

Name:	Register Number:	Class:
-------	------------------	--------

4NA



BEDOK GREEN SECONDARY SCHOOL

Preliminary Examination 2019

4NA

SOCIAL STUDIES

2175/01
2176/01
2177/01

1 August 2019

1 h 45 min

Candidates answer on Writing Paper.
Additional Materials: Writing Paper

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

Write your name, class and register number on all the work you hand in.
Write in dark blue or black pen on both sides of the paper.
You may use a pencil for any diagrams, graphs, tables or rough working.
Do not use staples, paper clips, glue or correction fluid.

Section A

Answer **all parts** of Question 1.

Section B

Answer **both parts** of Question 2.

At the end of the examination, fasten all your work securely together.
The number of marks is given in brackets [] at the end of each question or part question.

For Examiner's Use	
A	
B	
Total	50

This document consists of **6** printed pages including the cover page.

© BGSS 2019

No part of this document may be reproduced in any form or transmitted in any form or by any means without the prior permission of
Bedok Green Secondary School.

[Turn Over

SECTION A (Source-Based Case Study)

Question 1 is **compulsory** for all candidates.

1 Exploring Citizenship and Governance

Study the Background Information and the sources carefully, and then answer all the questions.

You may use any of the sources to help you answer the questions, in addition to those sources which you are told to use. In answering the questions, you should use your knowledge of the issue to help you interpret and evaluate the sources.

(a) Study Source A.

What is the message of the cartoon? Explain your answer, using details of the cartoon. [5]

(b) Study Sources B and C.

How far do these sources agree about the UK having a second referendum? Explain your answer. [7]

(c) Study Source D.

Are you surprised by this source? Explain your answer. [6]

(d) Study Sources E and F.

Does Source E prove that Source F is right? Explain your answer. [7]

(e) How far do the sources in the case study show that the UK should have a second referendum? Explain your answer. [10]

Should the UK have a second referendum?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Read this carefully. It may help you to answer some of the questions.

On 23rd June 2016, people of the United Kingdom (UK) voted to leave the European Union (EU) in a referendum*. This scenario is also termed as Brexit, short form for 'British Exit' from the EU. Members of the EU share many of the same laws and open their borders to each other. The country is divided – 52% of the people wanted to leave (they are termed as 'Leavers'), and 48% voted to remain in the EU (known as 'Remainers').

After almost two years of discussions, the UK is unable to come into an agreement with the EU on the terms of withdrawal. Many are now doubtful of the government's capabilities. There is also reduced confidence in economic opportunities within the UK. In light of the disagreements throughout the Brexit process, there has been a lot of debate about how the government should move forward. One option is to ask the public to vote again, in a second referendum.

**A referendum is a vote on a political issue in which all members of a country can decide on.*

Source A: A cartoon circulated online after Brexit in 2016. The man represents a British voter.



Source B: *An excerpt from an article written in 2019 by a Member of Parliament (MP) in the UK, published in The Economist, a weekly news magazine with subscribers worldwide.*

Having a second referendum is an insult to the decision of the people.

I have heard from both 'Leavers' and 'Remainers' saying that if a second referendum were held, they would never vote again. In their view, what would be the point if the government does not take our previous votes seriously?

A retired general said to me recently that Britain has always been known for our "confidence and competence". We are demonstrating neither quality at present. A second referendum would help to restore neither. It is our MPs who can and must now do that.

Source C: *Extracted from a 2018 BBC interview with John Major, the former Prime Minister of U.K. The BBC is a British public service broadcaster.*

A second vote will go against the majority's decision – but is it necessary? I think it is. If you look back at promises the politicians made before the first referendum, a great many of them were fantasy promises. It's painfully obvious they are not going to be met. Many of the things they said were absolutely unattainable.

Source D: *Written by a 'Remainer' on an online forum, 2019.*

For a lot of people, the last vote was a bit like coming home from the pub and buying stuff on eBay. Not a lot of sober consideration went into it and many people thought it wasn't important, or thought it as a joke, a way to demonstrate their dissatisfaction with the government.

