

SECTION A – SBCS [35]

(1) Study Source A. What does this cartoon tell you about world leaders' attitude to climate change? Explain your answer. [5]

Level	Descriptor
L1 [1m]	Lifts/describes the source with no reference to question.
L2 [2m]	Surface level interpretation/ interpretation not focussed on world leaders' attitude This cartoon tells me that the destruction from climate change is unavoidable/ This cartoon tells me that world leaders are trying very hard to resolve climate change problems.
L3 [3m]	Valid inference not on attitude This cartoon tells me that world leaders are not effective in managing the effects of climate change.
L4 [4-5m] 4m: I 5m: Ie	Inference on world leaders' attitude This cartoon tells me that world leaders have an insincere attitude towards managing climate change. The cartoon shows a ship about to crash onto a huge iceberg. Instead of immediately shifting course to avoid the crash, the world leaders "agree to sign a pledge to hold another meeting to consider changing course at a date yet to be determined." This is very ambiguous, suggesting that because world leaders are making vague promises to change course, they are not committed to avoiding the crash. Likewise, with the damage from climate change most certain to happen, world leaders are not taking immediate steps to manage the change. Instead, they are delaying decision-making, increasing the likelihood of the world being destroyed by the effects of climate change. This shows that world leaders have an insincere attitude towards managing climate change.

2) Study Sources B and C. How far are these sources similar? Explain your answer. [7]

Level	Descriptor
L1 [1m]	Comparison of source provenance The two sources are different as Source B is from an article published by the NRDC but Source C is from a statement released by Donald Trump.
L2 [2-3m] 2m: S or D 3m: S and D	S or D based on content comparison, unsupported
L3 [4-5m] 4m: Se or De 5m: Se and De	S or D based on content comparison, supported The two sources are different about whether withdrawing from the Paris Climate Agreement would benefit the US. Source B says that the withdrawal would not benefit the US but Source C says that the withdrawal would benefit the US. Source B states that “If the United States withdraws from the Paris Agreement, it will cost the US economy as much as \$6 trillion in the coming decades.” This shows that the withdrawal will actually damage US economy. Source C on the other hand states that “The reality is that withdrawing from the Paris Climate Agreement is in America’s economic interest and won’t matter much to the climate.” This shows that withdrawal from the Paris Climate Agreement would benefit US’s economy. Therefore, the two sources are different about whether withdrawing from the Paris Climate Agreement would benefit US. The two sources are similar in saying that countries must cooperate for climate change to be managed. Source B states that “Having understood this benefit, countries like China and India have agreed to concrete and ambitious commitments aimed at slowing down the progress of climate change. Both countries, which are already poised to lead the world in renewable energy, have made significant progress towards their goals set in the Paris Agreement.” This shows that with India and China cooperating to manage climate change, there is significant progress to be made. Likewise, Source C states that “In fact, 14 days of carbon emissions from China’s MNCs alone would wipe out gains from America. Why force the Americans to comply when the Chinese won’t cooperate? And this after we have had to spend billions and billions of dollars, lose jobs, close factories, and suffer much higher energy costs for our businesses and homes.” This tells me if China does not cooperate with managing climate change, all the efforts that US put in would be in vain, suggesting that countries need to cooperate in order to manage climate change. Hence, the two sources are similar in stating that countries need to cooperate for climate change to be managed.

