

**Bukit Batok Secondary School
Preliminary Examination 2019
Sec 4 Normal Academic Social Studies
Marking scheme**

Question 1

Question target: Inference

1a	Study Source A. What can you learn from this source about the impact of POFMA on Singaporeans? EYA	[5]
	Note: Inference(s) should be on the <u>impact of POFMA on Singaporeans</u> . Do not accept negative impact as an inference, unless the <u>nature</u> of the negative impact is explained.	
L1	Describes source / no inference	[1]
L2	Inference(s), unsupported 1 inference – 2m / 2 inferences – 3m e.g. POFMA could cause Singaporeans to become more fearful of what they do online e.g. POFMA could lead to the significant loss of privacy and freedom for Singaporeans	[2 - 3]
L3	Inference, supported e.g. I can learn from this source that <u>POFMA could cause Singaporeans to become more fearful of what they do online</u> . This is evident as the source says that POFMA “could be used to require any Internet company to keep records of what users view”, and that this information could be used one day by the government to identify “threats or potential threats based on what they wrote and viewed”. Thus, with POFMA, Singaporeans might become more worried about the implications of what they do online and fearful that their actions could be used by the government against them. OR e.g. I can learn from this source that <u>POFMA could lead to the significant loss of privacy and freedom for Singaporeans</u> . This is evident as the source says that POFMA “could be used to require any Internet company to keep records of what users view” and that this extends even to encrypted messaging services. This is “a chilling new level of surveillance online”, showing how POFMA threatens Singaporeans’ privacy.	[4 - 5]

Question target: Purpose

1b	Study Source B. Why was this post made on The Alternative View? EYA	[6]
L1	Describes the source/failed reason	[1]
L2	Misinterpretation e.g. This post was made on the Alternative View to convince Singaporeans that the POFMA bill should be implemented as the Law Minister says that the Bill should not affect Free Speech.	[2]
L3	Reason based on sub-message / context / outcome <u>Based on sub-message</u> e.g. This post was made to convince Singaporeans that POFMA should not be implemented / that the implementation of POFMA could negatively affect the freedom of speech in Singapore. <u>Based on context</u> e.g This post was made because there are some Singaporeans who are <u>unhappy about the introduction of the POFMA Bill. They view the Bill as giving the government too much power and are concerned that the government could abuse it to restrict free speech.</u> <u>Based on outcome</u> <i>Audience must be explicitly stated/implied</i> e.g. This post was made so that Singaporeans would feel upset and put pressure on the government to improve the Bill to protect freedom of speech / so that Singaporeans would feel upset and put pressure on the government not to implement the Bill.	[3]
L4	Reason based on message <u>Based on message</u> e.g. This post was made to convince Singaporeans that <u>POFMA could lead to restrictions on the freedom of speech/could negatively affect freedom of speech.</u> This is evident as the source draws attention to the words “should not” in the CNA headline, “Free speech should not be affected by this Bill,” says K. Shanmugam SC. This is to highlight to Singaporeans that the government is <u>not willing to guarantee that the POFMA bill will not lead to limitations on free speech</u>	[4]
L5	Reason based on message and outcome This post was published to criticise the POFMA bill as <u>it could lead to restrictions on the freedom of speech/negatively affect freedom of speech,</u> so that Singaporeans <i>would put pressure on the government to include greater safeguards for free speech in the bill / put pressure on the government not to implement the bill.</i> This is evident as the source draws	[5-6]

attention to the word “should not” in the CNA headline, “Free speech should not be affected by this Bill,” says K. Shanmugam SC. This is to **highlight to Singaporeans that the government is not willing to guarantee that the POFMA bill will limit free speech.**