So the main pro of having a second referendum is to check, three years later and armed with a lot more information, that it is still what the UK wants to do. If it isn't, the UK will have dodged a bullet. If it is, the UK will enjoy or suffer the results safe in the knowledge that it is indeed "the will of the people". A lot of dissenting voices will be silenced.

Source E: *An opinion of a British citizen written online, during discussions to hold a second referendum.*

What is the point of planning a second referendum?! Does it mean that if the results of the second referendum is unfavourable to the politicians, we will have a third and fourth referendum?! This is death to democracy! It's like spitting in the faces of people who voted the first time round.

Once the faith in democracy is lost, it will never be returned. That is not what I want for my grandchild, and the thought of it breaks my heart.

Source F: *An article written by a lecturer in public policy of a university, 17 January 2018.*

There were numerous credible objections raised against the first Brexit referendum – that people were not given full information about what their vote meant; that complicated issues were boiled down to a simple yes or no answer. These concerns remain for a second referendum, which is currently as problematic as the first one.

The people decided. Now, it's about coming up with a result that is best for all, which requires expert negotiation and high-level political decision-making. It is asking for politicians to do what they were hired to do: to represent the interests of all their constituents.

SECTION B (Structured-Response Questions)

Question 2 is **compulsory** for all candidates.

2 Being Part of a Globalised World

Study the extracts carefully, and then answer the questions.

Extract 1

One of the ways that globalisation has connected with world is through the global economy. Due to Singapore's small domestic market and limited resources, Singapore has to look globally to attract innovative and entrepreneurial resources to grow our economy. In the next few decades, as Association of South East Asian Nation (ASEAN) continues to grow, local Small Medium Enterprises (SMEs) can take advantage of newer and bigger markets outside of Singapore.

Extract 2

Countries can tap on the global economy for trade to sustain economic growth, and can benefit through opening up job opportunities and introducing new skills to local people.

Extract 3

Multinational corporations, with their massive economies of scale, may dominate local companies and drive them out of business. If it becomes cheaper to operate in another country, the local companies might close down factories and make local people redundant.

- (a) Extract 1 shows how SMEs should leverage on the opportunities which globalisation offers.

In your opinion, how can the Singapore government encourage SMEs to be competitive in a globalising era? Explain your answer using one strategy.

[7]

- (b) Extracts 2 and 3 show the economic impacts of globalisation.

Explain the positive and negative economic impact globalisation has on individuals.

[8]

Copyright acknowledgements:

- Source A: <https://www.quora.com/What-are-pros-and-cons-to-a-second-referendum-for-Brexit>
 Source B: <https://www.economist.com/open-future/2019/01/14/why-a-second-referendum-is-unwise>
 Source C: <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-britain-eu-referendum-factbox/factbox-what-do-british-politicians-say-about-another-referendum-on-brexit-idUSKBN1OG1IE>
 Source D: <https://www.quora.com/What-are-pros-and-cons-to-a-second-referendum-for-Brexit>
 Source E: <https://www.forumgarden.com/forums/showthread.php?t=65412&p=1522750>
 Source F: <http://theconversation.com/the-case-for-and-against-a-second-brexit-referendum-four-experts-give-their-views-90142>

Section A: Source-Based Case Study

1(a)	Study Source A. What is the message of the cartoon? Explain your answer, using details of the cartoon.		5m
	L1	Answers that are irrelevant to interpretation of the source. e.g. The streets are dirty after Brexit.	[1]
	L2	Answers based on basic inference of the source (i.e. sub-message), unsupported. e.g. The message of the cartoon is that many people are upset after Brexit. OR e.g. The message of the cartoon is that the UK is in chaos after Brexit.	[2]
	L3	Answers based on basic inference of the source (i.e. sub-message), supported.	[3]
	L4	Answers based on message of the source, unsupported	[4]
	L5	Answers based on message of the source, supported e.g. The message of the cartoon is that many have <u>regretted voting to leave the EU after seeing problems come to light after the Brexit referendum</u> . The evidence from Source A shows a man holding a newspaper with the headline "Brexit Chaos" and saying "Can I take my vote back?". The cartoon also shows a dirty pavement with the UK flag on the ground and another newspaper headlined "Brexit they lied". This shows that many voters only managed to see the disastrous effects of voting Leave after the referendum, and are having second thoughts about the outcome that they have voted on.	[5]