L4 [6m]	<p>Comparison of tone</p> <p>The two sources have different tones about the success of the Paris Climate Agreement in managing climate change. Source B has an optimistic tone but Source C has a pessimistic tone.</p> <p>Source B has an optimistic tone about the success of the Paris Climate Agreement. This is seen in the source where it says that “Finally, China and India have agreed to concrete and ambitious climate commitments. Both countries, which are already poised to lead the world in renewable energy, have made significant progress towards their goals set in the Paris Agreement.” This tells me that in accordance to the Paris Climate Agreement, countries are willing to cooperate to manage climate change. The phrase, “made significant progress towards their goals set in the Paris Agreement,” shows that the NRDC feels that it is possible to achieve the goals set in the Paris Agreement, leading to its success in managing climate change. Hence, this suggests an optimistic tone.</p> <p>On the other hand, Source C has a pessimistic tone. This is seen in the source where it says, “Even if the Paris Agreement is to be implemented in full, with total compliance from all nations, it is estimated that it would only produce a two-tenth of one degree Celsius reduction in global temperatures by the year 2100. In fact, 14 days of carbon emissions from China’s MNCs alone would wipe out gains from America.” This shows that there are many obstacles to the Paris Agreement’s success, including “full implementation” which can only lead to “a two-tenth of one degree Celsius reduction in global temperatures.” Such phrases show that it is not possible for the Paris Agreement to successfully manage climate change and thus, having a pessimistic tone. Therefore, the two sources have different tones about the success of the Paris Climate Agreement.</p>
L5 [7m]	<p>Comparison of purpose</p> <p>Success Criteria (from both sources):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Message ii. Anticipated Outcome iii. Evidence + Explanation iv. Context <p>The two sources have different purposes in terms of what is expected from the Americans. Source B is meant to convince Americans that (i) withdrawal from the Paris Climate Agreement would not benefit America (ii) so that they would pressurize the government to not withdraw from the agreement. On the other hand, Source C is from President Donald Trump stating that the (i) withdrawal from the Paris Climate Agreement would benefit America so that (ii) they would not be critical of the government’s decision to withdraw from the Paris Peace Agreement.</p>

	<p>This is seen in Source B where it states that (iii) “If the United States withdraws from the Paris Agreement, it would cost the US economy as much as \$6 trillion in the coming decades.” This shows that the withdrawal would actually damage US economy. (iv) US withdrawal from the Paris Climate Agreement would be a great setback for international efforts for climate change management. Hence, the NRDC’s article aims to convince Americans that the withdrawal will be detrimental for Americans so that they would pressurize the government to not withdraw from the Paris Climate Agreement.</p> <p>This is seen in Source C where it states that “Why force the Americans to comply when the Chinese won’t cooperate? And this is after we have had to spend billions and billions of dollars, lose jobs, close factories, and suffer much higher energy costs for our businesses and homes. The reality is that withdrawing from the Paris Climate Agreement is in America’s economic interest and won’t matter much to the climate.” This shows that withdrawal from the Paris Climate Agreement would salvage American’s jobs and the USA’s economy. (iv) When President Trump made this speech, he was attempting to justify his withdrawal from the Paris Climate Agreement as the Americans at this point were critical of his move because of the damage it would do to the environment. However, after listening to him and understanding the benefit that the withdrawal would have for USA, (AO) the Americans would no longer be critical of Trump’s decision and the US would not be pressured to fulfil the terms of the agreement. Hence, the two sources have opposing purposes.</p>
--	--

3) Study Source D. How far is this source useful in what it says about youths? Explain your answer. [6m]

Level	Descriptor
L1 [1m]	<p>U/NU based on provenance</p> <p>This source is useful in what it says about youths as it is by Greta Thunberg, a youth herself and she is reliable in expressing how youths feel about the damage being done to the environment.</p>
L2 [2m]	<p>NU, based on limited utility (insufficiency)</p> <p>This source is not useful in what it says about youths as it is by a youth who does not represent the youths around the world who might not be feeling the same way as she does. This limits the source’s utility.</p>
L2 [3-4m] 3m: U 4m: Ue	<p>U based on source content</p> <p>Source D is useful in telling me that <u>youths care about the environment</u>. This is seen in the source where it states that “People are suffering. People are dying. Entire ecosystems are collapsing. We are at the beginning of mass extinction, and</p>

