

LORMS (SBQ)

Level	(a)Study Source A. What is the message of the source? Explain your answer.	Mark s
		[5]
L1	Describe / copy / paraphrase the source, but no inference Award 1m for simply copying materials or merely paraphrasing or only giving detailed description of source.	[1]
L2	Sub-message Award the higher mark for the more fully developed answer. e.g. The source shows that there is the emergence of new and unconventional security threats in Singapore. (2m) with source evidence (3m).	[2-3]
L3	Main message Award the higher mark for the more fully developed answer. e.g. The message is that Singapore is ready to deal with modern and unconventional security threats in Singapore. (4m). This can be seen by “the government will make a strong push in digital transformation and robotics in order to deal with these security challenges. These can range from integrating robotics in the operations of the Singapore Civil Defence Force, the Immigration and Checkpoints Authority of Singapore employing more biometric solutions, to the police digitalising the investigation process” and this shows the Singapore government is making a concerted effort by incorporating digital technology and robotics to increase our readiness to deal with such threats. (5m).	[4-5]

Level	(b)Study Source B.	Marks
	How useful is Source B as evidence of Singapore's preparedness to deal with modern threats?	[7]
L1	Useful / not useful – undeveloped provenance / lifting from source e.g. It is useful / not useful because it is said by a minister.	[1]
L2	Not useful – based on typicality e.g. It is not useful as evidence of Singapore's preparedness to deal with modern threats because we have no reason to believe that what the Minister said must be representative of what others think about this issue.	[2]
L3	Useful – based on what it can tell me (inference, supported) Award 3m for fully supported and explained answer. e.g. It is useful as evidence of Singapore's preparedness to deal with modern threats as Source B tells me that Singapore is well-prepared to deal with modern threats. (2m). This can be seen by "No amount of tanks, planes, or ships – no matter how sophisticated the systems we build – can make up for a divided nation. More than ever, Total Defence is needed and every Singaporean has to play his or her part to safeguard Singapore. Only together, can we continue to keep Singapore safe and secure for another generation." (3m). This means that we have the necessary unity and equipment to keep Singapore safe from modern threats. (3m). Or Not useful – based on what it does not tell me (inference supported) Award 3m for fully supported and explained answer e.g. It is not useful as it does not tell me whether currently the minister thinks that Singaporeans have the necessary unity and whether the weaponry system that we possess currently are good enough to counter such modern threats. (2m). This can be seen by "No amount of tanks, planes, or ships – no matter how sophisticated the systems we build – can make up for a divided nation. More than ever, Total Defence is needed and every Singaporean has to play his or her part to safeguard Singapore. Only together, can we continue to keep Singapore safe and secure for another generation." And this can be taken to mean what is ideal but something that we do not possess now. (3m).	[2-3]
L4	Useful / not useful – L3 + explained provenance (no outcome) e.g. L3 + It is useful as evidence of Singapore's preparedness to deal with modern threats as it is from the Defence Minister Dr Ng Eng Hen. Being the Defence Minister, he will be the most equipped personnel to discuss matters on national security as he will be one of the most aware when it comes to what kinds of security threats, new and/or old, that Singapore faces and what would the best methods to counter such threats. e.g. L3 + It is not useful as evidence of Singapore's preparedness to deal with modern threats as it is from a governmental source and given that it is published and scripted by a Minister, he will likely only state the threats and emphasise on how we are prepared to deal with such threats.	[4]
L5	Useful / not useful – based on cross reference L3 + cross reference Or Not Useful – based on Motive (with outcome)	[5-6]