1(b)	Study Sources B and C. How far do the sources agree about the UK having a second referendum? Explain your answer.		7m
	L1	Agree / Disagree based on provenance / source type OR False matching OR No clear common criteria for comparison	[1]
	L2	Clear common criteria, unsupported OR NAQ, common criteria with no reference to the second referendum OR NAQ, valid comparison without stating whether sources agree or disagree	[2]
	L3	Agree OR Disagree in content, supported OR Agree AND Disagree in content, unsupported	[3]
	L4	Agree AND Disagree in content, supported e.g. The sources agree that there were people disapproving of having a second referendum. Source B says that "Having a second referendum is an insult to the decision of the people." This shows that having a second referendum would be a disrespect to the people's choice. Similarly, Source C acknowledges that "A second vote will go against the majority's decision." This means that having a second referendum would undermine the results of the first referendum. AND e.g. The sources disagree in regard to having a second referendum. Source B is against having a second referendum while Source C is supportive of having a second referendum. Source B states "what would be the point if the government does not take our previous votes seriously?." This means that <u>having a second referendum would disrespect the decision of the people who voted in the first place, and might cause a distrust towards the government in the country.</u> On the other hand, Source C states "If you look back at promises the politicians made before the first referendum, a great many of them were fantasy promises. It is painfully obvious they are not going to be met." This means that the <u>politicians were not being truthful in the first referendum, and caused voters to be misinformed in their judgement.</u> Hence a second referendum would be a more accurate representation of the people's decision. OR e.g. The sources disagree in regard to having a second referendum. Source B is against having a second referendum while Source C is supportive of having a second referendum. Source B states that "a second referendum would help restore neither" of the general impression that Britain has "confidence and competence". This means that <u>a second referendum will not improve the position of the UK and its image that it now portrays to the world.</u> On the other hand, Source C states "If you look back at promises the politicians made before the first referendum, a great many of them were fantasy promises. It is painfully	[4-5]

		obvious they are not going to be met.” This means that the <u>politicians were not being truthful in the first referendum, and caused voters to be misinformed in their judgement</u> . Hence a second referendum would be a more accurate representation of the people’s decision.	
	L5	<p>Disagree based on purpose</p> <p>Both sources disagree in regard to the second referendum based on purpose.</p> <p>The Member of Parliament in Source B is trying to justify to British citizens that having a second referendum will not resolve the existing problems that UK is facing after Brexit. This is seen from “A retired general said to me recently that Britain has always been known for our ‘confidence and competence’. We are demonstrating neither quality at present. A second referendum would help to restore neither. It is our MPs who can and must now do that.” This means that having a second referendum will not improve the problems that UK currently faces, and also will not improve the image that UK portrays to the world. Hence the Member of Parliament wishes that the British citizens would accept the outcome of Brexit, and have confidence in the government that they would make the best decision for the people and the country.</p> <p>However in Source C, the former Prime Minister is attempting to convince British citizens that voters were misinformed during the first referendum, and having a second referendum will be a more accurate representation of the people’s decision. This is seen in “If you look back at promises the politicians made before the first referendum, a great many of them were fantasy promises. It is painfully obvious they are not going to be met.” This means that politicians were not truthful in the first referendum, and might have caused a misjudgement in the people when they were deciding on the vote. This is in hopes that the British would pressurise the government for a second referendum to take place.</p>	[6-7]