	<p>all you can talk about is money and fairy tales of eternal economic growth.” Greta Thunberg is criticising the leaders from different countries for not understanding the severity of the damage being done to the earth and is pressurising them to be more environmentally conscious. This shows that youths care about the environment.</p>
L3 [5m]	<p>U or NU based on cross reference</p> <p><u>Useful</u> L2 + This is supported by source F which also tells me that <u>youths care about the environment</u>. This is seen in the source where the little girl is seen to be stopping her father from throwing rubbish in the wrong bin and pointing him to the right bin that he should use. This shows that the little girl cares about the environment and is making sure that her parent is environmentally conscious as well. <u>Since Source F supports Source D, this makes the information in Source D reliable and hence useful.</u></p> <p><u>Not Useful</u> This source is not useful in telling me that <u>youths care about the environment</u> as it is refuted by Source E which tells me that <u>youths do not care about the environment</u>.</p>
L4 [6m]	<p>NU based on provenance explained</p> <p>Context/ Motive OR Source Analysis</p> <p>Success Criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Stand Message Provenance Evidence/ Explanation of message CA/SM, explained Link to reliability <p>(i) This source is not useful in telling me (ii) that youths care about the environment as is by (iii) Greta Thunberg, a climate activist who will be biased towards her stand as she justifies her aggression towards world leaders’ efforts in environmental conservation. (iv) This is seen in the source where she states that “People are suffering. People are dying. Entire ecosystems are collapsing. We are at the beginning of mass extinction, and all you can talk about is money and fairy tales of eternal economic growth.” Greta Thunberg is criticising the leaders from different countries for not understanding the severity of the damage being done to the earth and is pressurising them to prioritise environmental conservation. This shows that youths care about the environment. (v) However, as an environmental activist, it is only natural that Greta will feel passionate about conserving the environment but this is not applicable to the majority of youths in the world. Furthermore, she uses emotive phrases like “You have stolen my</p>

	<p>dreams and childhood with your empty words,” “Entire ecosystems are collapsing” and “We will never forgive you.” These are emotive and exaggerated words, not based on actual facts. In fact, while she is suggesting that world leaders have done nothing and youths are angry, we know that the Paris Climate Agreement is one example of actions taken by world leaders and that there are specific goals that countries are working towards. (vi) This reduces her credibility as a representative claiming that youths care about the environment. As such, I do not find Greta Thunberg reliable. This reduces the usefulness of what the source tells me about youths.</p>
--	--

4) Study Sources E and F. Having read Source E, are you surprised by Source F? Explain your answer. [7m]

Level	Descriptor
L1 [1m]	<p>Source analysis with no reference to surprise</p> <p>Sources E and F both say that Singaporeans prioritise their own convenience.</p>
<p>L2 [2-3m]</p> <p>2m: Identifying reason</p> <p>3m: Explaining reason with evidence</p>	<p>S/N based on reason internal to Source F</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Such answers do not take into consideration Source E. Only provide analysis of Source F.</i> <p>Having read Source E, I am not surprised that Source F says that Singaporeans prioritise their own convenience. Source F shows a Dad throwing a banana peel into a can meant for metal waste. He seems to have done this without thinking about the consequence of throwing rubbish into the wrong bin and only prioritises his own convenience. This is not surprising as Singaporeans are always in a rush to get things done and take actions that are mostly convenient to them, especially if they are timesaving. As such, they don't think about the long term impact of individual actions on the environment. Hence, I am not surprised that Source F says that Singaporeans prioritise their own convenience.</p>
<p>L3 [4-6m]</p> <p>4m: S/NS 5m: S+NS 5m: Se or NSe 6m: Se+NSe</p>	<p>S or/and NS based on content comparison of both sources</p> <p>Having read Source E, I am not surprised that Source F says that Singaporeans prioritise their own convenience. This is because Source E agrees with Source F. Source F shows a Dad throwing a banana peel into a can meant for metal waste. He seems to have done this without thinking about the consequence of throwing rubbish into the wrong bin and only prioritises his own convenience. Source E supports this where it states that Singaporeans are “prioritizing their own needs and convenience over environmental conservation.” Since Source E supports Source F, the information in Source F is expected and hence, I am not surprised by Source F.</p>