	<p>Award 6m for fully supported and explained answer.</p> <p>e.g. It is useful as evidence of Singapore's preparedness to deal with modern threats as Source B tells me that Singapore is well-prepared to deal with modern threats, as Singapore knows that citizens and community partnership is important Total Defence now. This can be seen by "No amount of tanks, planes, or ships – no matter how sophisticated the systems we build – can make up for a divided nation. More than ever, Total Defence is needed and every Singaporean has to play his or her part to safeguard Singapore. Only together, can we continue to keep Singapore safe and secure for another generation." This means that to counter the modern security threats, it is imperative to keep the unity amongst the citizens as even with the most sophisticated systems, it will not be enough. This can be supported by Source D as it also suggests that Singapore is well-prepared especially with the continued effort by its citizens helps to counter modern security threats, as can be seen by "In the Global Cybersecurity Index ranking 2017, Singapore staved off stiff competition from countries such as United States and Australia to emerge as the most cyber-secure nation. Cyber Security Agency of Singapore CEO Mr David Koh affirmed one key aspect of this good result, which is the continued vigilance of Singaporeans to not take cybersecurity for granted, as doing so will cause disastrous consequences ranging from online identity theft to using technology to spark acts of terror." Since Source B is supported by Source D, Source B is reliable hence it is useful.</p> <p>e.g. It is not useful as evidence of Singapore's preparedness to deal with modern threats as Source B tells me that Singapore is well-prepared to deal with modern threats, as Singapore knows that citizens and community partnership is important Total Defence now. This can be seen by "No amount of tanks, planes, or ships – no matter how sophisticated the systems we build – can make up for a divided nation. More than ever, Total Defence is needed and every Singaporean has to play his or her part to safeguard Singapore. Only together, can we continue to keep Singapore safe and secure for another generation." While he did say that we should continue to keep Singapore safe and secure, however, in Source E, it states that Singapore's preparedness is questionable due to the lack of vigilance displayed by Singaporeans. This can be seen by "Professor David Chan said, that to many Singaporeans, a terror attack in Singapore is still a distant possibility and campaigns that do not make the danger relatable are at risk of being dismissed as "just another tagline"." Since Source B is contradicted by Source E, Source B is not reliable and hence it is not useful.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>It is not useful as evidence that Singapore is well-prepared to deal with modern threats. He seems to suggest that he knows that the partnership between the community, citizens and the government is tenuous and so he wants to convince Singaporeans to work with the government to ensure that Singapore will continue to enjoy the peace and security that we currently enjoy.</p>	
L6	<p>Useful / not useful – based on cross reference</p> <p>PLUS</p> <p>Motive (outcome must be clear)</p>	7

Level	(c)Study Sources C and D.	Marks
	How similar are these sources? Explain your answer.	[6]
1	Similarity or Difference - describing sources / no match / assertions based on provenance	1

2	<p>Similarity or Difference - based on content, unsupported</p> <p>e.g. Sources C and D are similar in terms of suggesting that the attitude of people is important when it comes to preventing security threats.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>e.g. Sources C and D are different in terms of suggesting whether Singaporeans' mindset is right when it comes to vigilance towards security threats.</p>	2
3	<p>Similarity or Difference - based on content, supported</p> <p>Award 4m for valid and relevant supporting evidence from both Sources C and D.</p> <p>e.g. Sources C and D are similar in terms of suggesting that the attitude of people is important when it comes to preventing security threats. In Source C, it shows how, when the people's mindset is lax and lacklustre, it can lead to severe security threats. In Source C, it depicts a lady saying "What's the big deal" in response to others piggybacking her unsecure wireless network, thereby highlighting the lacklustre efforts at online security. This is also shown by how Source D emphasises the role played by people, especially their positive and vigilant attitude, as shown by "In the Global Cybersecurity Index ranking 2017, Singapore staved off stiff competition from countries such as United States and Australia to emerge as the most cyber-secure nation. Cyber Security Agency of Singapore CEO Mr David Koh affirmed one key aspect of this good result, which is the continued vigilance of Singaporeans to not take cybersecurity for granted, as doing so will cause disastrous consequences ranging from online identity theft to using technology to spark acts of terror."</p> <p>e.g. Sources C and D are different in terms of suggesting whether Singaporeans' mindset is right when it comes to vigilance towards security threats. Source C suggests that some people's attitude is simply lax and negative, and hence not vigilant, thereby causing severe security threats to happen, whereas Source D suggests otherwise, praising Singaporeans' vigilant effort, as seen by "In the Global Cybersecurity Index ranking 2017, Singapore staved off stiff competition from countries such as United States and Australia to emerge as the most cyber-secure nation. Cyber Security Agency of Singapore CEO Mr David Koh affirmed one key aspect of this good result, which is the continued vigilance of Singaporeans to not take cybersecurity for granted, as doing so will cause disastrous consequences ranging from online identity theft to using technology to spark acts of terror."</p>	3-4
4	<p>Similarity AND Difference - based on content, supported</p>	5
5	<p>Similarity in Purpose (Verb, Audience, Message, Outcome must all be valid to get 6 marks)</p> <p>e.g. They are similar in purpose. Both sources aim to convince Singaporeans that their role in terms of being vigilant towards security threats will be important in countering such threats from happening, so that they will take their role seriously and not be lacklustre in their mindset. This can be seen by how Source C shows what can happen if Singaporeans are not vigilant, and how Source D shows "In the Global Cybersecurity Index ranking 2017, Singapore staved off stiff competition from countries such as United States and Australia to emerge as the most cyber-secure nation. Cyber Security Agency of Singapore CEO Mr David Koh affirmed one key aspect of this good result, which is the continued vigilance of Singaporeans to not take cybersecurity for granted, as doing so will cause disastrous consequences ranging from online identity theft to using technology to spark acts of terror."</p>	6