1(c)	Study Source D. Are you surprised by this source? Explain your answer.		6m
	L1	Identifies what is and/or is not surprising, but no explanation of why OR No explanation of surprise / no surprise based on purpose e.g. I am surprised that many voters did not take the referendum seriously.	[1]
	L2	Surprised / Not Surprised based on common sense reasoning e.g. I am surprised that the UK voters did not take the referendum seriously. I would expect the citizens to make the most informed decision in determining the future of their country.	[2]
	L3	Surprised / Not Surprised explained through cross-reference e.g. I am not surprised by Source D as it is supported by Source F. Both sources state that <u>many of the voters could not make the best judgement during the Brexit referendum due to a lack of information</u> . Evidence from Source D shows “the main pro of having a second referendum is to check, three years later and armed with a lot more information, that it is still what the UK wants to do.” This shows that the voters were not provided with complete and accurate information when they were deciding on the vote for Brexit. Similarly, evidence from Source F shows “There were numerous credible objections raised against the first Brexit referendum – that people were not given full information about what their vote meant”. This means that some voters might have been misinformed about the consequences of their vote during the first referendum. Other valid cross references include: Source A – “Brexit: They Lied” Source C – “many of the things they said were absolutely unattainable”	[3-4]
	L4	Not surprised explained through purpose e.g. I am not surprised by Source D based on its purpose. The ‘Remain’ voter is trying to persuade the British that having a second referendum will ensure that the people’s vote is the most accurate representation of the UK’s decision. This is seen from “So the main pro of having a second referendum is to check, three years later and armed with a lot more information, that it is still what the UK wants to do.” This is in hopes that the British would be persuaded to campaign for a second referendum. I am not surprised by this. <u>I would expect a ‘Remain’ voter to be unconvinced by the outcome of the first Brexit referendum, and hope that the outcome of a second referendum would change to be in favour of his position.</u>	[5-6]

1(d)	Study Sources E and F. Does Source E prove that Source F is right? Explain your answer.		7m
	L1	Uses source content but no mention of proving	[1]
	L2	Proves / Does not prove based on comparison of E and F <i>Award 2 marks for answers without use of evidence.</i> <i>Award 3 marks for answers with fully developed reasoning.</i> e.g. Source E does prove that Source F is right, as <u>both sources are similar in their stand that there should not be a second referendum</u> . According to Source E, "Does it mean that if the results of the second referendum is unfavourable to the politicians, we will have a third and fourth referendum?! This is death to democracy! It's like spitting in the faces of people who voted the first time round." This means that having a <u>second referendum undermines the idea of democracy, and is an insult to the voters' decision in the first referendum</u> . Similarly, Source F states that "These concerns remain for a second referendum which is currently as problematic as the first one." This means that <u>there should not be a second referendum as it will not resolve the complicated issues that have surfaced when the first referendum was taking place</u> .	[2-3]
	L3	Proves / Does not prove based on reliability of Source F e.g. Source E proves that Source F is right, as Source F is reliable and supported by Source B. Both sources mention that it is up to the government to prove its competency in light of the problems that UK is facing rather than relying on a second referendum to resolve these issues. Note: Only accept valid cross references with mention of reliability in any form (trust, believe etc.)	[4]
	L4	Proves / Does not prove based on reliability of Source E with cross reference e.g. Source E proves that Source F is right, as Source E is reliable and supported by Source B. Both sources mention that there should not be a second referendum as it would cause <u>political distrust amongst the people</u> . Source E states that "Once the faith in democracy is lost, it will never be returned." This shows that <u>having a second referendum will cause the people to lose trust in democracy and the political system</u> . Similarly, Source B states "what would be the point if they could never be confident that a majority vote would be implemented?" This means that <u>having a second referendum would be unfair to the outcome of the Brexit referendum, and would cause the people to be disenfranchised</u> . Note: Only accept valid cross references with mention of reliability in any form (trust, believe etc.)	[5-6]