Question target: Comparison

1 c	Study Source C and D. How different are these two sources? EYA	7m
L1	Difference AND/OR Similarity based on provenance / source type / invalid comparison e.g. Sources C and D are different. Source C is an opinion piece while Source D is a speech.	1
L2	False matching e.g. Sources C and D are different. Source C says that fake news can threaten Singapore’s racial harmony but Source D does not mention this.	2
L3	Difference OR Similarity in content <i>Award 3m for 1 similarity/difference unsupported. Award 4m for 1 similarity/difference supported.</i> e.g. Sources C and D are <u>similar</u> as they both show that <u>there are concerns that POFMA can be abused by the government to silence its critics</u> . Source C states how some Singaporeans “worry that POFMA will be used by future ministers to silence opposing voices”. Likewise, Source D states that POFMA will allow a future Government to “selectively punish a few critics as an example to others, achieving a chilling effect” where people would no longer dare to criticise the government for fear of being punished. e.g. Sources C and D are <u>different</u> in terms of their views about <u>whether POFMA should be implemented</u> . Source C believes that POFMA should be implemented. This is evident as Source D states that it “supports legislation that empowers the Government to take swift action against viral fake news that can harm a multiracial Singapore”. Thus, by helping to control the spread of fake news, POFMA can help to maintain Singapore’s racial harmony by reducing misunderstanding and suspicion. However, Source D believes that POFMA should not be implemented as it can be abused by a future government to silence its critics. This is evident as Source C states that POFMA will allow a future Government to “selectively punish a few critics as an example to others, achieving a chilling effect”. e.g. Sources C and D are <u>different</u> in their views about <u>whether it is easy for citizens to challenge a decision made by a Minister under POFMA in court</u> . Source C argues that it is easy for citizens to challenge the government’s decisions in court, stating that “I’m sure we won’t hesitate to challenge unfair ministerial orders in court, especially since one only needs to fill up a standard form to do so”. This shows that the process of challenging a Ministerial decision is relatively straightforward. However, Source D disagrees and believes that it is quite difficult for citizens to do so. This is evident as Source D states how “although the people are allowed to appeal to the court against the Minister’s actions, it is both time consuming and energy sapping”.	3-4

L4	Difference AND Similarity in content <i>Award 4m for 1 difference AND 1 similarity unsupported. Award 5m for 1 difference AND 1 similarity supported.</i>	4-5
L5	Difference in purpose, supported. E.g. Sources C and D are different in purpose. The purpose of Source C is to convince Singaporeans that POFMA will help to preserve Singapore's harmony and that their concerns about the potential for POFMA to be abused are overblown, so that Singaporeans will feel more reassured and be more supportive of the Bill. However, the purpose of Source D is to convince Singaporeans that POFMA will give the Government too much power that can be abused, so that Singaporeans can put more pressure on the Government to modify the Bill to address these concerns.	6-7

1d	Study Source E. Does this source prove that the implementation of POFMA will benefit Singapore? EYA.	[7]
L1	Answers based on provenance Source E does not prove that the implementation of POFMA will benefit Singapore. It is a speech by the Law and Home Affairs Minister. It is expected of him to defend the government's policy.	[1-2]
L2	Proves or does not prove based on source content / provenance e.g. Source E proves that the implementation of POFMA will benefit Singapore. In his speech, Mr Shanmugam cites an example of a girl who made up a story about being assaulted by three Middle Eastern migrants and how such stories can make people angry. This shows how fake news has the potential to incite hatred among different groups in society. <u>Thus, by clamping down on fake news, POFMA can help to maintain the harmony of a society.</u> OR e.g. Source E does not prove that the implementation of POFMA will benefit Singapore. In his speech, Mr Shanmugam only mentions <u>how the implementation of POFMA will benefit Singapore</u> . He cites an example of a girl who made up a story about being assaulted by three Middle Eastern migrants and how such stories can make people angry. This shows how fake news has the potential to incite hatred among different groups in society. Hence, <u>with POFMA, the spread of fake news can be restricted, helping to maintain harmony.</u> However, <u>the source fails to mention any problems that POFMA could bring about.</u> This makes the source biased e.g Source E does not prove that the implementation of POFMA will benefit Singapore as it is unreliable. In his speech, Mr Shanmugam cites an example of a girl who made up a story about being assaulted by three Middle Eastern migrants and how such stories can make people angry". This shows how fake news has the potential to incite hatred among different groups in society. <u>Thus, by clamping down on fake news, POFMA can help to maintain the harmony of a society.</u> However, it is expected of the Law and Home Affairs Minister to speak positively about a Bill the government is trying to pass. This makes him biased.	
L3	Proves or does not prove based on cross-referencing [reliability check] Source E proves that the implementation of POFMA will benefit Singapore as it is supported by Source C, making Source E reliable. Like Source E, Source C also tells me that POFMA will	[5-6]