Level	<p>(d)Study Sources E and F.</p> <p>Having read Source E, are you surprised by Source F? Explain your answer.</p>	[7]
-------	---	------------

L1	Answers using source content but fails to address element of surprise (e.g. source lifting) OR Identifies what is / is not surprising in Source F but no valid explanation.	[1]
L2	Describes the element of surprise entirely from Source F (no use of Source E). Eg: I am surprised / not surprised by Source F as it shows what Singaporeans feel about security issues and our readiness to combat such issues. For instance, it shows 75.2 percent of Singaporeans think that Singapore will face a terror attack.	[2]
L3	Surprised/not surprised based on disagreement/agreement of content of the 2 sources. Award 4m for comparing/contrasting Sources F and E. e.g. I am surprised by Source F. It shows that almost $\frac{3}{4}$ of the respondents believing that the terrorism threat is very real in Singapore and that Singapore could likely face an attack. However, comparing with what is said in Source E, it is contradicted by Source E as it says Singaporeans tend to be indifferent to this threat of terrorism, as shown by "Professor David Chan said, that to many Singaporeans, a terror attack in Singapore is still a distant possibility and campaigns that do not make the danger relatable are at risk of being dismissed as "just another tagline". OR e.g. I am not surprised by Source F. It shows that almost half of the polled respondents who believe, or are unsure, that Singapore is not ready for a terrorist attack. This seems to suggest that we are really unprepared and unsure of how to deal with such threats. Comparing with Source E, it matches with what Source E is saying as it also seems to suggest that Singapore is unprepared, as can be seen by "Professor David Chan said, that to many Singaporeans, a terror attack in Singapore is still a distant possibility and campaigns that do not make the danger relatable are at risk of being dismissed as "just another tagline".	[3-4]
L4	L3 plus surprised/not surprised by Source F based on cross reference to other sources. Award 6m for well-explained cross-reference with another source. Eg. I am surprised by Source F. It shows that almost $\frac{3}{4}$ of the respondents believing that the terrorism threat is very real in Singapore and that Singapore could likely face an attack. This seems to suggest that Singaporeans are not complacent. However, comparing with what is said in Source E, it is contradicted by Source E as it says Singaporeans tend to be indifferent to this threat of terrorism, as shown by "Professor David Chan said, that to many Singaporeans, a terror attack in Singapore is still a distant possibility and campaigns that do not make the danger relatable are at risk of being dismissed as "just another tagline". Furthermore, cross-referring to Source C, it shows that it is not entirely true as the person portrayed in Source C shows that she is very complacent when it comes to her attitude in responding to security threats. Since Source C does not support Source F, Source F is unexpected and hence surprising. Eg. I am not surprised by Source F. It shows that almost half of the polled respondents who believe, or are unsure, that Singapore is not ready for a terrorist attack. This seems to suggest that we are really unprepared and unsure of how to deal with such threats. Comparing with Source E, it matches with what Source E is saying as it also seems to suggest that Singapore is unprepared, as can be seen by "Professor David Chan said, that to many Singaporeans, a terror attack in Singapore is still a distant possibility and campaigns that do not make the danger relatable are at risk of being dismissed as "just another tagline". This is further supported by Source D, where it shows a similar message, as it states "In the Global Cybersecurity Index ranking 2017, Singapore staved off stiff competition from countries such as United States and Australia to emerge as the most cyber-secure nation. Cyber Security Agency of Singapore CEO Mr David Koh affirmed one key aspect of this good result, which is the continued vigilance of Singaporeans to not take	[5-6]

	cybersecurity for granted, as doing so will cause disastrous consequences ranging from online identity theft to using technology to spark acts of terror.”, which does not seem to agree with Source E which claimed that Singaporeans are not vigilant. Since Source D supports Source F, Source F is expected and hence not surprising.	
L5	<p>L4 + Not Surprised based on Purpose</p> <p>L4 + I am not surprised by Source F. It shows that almost ¾ of the respondents believing that the terrorism threat is very real in Singapore and that Singapore could likely face an attack. This seems to suggest that Singaporeans are not complacent. It aims to persuade Singaporeans to continue to be vigilant so as to better prepare ourselves in the event that such acts of terror do strike Singapore.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>L4 + I am not surprised by Source F. It shows that almost half of the polled respondents who believe, or are unsure, that Singapore is not ready for a terrorist attack. This seems to suggest that Singapore is really unprepared and unsure of how to deal with such threats. It aims to warn Singaporeans that as such acts of terror are real possibilities in Singapore, we should aim to equip ourselves to better prepare ourselves in case such attacks really do strike Singapore.</p>	[7]