	<p>Having read Source E, I am surprised by Source F as Source E contradicts Source F. According to Source F, young people care about the environment but Source E contradicts this when it states that young people do not care about the environment. Source F shows the young girl correcting her dad when she says stops him from throwing banana peel into the can meant for metal. She points him to the correct bin saying "That bin is for recycling," so that he would throw the banana peel into the correct bin. This shows that the little girl cares about the environment as she ensures that the metal meant for recycling are not damaged. However, Source E states that "Younger people consume to meet their needs, buying or throwing things away mindlessly when they are in a rush without considering the consequences of their actions on the environment." This shows that young people are willing to sacrifice the environment, not caring about the environmental damage their actions can bring about. Since Source E contradicts Source F, the information in Source F is unexpected and hence, I am surprised by Source F.</p>
L3 + L4 [7m]	<p>S or NS based on comparing provenance and motive</p> <p><u>Not Surprise</u></p> <p>I am not surprised that the two sources contradict each other as it is expected. Source E is trying to highlight that youths do not care about the environment. This is seen in the source where it states that "Younger people consume to meet their needs, buying or throwing things away mindlessly when they are in a rush without considering the consequences of their actions on the environment."</p> <p>This shows that young people are willing to sacrifice the environment, not caring about the environmental damage their actions can bring about. <u>The author makes this statement to convince youths to be more conscious of the environment so that they will take the necessary actions for environmental conservation.</u> On the other hand, source F states that youths care about the environment. Source F shows the young girl correcting her dad when she says stops him from throwing banana peel into the can meant for metal. She points him to the correct bin saying "That bin is for recycling," so that he would throw the banana peel into the correct bin. This shows that the little girl cares about the environment as she ensures that the metal meant for recycling are not damaged. <u>Through this, the author is trying to motivate youths to understand that they can do their part to protect their environment. Upon realising that environmental conservation does not have to be complicated and that everyone can play their part, youths will feel more motivated play their part to protect the environment.</u> Since both sources have different approaches to getting youths to protect the environment, I am not surprised that the two sources contradict each other.</p> <p><u>Surprise</u></p> <p>I am surprised that the two sources contradict each other even though they</p>

	have the same motive to increase awareness amongst Singaporeans about the damage that their actions cause the environment.
--	--

5) ‘Future generations will live on a better Earth.’ Using sources from this case study, explain how far you would agree with this statement. [10]

Level	Descriptor
L1 [1m]	Identifies sources to agree/disagree without explanation.
L2 [2-3m]	Provides reason why agree and/or disagree OR [2]; AND [3]
L3 [4-5m] 4m: A or D 5m: 2A or 2D	Explains with further impacts why agree OR disagree (One perspective only) 1 Agree OR Disagree [4]; 2 Agree OR Disagree [5]
L 4 [6-8m] 6m: A + D 7m: A + D + (A or D) 8m: 2A + 2D	Explains with further impacts why agree AND disagree (Two perspectives) 1 Agree + 1 Disagree [6] 1 Agree + 2 Disagree/ 2 Agree + 1 Disagree [7] 2 Agree + 2 Disagree [8] Success Criteria: (i) Provides a reason why agree/disagree (ii) Provides relevant evidence (iii) Uses evidence to establish further impact Agree Source B→ countries have taken steps to adopt climate friendly measures→ achieve Paris Climate Agreement’s goals→ reduce damage to environment. Source D→ youths care for the environment→ take steps to protect→ reduce damage to earth. Source F→ public education→ more people will learn to conserve environment→ less damage. I agree that “Future generations will live on a better Earth” as Source F states that currently (i) there are efforts being made to educate the public. (ii) Source F shows a little girl correcting her dad when he threw a banana peel into the bin meant for metals that should be recycled. The banana peel could contaminate the metal in the bin rendering the items in the bin unsuitable for recycling. Such actions will slow down conservation efforts. (iii) However, with public awareness, such damaging actions can be reduced as more people will realise that there simple everyday actions that go a long way to protect the