	<p>L5 Does not prove based on analysis of Source E's tone or purpose</p> <p>e.g. Source E does not prove that Source F is right, as Source E is unreliable and biased in tone. The British citizen expresses dissatisfaction by using phrases like "spitting in the faces of people who voted the first time round". Also, he expresses frustration through exaggeration such as "death to democracy" and the usage of exclamation marks. He is also sarcastic in his remarks that "if the results of the second referendum is unfavourable to the politicians, we will have a third and fourth referendum." This shows that the British citizen is not objective in his/her opinion, and thus cannot be trusted.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>e.g. Source E does not prove that Source F is right, as Source E is unreliable and has a hidden agenda. The British citizen is trying to influence the rest of Britain (the politicians) that having a second referendum will not do the country any good. This is seen from "Does it mean that if the results of the second referendum is unfavourable to the politicians, we will have a third and fourth referendum?! This is death to democracy!" This shows that the voters' decision should not be taken lightly and politicians should just accept the people's choice. This is so that the British citizens (the politicians) would go against the suggestion of having a second referendum (decide not to implement a second referendum).</p>	[7]
--	--	------------

1(e)	How far do the sources in the case study show that the UK should have a second referendum after Brexit? Explain your answer.	10m
	L1 Writes about statement, no valid source use e.g. The UK should have a second referendum because people are unhappy.	[1-2]
	L2 Yes / No, supported by valid source use e.g. Sources A, C and D show that the UK should have a second referendum. Source A shows that UK should have a second referendum because voters only manage to see that they were being misinformed after the first referendum, and are regretting their choice then. The evidence from Source A shows a man holding a newspaper with the headline “Brexit Chaos” and saying “Can I take my vote back?”. The cartoon also shows a dirty pavement with the UK flag on the ground and another newspaper headlined “Brexit they lied”. This shows that voters might have been misled during the first referendum, and the politicians have failed to deliver their promises after. Hence a second referendum would more accurately represent the people’s sentiments after being given full information about the issue. Source C shows that UK should have a second referendum because politicians were not being truthful in the first referendum, and caused voters to be misinformed in their judgement. Source C states “If you look back at promises the politicians made before the first referendum, a great many of the promises they made were fantasy promises. It is painfully obvious they are not going to be met.” Source D shows that UK should have a second referendum because it serves as a confirmation of voters’ decision, after seeing the consequences of the first referendum. Source D states that during the first referendum, “not a lot of sober consideration went into it and many people thought it wasn’t important, or maybe just a bit of a lark, a way to demonstrate their dissatisfaction with the government.” This means that many voters did not take the first referendum seriously, and were irrational in making their decision. OR Sources B, E and F show that UK should not have a second referendum. Source B shows that UK should not have a second referendum because it would disrespect the decision of the people who voted in the first place. Source B states “what would be the point if the government does not take our previous votes seriously?” Having a second referendum would disregard the democratic process, and could lead to distrust between the people and the government. Source E shows that the UK should not have a second referendum because it would cause political distrust amongst the people. Source E states that “Does it mean that if the results of the second referendum is unfavourable to the politicians, we will have a third and fourth referendum?! This is death to democracy!” This shows that having a second referendum will cause the people to lose faith in democracy and the political system.	[3-6]

		<p>Source F shows that the UK should not have a second referendum because it will not resolve the complicated issues that have surfaced when the first referendum was taking place. Source F states that “These concerns remain for a second referendum which is currently as problematic as the first one.” Also, “Now, it’s about coming up with a result that is best for all, which requires expert negotiation and high-level political decision-making.” This means that instead of assuming the second referendum would resolve UK problems, the politicians should be the ones stepping up to ensure the best interest of the UK.</p> <table><tr><td>L2</td><td>1 source</td><td>3m</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>2 sources</td><td>4 - 5m</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>3 sources</td><td>6m</td></tr></table>	L2	1 source	3m		2 sources	4 - 5m		3 sources	6m																
L2	1 source	3m																									
	2 sources	4 - 5m																									
	3 sources	6m																									
	<p>L3 Yes + No, supported by valid source use</p> <p>i.e. Both elements of L2</p> <table><tr><td></td><td></td><td>Yes</td><td>No</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>L3</td><td>2 sources</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>7m</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>3 sources</td><td>1/2</td><td>2/1</td><td>8m</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>4 sources</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>9m</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>5 sources</td><td>2/3</td><td>3/2</td><td>10m</td></tr></table> <p>Note: Consideration on number of sources used and the quality of analysis in deciding on marks in L2 & L3.</p>			Yes	No		L3	2 sources	1	1	7m		3 sources	1/2	2/1	8m		4 sources	2	2	9m		5 sources	2/3	3/2	10m	<p>[7-10]</p>
		Yes	No																								
L3	2 sources	1	1	7m																							
	3 sources	1/2	2/1	8m																							
	4 sources	2	2	9m																							
	5 sources	2/3	3/2	10m																							