Level	(e)‘Singapore is well-equipped to handle new and unconventional security threats.’ Using the sources in this case study, explain how far you would agree with this statement.	Marks [10]
L1	<p>Writes about statement, no valid source use</p> <p>e.g. Singapore is well-equipped to handle new and unconventional security threats because we are an advanced country.</p>	[1]
L2	<p>Yes/No, supported by valid source use</p> <p>1 source 2m 2 sources 3m 3 sources 4m</p> <p>e.g. <u>Yes, Singapore is well-equipped to handle new and unconventional security threats.</u> This is supported by <u>Source A</u>, which <u>shows that the government is sparing no expenses to boost its capacity to deal with threats</u> such as transnational terrorists and criminal syndicates that make use of technology. This can be seen by “To counter these new and unconventional threats, the government will make a strong push in digital transformation and robotics in order to deal with these security challenges. These can range from integrating robotics in the operations of the Singapore Civil Defence Force, the Immigration and Checkpoints Authority of Singapore employing more biometric solutions, to the police digitalising the investigation process.” <u>Source D</u> agrees with the statement as well, as it <u>shows that collaboration with other countries can boost Singapore’s capacity to deal with such threats</u>, as shown by “Another reason cited for this good result is bilateral cooperation, such as the recent Formal Agreement signed by Singapore and New Zealand which can help “to capitalise on each of our strengths and share information and expertise to secure our cyberspace”.”</p> <p>OR</p> <p>e.g. <u>No, Singapore is not well equipped.</u> <u>Source E</u> does not agree with the statement’s view and shows that <u>the mindset and attitude of some Singaporeans might be called</u></p>	[2-4]

	<p><u>into question when it comes to our preparedness to handle an attack as we can be complacent</u>, as seen by "Professor David Chan said, that to many Singaporeans, a terror attack in Singapore is still a distant possibility and campaigns that do not make the danger relatable are at risk of being dismissed as "just another tagline"." Source F also disagrees with the statement as the middle graphic shows that only half the respondents feel that Singapore is ready or prepared for an attack, and <u>this shows a lack of current capacity in dealing with these threats</u>.</p>	
L3	<p>Yes + No, supported by valid source use i.e. both elements of L2 1:1 – 5 marks; 1:2/2:1 – 6 marks; 2:2 – 7-8</p> <p>Note: Consideration on the number of sources and the quality of the analysis in deciding marks in L2 and L3.</p> <p>**To score additional 2 marks, students can take any one of these 3 routes:</p> <p>-Through analysing at least one source in relation to its reliability, utility or sufficiency</p> <p>e.g. However, the reliability and utility of Sources A and B could be limited and hampered by the fact that they are said by government ministers who very likely could have certain agendas when trying to persuade Singaporeans that Singapore, though currently is fairly secure and well-prepared to handle security threats and we have infused technology to handle such threats, the government still needs community support and hence would want the people to further lend their support to partner the government in its ongoing efforts to keep Singapore safe and secure.</p> <p>- By sharing example(s) from their contextual knowledge</p> <p>e.g. I think Singapore is ready to handle security threats based on my contextual knowledge. In schools, they dedicate strong emphasis to teaching students how to respond to security threats, like for instance, the yearly lockdown drill. It enhances the response rate of students, and in communities, there are more efforts at reaching out to citizens in teaching them how to respond, such as through the educational campaigns based on platforms like SGSecure.</p> <p>- By giving a balanced conclusion/ resolution</p>	[5-8]

LORMS (SRQ)

2(a)	<p>Extract 1 describes the phenomenon of cultural erosion.</p> <p>In your opinion, how can societies slow down this process of cultural erosion? Explain your answer using <u>two</u> strategies.</p>	[7]
L1	<p>Describes the topic, i.e. trend of cultural erosion</p> <p>E.g. In many societies, due to new emerging cultural elements such as in the areas of music and entertainment, the local culture might be eroded and lose their efficacy among the locals, especially the youths.</p>	1
L2	<p>Identifies / Describes strategies Award 2m for identifying one strategy, 3m for identifying 2 strategies.</p>	2-4