	<p>environment. This will then increase environmental conservation efforts so that future generations will live on a better Earth.</p> <p>Disagree</p> <p>Source A → governments are incapable of managing climate change → environmental problems will worsen.</p> <p>Source C → countries prioritise national interest → climate change will continue → worsen environmental damage.</p> <p>Source D → actions taken are insufficient → damage to earth cannot be significantly reduced → damage to earth will continue.</p> <p>Source E → people too selfish → at the cost of environmental conservation → more damage to environment</p> <p>I do not agree that future generations will live on a better Earth as Source D says that the (i) actions taken to manage climate change are insufficient. This is seen in the source where it states (ii) that “Even if the Paris Agreement was implemented in full, with total compliance from all nations, it is estimated that it would only produce a two-tenth of one degree Celsius reduction in global temperatures by the year 2100. In fact 14 days of carbon emissions from China’s MNCs alone would wipe out gains from America.” This shows that even with great effort and commitment, the effect on reversing climate change will be insignificant. This signals environmental conservation efforts to be unproductive and so less people will come forward to protect the environment. (iii) This will continue the damage to the environment and future generations will not live on a better Earth.</p>
+ 2	<p>Conclusion (Must make reference to a specific source and evidence)</p> <p>Through analysing at least one source in relation to its reliability, utility or sufficiency</p> <p>I do agree that the future generations will live on a better Earth even though Source D says that the actions taken to manage climate change are insufficient. This is seen in the source where it states that “Even if the Paris Agreement was implemented in full, with total compliance from all nations, it is estimated that it would only produce a two-tenth of one degree Celsius reduction in global temperatures by the year 2100. In fact 14 days of carbon emissions from China’s MNCs alone would wipe out gains from America.” This shows that even with great effort and commitment, the effect on reversing climate change will be insignificant.</p>

However, this cannot reliable as this statement is being made by President Donald Trump who was at this point being criticised by the Americans and the international community for withdrawing from the Paris Climate Agreement. Many had accused him of compromising global interest as a result of his actions. Hence, he would naturally label international efforts to be insufficient as he wanted to justify a seemingly senseless action. Therefore, he would be biased against international efforts and is not reliable. Since I feel that his opinions cannot be taken at face value, I feel that the international efforts will be sufficient and that future generations will live on a better Earth.

By sharing example(s) from their contextual knowledge.

I agree that “Future generations will live on a better Earth” as Source F states that currently there are efforts being made to educate the public. Source F shows a little girl correcting her dad when he threw a banana peel into the bin meant for metals that should be recycled. The banana peel could contaminate the metal in the bin rendering the items in the bin unsuitable for recycling. Such actions will slow down conservation efforts. However, with public awareness, such damaging actions can be reduced. **(CK)** This is the reason why Singapore has stepped up efforts to increase public awareness of environmental conservation. Schools conduct assembly talks on the importance of saving the environment as well as the actions that can be taken, including the Reduce, Reuse and Recycle steps. Green bins are found in many parts of Singapore to encourage people to recycle paper. More and more Singaporeans are using reusable straws and many fast food outlets have stopped providing disposable straws. All these actions are meant to create greater awareness on the steps that individuals can take to conserve environment until it becomes a part of their lives. Such actions will accumulate to reduce the damage to the environment so that future generations will live on a better Earth.

By giving a balanced conclusion / resolution

Overall, I believe that future generations will live on a better Earth if everyone plays a role. Leaders of the world need to take concrete actions unlike what is seen in Source A. However, we know that countries like India, China and Singapore are already taking concrete steps to support the world in the use of renewable energy. This can be seen from Sources B and E. Youngsters who are going to lead the actions for slowing climate change are already stepping up as seen from Sources D and F. Hence, with governments collaborating and sharing the kind of actions that can be taken on policy changes, industrial changes as well as changes to the way society behaves, climate change can be better managed and future generations will live on a better Earth.