Section B: Structured Response Questions

2(a)	<p>Extract 1 shows how SMEs should leverage on the opportunities which globalisation offers.</p> <p>In your opinion, how can the Singapore government encourage SMEs to be competitive in a globalising era? Explain your answer using one strategy.</p>		7m
	L1	<p>Describes the topic e.g. SMEs are important for Singapore's economy.</p>	[1-2]
	L2	<p>Identifies / Describes strategy <i>Award 3 marks for identifying strategy.</i> <i>Award 4 – 5 marks for describing strategy</i></p> <p>Government can encourage SMEs by providing financial schemes. [3] (Award additional marks if student identifies what the loans/financial assistance/tax exemptions are for) Example: expanding overseas to expand customer base/market reach, to help digitise SMEs to combat shortage of labor</p> <p>Government can facilitate partnerships between SMEs and other SMEs/MNCs/businesses [3]. Government can host conventions from various industries to showcase their products and services. This will allow greater interaction between SMEs and larger corporations which can lead to future business partnerships. [5]</p>	[3-5]
	L3	<p>L2 + Explains strategy <i>Award 6 – 7 mark for explanation showing allow stay competitive.</i></p> <p>Government can facilitate partnerships between SMEs and larger corporations. Government can host conventions from various industries to showcase their products and services. This will allow greater interaction between SMEs and larger corporations which can lead to future business partnerships. Through such partnerships, SMEs will be able to leverage on the goods and services of other companies. This will allow them to provide more goods and services to more customers and to compete with other companies in a globalized world.</p>	[6-7]

2(b)	Extracts 2 and 3 shows the economic impacts of globalisation. Explain the positive and negative economic impact globalization has on individuals.		8m
	L1	Writes about the topic without addressing the question e.g. Globalisation affects individuals.	[1-2]
	L2	Describes the factor(s) <i>Award 3m for describing one factor.</i> <i>Award 4m for describing both factors.</i> Globalisation has positive impacts on individual because they have higher pay and better job prospects when they travel overseas. Since globalization has facilitated mobility, it is easier for individuals to work abroad. There are companies who wish to employ them because of a specific skill they possess. Globalisation has negative impacts on individuals because local workers have to compete with more people for job opportunities in their home country. This means individuals may have to contend with lower income or the risk of losing their jobs, because companies can get access to workers overseas offering lower labour cost. For example retail companies like Uniqlo are moving out of China into Vietnam where labour costs are lower.	[3-4]
	L3	L2 + Explains the factor(s) <i>Award 5-6m for explaining one factor.</i> <i>Award 6-7m for explaining both factors.</i> Globalisation has positive impacts on individuals because they have higher pay and better job prospects when they travel overseas. Since globalization has facilitated mobility, it is easier for individuals to work abroad. There are companies who wish to employ them because of a specific skill they possess. This means globalisation enables individual to achieve a higher standard of living with the increased income hence experiencing a positive impact. Globalisation has negative impacts on individuals because local workers have to compete with more people for job opportunities in their home country. This means individuals may have to contend with lower income or the risk of losing their jobs, because companies can get access to workers overseas offering lower labour cost. For example retail companies like Uniqlo are moving out of China into Vietnam where labour costs are lower. This means globalisation results in negative impacts on individuals because they are not able to climb the socio-economic ladder because the loss of jobs and income ceilings they will experience when companies move away due to globalization.	[5-7]