	<p><i>Award 3m for describing one strategy, 4m for describing 2 strategies.</i></p> <p>E.g. One strategy is to rope in the help of grassroots organisations to organise events that commemorate the local culture. This can help strengthen people's allegiance to their own local culture more deeply. One example is when the community centres organise cultural festivals such as Mid Autumn Festival and Deepavali.</p> <p>AND/OR</p> <p>E.g. Another strategy is to ensure that the local TV stations and radio stations promote more local shows and local music. This can help strengthen people's allegiance to their own local culture more deeply. One example is that MediaCorp can broadcast more locally produced shows which feature more local culture, such as Singapore's history etc. Another example can be Class 95 DJs promoting local music, especially those that feature local culture.</p>	
L3	<p>L2 + Explains strategies</p> <p><i>Award 5-6m for explaining one strategy.</i> <i>Award 6-7m for explaining two strategies.</i></p> <p>E.g. One strategy is to rope in the help of grassroots organisations to organise events that commemorate the local culture. This can help strengthen people's allegiance to their own local culture more deeply. One example is when the community centres organise cultural festivals such as Mid Autumn Festival and Deepavali. <u>By doing this, people can better appreciate how important their local culture is as they can use their own local culture to better appreciate their fellow citizens more easily, forging closer bonds and hence slowing down the process of cultural erosion.</u></p> <p>AND/OR</p> <p>E.g. Another strategy is to ensure that the local TV stations and radio stations promote more local shows and local music. This can help strengthen people's allegiance to their own local culture more deeply. One example is that MediaCorp can broadcast more locally produced shows which feature more local culture, such as Singapore's history etc. Another example can be Class 95 DJs promoting local music, especially those that feature local culture. <u>By doing this, people can better appreciate how important their local culture is as they can use their own local culture to better appreciate their fellow citizens more easily, forging closer bonds and hence slowing down the process of cultural erosion.</u></p> <p><i>Accept other reasonable strategies.</i></p>	5-7

2(b)	<p>Extract 2 and Extract 3 reflect on the impacts of cultural homogenisation.</p> <p>To what extent are the impacts of cultural homogenisation positive? Explain your answer.</p>	[8]
L1	<p>Writes about the topic i.e. cultural homogenisation but without addressing the question</p> <p>E.g. Cultural homogenisation refers to the process by which local cultures are transformed or absorbed by a dominant outside culture.</p>	1-2
L2	<p>Describes impacts of cultural homogenisation</p> <p><i>Award 3 marks for describing a positive/negative impact</i> <i>Award 4 marks for describing both positive and negative impacts</i></p> <p>E.g. One negative impact of cultural homogenization is it may lead to the dilution or loss of our own culture and history and it might cause unrest amongst people. For example, when Starbucks opened its first outlet in Italy, many Italians were unhappy as they felt that this might cause their local traditional coffee culture to lose its significance in the country.</p>	3-4

	<p>e.g. One positive impact is that with cultural homogenization, it provides a wider range of cultural entertainment products and experiences for people's consumption. For instance, with the American and Korean pop culture influences, many people will get to enjoy the entertainment from these 2 pop culture powerhouses. Some examples include music from K-pop bands like BTS and Black Pink.</p>	
L3	<p>Explains the impacts regarding cultural homogenization <i>Award 5-6 marks for explaining positive/negative impact</i> <i>Award 6-7 marks for explaining both positive and negative impacts</i></p> <p>E.g. One negative impact of cultural homogenization is it may lead to the dilution or loss of our own culture and history and it might cause unrest amongst people. For example, when Starbucks opened its first outlet in Italy, many Italians were unhappy as they felt that this might cause their local traditional coffee culture to lose its significance in the country. <u>When taken to its extreme, the local culture might lose its presence and significance entirely as the local people might forego or not practise this particular aspect of local culture at all. This might particularly affect the people, especially the older generation, as they tend to treasure it more.</u></p> <p>e.g. One positive impact is that with cultural homogenization, it provides a wider range of cultural entertainment products and experiences for people's consumption. For instance, with the American and Korean pop culture influences, many people will get to enjoy the entertainment from these 2 pop culture powerhouses. Some examples include music from K-pop bands like BTS and Black Pink. <u>This is a positive impact as it means that more people, especially those from more obscure parts of the world, can indulge in more cultural entertainment products and experiences and be more exposed to them and can also learn to be more appreciative of other cultures.</u></p>	5-7
L4	<p>Both aspects in L3 plus explains the relative importance of each factor</p> <p>e.g. In any given society, it is very difficult to come to a definitive conclusion which form of impact, positive or negative, is the eventual outcome. Different social communities in a society will have different lived experiences and hence, might experience different extent of cultural homogenization and/or cultural hybridization.</p>	8