SECTION B – SRQ [15]

(a) In your opinion, what message can be sent to society for people to be less elitist? Explain your answer using two strategies. [7]

Level	Descriptor
L1 [1m]	Writes about elitism without focusing on the question
L2 [2-4m] 2m: 1 I 3m: 1D 3m: 2 I 4m: 2 D	Identifies strategy(ies) and describes examples
L3 [5-7] 5-6m: 1 E 6-7m: 2 E	<p>Explains how the strategy addresses the issue Weaker explanation = no (ii)</p> <p>Success Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Identify the message (ii) State why this message is needed (iii) State how this message can be delivered (strategy) (iv) Describe the strategy (v) Show how the strategy will reduce elitism (incorporating message) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. One message that can be sent out to the public for people to be less elitist is that everyone who is capable can progress in life. ii. With elitism, people believe that some are better than others in terms of background. This leads them to form cliques and marginalise people who are from a lower income background or lower education. iii. We can communicate this message through public education in schools. iv. Assembly talks or CCE lessons can share information on people who have struggled to progress in life despite coming from poorer backgrounds. Such sessions can relate the opportunities given to these individuals as recognition of their abilities and not their backgrounds. v. Through assembly talks and CCE lessons that focus on progress in society through merit and not background, we will educate students, the future generation that everyone has the potential to progress in society. This will lead them to believe that no one is better than the other and that everyone who is capable can progress in life. Students from more affluent backgrounds will not look down on those from less well-to-do families, reducing elitist mindset in society.

--	--

b) Do you think prejudice and misconceptions cause greater disharmony to society than competition for resources? Explain your answer. [8]

Level	Descriptor
L1 [1-2m]	Writes about topic without focusing on the question
L2 [3-4m]	Describes given factors, cannot paraphrase/ lift from extracts. 1 system described [3]; 2 systems described [4]
L3 [5-7m]	<p>Explains the negative impact of cultural homogenisation and cultural hybridisation Explains 1 factor: [5-6] Explains 2 factors: [6-7]</p> <p>Success Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Describe given factor (ii) State why it exists (iii) Illustrate given factor using an example (iv) Show how this leads to disharmony (tension/ not willing to work/ live together) <p>*Weak/strong depends on how elaborate the description in (ii) and (iii)</p> <p>Prejudice and Misconceptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Prejudice and misconceptions can lead to disharmony. Prejudice and misconceptions refer to preconceived, generalised opinions one has about a group of people. Such opinions are not based on valid reason or actual experience but inaccurate impressions that have been hardwired into people's minds. ii. Such thoughts cannot be easily changed and can make people irrational in their attitude towards others. In a diverse setting like Singapore, there are people from different cultural backgrounds and have different norms. Ignorance of such backgrounds and norms can lead to people jumping to conclusion about one another, leading to prejudice and misconceptions. iii. An example of such a prejudice is seen in the property sector. There is a misconception that Indians always cook smelly curries and are not clean in housekeeping matters. As a result, local landlords don't like to rent houses to Indian tenants, even local ones. Such a prejudice is difficult to control and the situation cannot be rectified as landlords cannot be forced to rent their houses to people they don't like. iv. This causes inconvenience for those of Indian ethnicity in finding accommodation and they may feel targeted and isolated. This creates

	<p>an environment of mistrust in society, leading to tension between groups of people and disharmony in Singapore.</p> <p>Competition for resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Competition for resources can lead to disharmony. Singapore has finite resources in terms of job availability, funds for salary, land, transportation, etc. ii. Allocating resources for one sector of community can compromise the funds available for other sectors or communities. Such competing priorities may lead to trade-offs being made. iii. For example, Singapore has seen an increased inflow of foreigners over the years to make up for the aging population and low birthrates. This has resulted in competition for resources between Singaporeans and foreigners over opportunities or availability of infrastructure. This has resulted in overcrowding in public transport, shortage of available housing and employment opportunities as locals compete with foreigners. iv. This could lead to resentment between the two sectors of the community with both blaming the other for loss of resources, leading to disharmony in society.
L4 [8m]	<p>Weighing based on criteria</p> <p>I think prejudice and misconceptions cause greater disharmony compared to competition for resources. This is because prejudice and misconceptions are the root causes as they influence a person's thinking. When a person is prejudiced against a particular community, he will naturally see that community as a threat and competition. This will then contribute to the perception that the community is competing with him for limited resources. Hence, prejudice and misconceptions will lead to perceived competition for resources.</p>

End of document.