	<p>benefit Singapore. Source D states, "I support legislation that empowers the Government to take swift action against viral fake news that can harm a multiracial Singapore". This shows how POFMA benefits Singapore by helping to reduce the potential of misunderstandings in Singapore, thus promoting racial harmony. [6]</p> <p>Source E does not prove that the implementation of POFMA will benefit Singapore as it is contradicted by Source D, making it unreliable. Unlike Source E, Source D tells me that POFMA could actually hurt Singapore's interests. Source C states that with POFMA, "the Government can selectively punish a few offenders as an example to others, thereby achieving a chilling effect and deterring critics". This shows how POFMA will deter Singaporeans from giving highlighting potential problems with government policies, thus affecting the quality of governance. [5]</p>	
L4	<p>Does not prove based on provenance explained with purpose</p> <p>e.g. Source E does not prove that the implementation of POFMA will benefit Singapore as it is unreliable. It is from a speech given by the Law and Home Affairs Minister on 7 May 2019. It is expected of the Law and Home Affairs Minister to speak positively of a bill that the government is trying to pass, especially given the resistance among some Singaporeans to this bill. He wants to try to convince Singaporeans that the bill will benefit the country as it will help to maintain the people's trust in the government/maintain harmony in society, so that they will be more supportive of the bill. Given such an agenda, the source is not reliable and thus does not prove that POFMA will benefit Singapore.</p>	[6-7]

(e)	<p>Study all sources.</p> <p>How far do the sources in the case study show that the Singapore government is justified in passing the POFMA Bill?</p>	10m
L1	<p>Writes about the statement, no valid source use</p> <p>E.g. The Singapore government is justified in passing the POFMA Bill because fake news is a growing problem in Singapore. Many countries have also passed similar laws.</p>	[1-2]
L2	<p>Yes/No, supported by valid source use</p> <p>Award 3-4m for 1 source supported, 4-5m for 2 sources supported, 5-6m for 3 sources</p> <p>Source A shows that the Singapore government is not justified in passing the POFMA Bill. Source A states that under POFMA, any Internet company could be required to keep records of what users view. This could open the door for the government to request for this information and then "define individuals as threats or potential threats based on what they wrote and viewed". This shows that the POFMA Bill as not justified as it could be <u>abused by the government to deal with its political opponents.</u></p> <p>Other possible answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A <u>climate of fear</u> could be created among citizens as they worry about being targeted by the government for what they view/say. - Source A states that POFMA will lead to "a chilling new level of surveillance online". This shows that POFMA will lead to <u>a severe loss of privacy.</u> <p>Source B shows that the Singapore government is not justified in passing the POFMA Bill. The source draws attention to the words "should not" in the CNA headline, "Free speech should not be affected by this Bill," says K.</p>	[3-6]

	<p>Shanmugam SC. Thus, this warns us that the government is unwilling to guarantee that POFMA will not affect free speech. Thus, the POFMA Bill is not justified as it could lead to the <u>restriction of free speech.</u></p> <p>Source C shows that the Singapore government is justified in implementing the POFMA Bill. Source C states, "I support legislation that empowers the Government to take swift action against viral fake news that can harm a multiracial Singapore". This shows that the POFMA Bill will help to prevent the spread of fake news that can <u>threaten Singapore's racial harmony.</u></p> <p>Source D shows that the Singapore government is not justified in implementing the POFMA Bill as it grants the government too much power. Under the Bill, a government Minister is "both player and referee" as he has "the power to decide what are falsehoods and what punishments to mete out". Thus, this <u>grants the government too much power and is unfair to the citizens.</u></p> <p>Other possible answers: Generate fear of criticizing the government, <u>negatively affecting the quality of governance as the government is less aware of problems.</u> "A future Government can thus selectively punish a few critics as an example to others, achieving a chilling effect".</p> <p>Source E shows that the Singapore government is justified in implementing the POFMA Bill In Source E, the Law and Home Affairs Minister cites an example of a fake news story going viral online of the German police covering up a crime committed by three Middle Eastern migrants, saying that "such irresponsible acts can damage democracy". This shows how fake news can be used to erode trust and create greater suspicion of the government. Thus, this shows that the POFMA Bill is justified as it can <u>help to maintain trust in the government</u> by clamping down on the spread of fake news that aims to sow discord between the people and the government.</p>																					
L3	<p>Yes + No, supported by valid source use i.e. Both elements of L2</p> <p>Note: Consideration on number of sources used and the quality of analysis in deciding on marks in L2 & L3 by using the following table</p> <table><tr><th>Number of sources</th><th>Marks</th></tr><tr><td colspan="2">Level 2</td></tr><tr><td>1 source</td><td>3-4m</td></tr><tr><td>2 sources</td><td>4-5m</td></tr><tr><td>3 sources</td><td>5-6m</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">Level 3</td></tr><tr><td>2 sources (1Yes, 1No)</td><td>7m</td></tr><tr><td>3 sources (2Yes, 1 No or 1 Yes, 2 No)</td><td>8m</td></tr><tr><td>4 sources (2Yes, 2No) > 8m for well-elaborated answers</td><td>9-10m</td></tr><tr><td>5 sources > all sources has to be well explained and linked back to the question asked. Poor explanation would lead to lower marks given.</td><td>10m</td></tr></table> <p>● Unbalanced ¼, 3/1, 1/5, max 7-8</p>	Number of sources	Marks	Level 2		1 source	3-4m	2 sources	4-5m	3 sources	5-6m	Level 3		2 sources (1Yes, 1No)	7m	3 sources (2Yes, 1 No or 1 Yes, 2 No)	8m	4 sources (2Yes, 2No) > 8m for well-elaborated answers	9-10m	5 sources > all sources has to be well explained and linked back to the question asked. Poor explanation would lead to lower marks given.	10m	7-10
Number of sources	Marks																					
Level 2																						
1 source	3-4m																					
2 sources	4-5m																					
3 sources	5-6m																					
Level 3																						
2 sources (1Yes, 1No)	7m																					
3 sources (2Yes, 1 No or 1 Yes, 2 No)	8m																					
4 sources (2Yes, 2No) > 8m for well-elaborated answers	9-10m																					
5 sources > all sources has to be well explained and linked back to the question asked. Poor explanation would lead to lower marks given.	10m																					

