sri Lanka is able to manage terrorism by increasing their technological know-how to contain terrorist ideology online. Source A shows that the extremists' own misconception of religion drove them to violence and Source E provides a suggestion on how such misconceptions can be gotten rid of. While it is very challenging to police people's mind-set, active de-radicalisation platforms that are as sophisticated as the ISIS' campaigns would be able to undo the damage. Social media users will be able to rely on accurate information about their own religion and legitimate religious figures who can help them clarify their doubts immediately. This would help to address the root cause of why some people were attracted to ISIS' extremist views and eventually reduce terror threats.

	This allows scope for candidature to decide what comes more naturally for them, and will invite meaningful thinking, without making any of the above a direct requirement.

2a) In your opinion, what can be done to reduce poverty in Singapore? Explain your answer using two strategies. [7]

Descriptor	Suggested Answer
L1: Describes the topic [1]	
L2: Identifies / Describes the strategies [2-4]	2m: I, 3m: 2I, 3m: 1D, 4m: 2D i) Identify the strategy ii) Describe the strategy
L3: L2 + Explains the strategy [5-7] **5-6m: 1 strategy** **6-7m: 2 strategies**	Weak: (ii) is missing i) Identify the strategy ii) States why there is poverty in Singapore iii) Describe what this strategy is, using examples iv) Using an example, show how this strategy helps to reduce poverty in Singapore

	One way in which poverty can be reduced in Singapore would be to (i) <u>provide more assistance to the poor and destitute to cope with the cost of living.</u> (ii) One reason why there is poverty in Singapore is due to the rising cost of living here. The elderly and those that are not as educated may be holding down low-paying odd jobs. Hence, they struggle to afford even basic necessities and become trapped in the bottom tier of the socio-economic ladder. (iii) For example, more food coupons can be issued for the poor so that they can use that to buy groceries and meals from supermarkets and food courts. A special category of EZ-link cards can also be issued for the poor and destitute, enabling them to ride on public transport to attend interviews or travel to work. (iv) Instead of spending most of their little wages on basic needs like food and transport, the money saved can now be used to further one's studies or developing one's skills. This raises the chances of them

	securing better-paying jobs and earning a higher income. By moving up the socio-economic ladder, the poor will be able to lift themselves out of poverty. This would reduce the presence of poverty in Singapore. *Other possible answers:* - Increased presence of social workers and volunteers to reach out the poor and assist them in applying for the help they qualify for - More publicity on existing resources available / improve awareness among the poor - Tackle income inequality - Revise criteria and simplify application process for applying for financial assistance or subsidies - Hold children accountable / penalties for children if they neglect or do not support

	their aged/ needy parents

2b) Do you think that assimilation is more effective than integration in managing the impacts of socio-cultural diversity? Explain your answer. [8]

Descriptor	Suggested Answer
L1: Writes about topic without addressing the question [1-2m]	Assimilation is practiced in France.
L2: Describes both factors [3-4] **3m: 1 p.o.v** **4m: 2 p.o.v**	i) States the factor ii) Describes what the factor is about
L3: Explain both points of view [5-7] **5-6m: 1 factor** **6-7m: 2 factor** **Weak: no (ii)**	i) States the factor ii) Describes what the factor is about iii) Describe an example that leads to the factor iv) Use the examples to show the factor creates a harmonious society v) Explain how impact of socio-cultural diversity is managed <u>Factor: Assimilation</u> (i) Assimilation is effective in managing the impacts of socio-cultural diversity. (ii) Assimilation is a process where all groups adopt the beliefs and practices of the majority group. Immigrants are expected to adopt and follow the beliefs and practices of the majority group instead of following their own cultures and practices. (iii) For example, in France, which practices assimilation, all French people are required to adopt a French national identity, regardless of their ancestry. All immigrants are thus required to sign an "integration contract" in which they have to learn about French culture and master the French language. (iv) By ensuring a common language among immigrants and the French, the immigrants are able to interact and communicate freely and without any language barrier with the locals. This fosters greater understanding between locals and immigrants. Immigrants are now able to resolve conflicts and reduce misinterpretation between themselves and the local French citizens, so that they are able to able to get along with each other, leading to a harmonious society. (v) In the long run, the adoption of French as a common language provides a platform to break down and reduce pre-existing misconceptions and stereotypes through better inter-ethnic communication. This manages prejudice and misconceptions in a diverse society.

	Factor: Integration (i) Integration is effective in managing the impacts of socio-cultural diversity. (ii) Integration is a process where ethnic groups retain their unique identities while forging common ground with the other ethnic groups in the country. (iii) For example, in Singapore, which practices integration, inter-racial differences are recognized and respected. All major ethnic groups are thus allowed to retain the use of their mother tongues through the Bilingual Policy in schools, while using English as a common language medium. English is a non-native language, so it ensures that no one ethnic group has an advantage over the other. (iv) By facilitating integration through the Bilingual Policy in schools, this ensures that everyone feels that their ethnic groups are equally respected. As language barriers are broken down through the use of English as a common language, there will be more communication and interaction between students of different ethnicities. This leads to greater understanding of the various cultures and practices between different ethnic groups, which enables them to be more accepting of differences and to get along better. Friendships are built between people from different ethnic groups, strengthening bonds and leading to a harmonious society. (v) In the long run, stereotypes and misconceptions will be cleared, reducing tensions in society and thus managing the impact of socio-cultural diversity.
L4: Both aspects of L3 + explains the relative importance of each factor [8]	**i) Must have a reason / criterion for stand** **ii) Explain reason / criterion** **(i) Integration is the more effective approach**. This is because the practices that come with aspects of identity, such as religion and ethnicity, are deeply embedded within an individual and cannot be changed easily. **(ii) The flaw in assimilation is that is neglects the practical difficulty of erasing these deeply-embedded beliefs and practices and assumes that homogeneity and conformity are easily achievable in a diverse populace**. Instead of enforcing conformity to the majority, it may thus be **more realistic to accept the differences between people and, instead, acknowledge and respect these differences**. With the integration approach, differences are less likely to become sources of tension, and the likelihood of tensions arising in a diverse populace is minimised. Integration is thus more effective in managing the impacts of socio-cultural diversity than assimilation.