2(a) Extract 1 shows the important role played by each and every Singaporean in promoting racial and religious harmony.

In your opinion, what do you think individuals can do to promote racial and religious harmony?
Explain your answer using one way. [7]

Level	Answer	Marks
1	Describe the topic	1-2
2	Identifies / Describe a way <i>Award 3 marks for identifying a way.</i> <i>Award 4-5 marks for describing a way.</i> One way for individuals to promote racial and religious harmony is by attending activities conducted by the Inter-religious confidence circle committee in community centres. It is important for me to participate in activities like visits to mosque, temples and churches that the IRCC organises.	3-5
3	L2 + Explains reason <i>Award higher mark for better explanation</i> Note: An explanation shows how the strategy can help to promote racial and religious harmony. One way for individuals to promote racial and religious harmony is by attending activities conducted by the Inter-religious confidence circle committee in Community Centres. It is important for individuals to participate in activities like visits to mosque, temples and churches that the IRCC organises. By participating in such activities, we will be able to learn more about the religious practices of the other racial or religious groups. This opens up our mind and creates opportunities for better understanding. This will ensure that there will be less opportunity for conflict and harmony can be achieved.	6-7

(b) Extract 2 and 3 describe the relatively safe environment and the economic opportunities which are available in Singapore.

Explain how socio-cultural environment and economic opportunities attract foreigners to Singapore. [8]

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Writes about the topic without addressing the question.	[1-2]
L2	Describes the factors Award 3-4 marks for describing one factor Award 4-5 marks for describing two factors	[3-5]
L3	Explains the factors. Note: An explanation is showing how socio-cultural environment and economic opportunities attract foreigners to Singapore. Award 6-7 marks for explaining one factor Award 7-8 marks for explaining two factors e.g. Singapore's socio-cultural environment is a factor that has contributed to the greater diversity in Singapore today. Singapore's education system is well-recognised and admired for its effectiveness and high standards. Tertiary institutions such as polytechnics and universities have also been popular with international students. They offer high standards of certification and a wide range of courses, from the Sciences, Engineering, Humanities, Arts and vocational skills. <u>The options available have made Singapore a well-known hub for quality education which attracted about 80 000 international students in 2014.</u> e.g. Economic opportunities is a reason that attracts foreigners to settle in Singapore. Employment opportunities are readily available in Singapore due to the large number of businesses that operate here. In particular, Singapore is home to almost 7,000 multi-national corporations, who are attracted to set up operations in Singapore due to its efficiency, growth potential and stable political environment. For example, the L'Oreal Group has set up their businesses here and offer jobs in various positions such as counter managers and beauty advisors. <u>As MNCs have more resources, they tend to offer high salaries and attractive employment packages. Such employment opportunities attract foreigners to seek employment and take up residency here, especially if such opportunities may not exist in their home countries.</u>	[6-8]