

**Answer Scheme**  
**4E5N Social Studies Prelim 2019**

(a)	<p><b>Study Source A.</b></p> <p><b>Does the illustrator agree with the Singapore government? Explain your answer.</b></p>	<b>[5]</b>
	<p><b>L1 Surface description of the source but no valid message</b></p> <p>e.g. I can see a hand covering a person's mouth.</p>	<b>[1]</b>
	<p><b>L2 Surface interpretation based on the source</b></p> <p>e.g. The artist does not like the anti-<i>fake news</i> laws. e.g. The government is trying to stop the free press from reporting news.</p>	<b>[2]</b>
	<p><b>L3 Valid interpretation of the source, but without stand.</b></p> <p>e.g. The cartoonist thinks that the anti-fake news laws will give the government power to control the news industries from freedom of expression and reporting news freely.</p>	<b>[3]</b>
	<p><b>L4 Main message of the source, with evidence and stand.</b> <i>4 marks for main message without evidence.</i></p> <p>e.g. The illustrator <b>does not agree</b> with the Singapore government/is against the <b>passing of the anti-fake news laws as this law will give the government power to control the news industries by not allowing freedom of expression/ reporting news freely.</b> This is evident from "a hand with a mouth which says parliament covering a person's mouth, (which represents the press/news industries) and speaking on the press behalf." This implies that the <b>government will have the ability to censor news from various news sources and there will be a limitation to the extent of information as most of the news might come from only one main official source</b> – the government.</p>	<b>[4-5]</b>

(b)	<p><b>Study Sources B and C.</b></p> <p>Can Source B prove Source C right? Explain your answer.</p>	[7]
	<p><b>L1 Answers based on undeveloped use of provenance</b></p> <p>e.g. Source B can prove Source C right as it is a report by experts.</p> <p>e.g. Source B can prove Source C right as it is a report by experts which can be reliable as they would have done research to know more.</p>	[1-2]
	<p><b>L2 More useful based on content</b>  <i>3 marks for showing the similarity in message/common criteria.</i>  <i>4 marks for message supported by evidence</i></p> <p>e.g. <b>Source B can prove Source C right because Source B and Source C have similar views on the seriousness of online falsehoods. [3 marks]</b>  <b>Source B shows that fake news can cause serious social consequences.</b> This is evident by “When there is a falsehood which affects public interest, it can spread very fast, very quickly.... I can give you an actual incident. In Indonesia, a false allegation was made that a Chinese woman had criticised and said nasty things about a mosque. Within 24 to 36 hours, buildings were damaged...”, implying that false news can lead to social unrest within a short time period, which is a very serious outcome to the nation. <b>Similarly, Source C shows that online falsehoods can cause social disharmony in Singapore.</b> This is evident from “For example, the fabrication in 2015 that a Filipino family’s complaints had sparked a scuffle between the police and Thaipusam participants set off a flurry of xenophobic reactions among netizens”, implying that fake news can cause tension between locals and foreigners living in Singapore, which will result in serious conflict. <b>[4 mark]</b></p>	[3-4]
	<p><b>L2 + L3 Based on x-reference to Sources.</b>  <i>4 marks for 1 x-reference to source C. 5 marks for 1 x-reference to Source B.</i></p> <p><i>Note: Valid cross-references without having done the comparison of Sources B and C will be awarded L2/3.</i></p> <p>e.g. <b>Source B can further prove Source C right as Source B is reliable. Source B is supported by Source D.</b> Source D shows that the spread of fake news online leading to serious consequences which needs government’s intervention. This is evident “There are threats to national security and social harmony due to online falsehoods that which require decisive government’s actions”, implying that such negative consequences have far-reaching consequences to the country. <b>Also, as Source C has the same view point as Source B and Source B is reliable, hence Source B is able to prove Source C right. [5m]</b></p>	[4-5]

	<p><b>Or</b></p> <p>e.g. <b>Source B can further prove Source C right as Source C is right in the first place. Source C is supported by Source D.</b> Source D shows that the spread of fake news online leading to serious consequences which needs government's intervention. This is evident "There are threats to national security and social harmony due to online falsehoods that which require decisive government's actions", implying that such negative consequences have far-reaching consequences to the country. As Source C is right, hence Source B can prove Source C right. <b>[4m]</b></p> <p><b>Please Note: Due to a possibility of inferring Source D in 2 ways, the following can occur:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Source B can be challenged by Source D instead, and hence Source B is unreliable and cannot prove Source C right.</li> <li>• Source C can be challenged by Source D too, hence Source C can be proven wrong by Source B.</li> </ul>	
	<p><b>L4 Based on the provenance and purpose of Source B + comparison of Source B and C content (L2/4)</b></p> <p><b>7 marks for fully-explained provenance and purpose of Source B</b></p> <p>6 marks for fully-explained provenance and wrong audience/outcome of Source B</p> <p>6 marks for weak explanation of provenance and full purpose of Source B</p> <p>L2/4 awarded for weak explanation of provenance AND wrong audience/outcome of Source B</p> <p>L2/3 awarded for fully-explained provenance and purpose of Source B WITHOUT comparison of content of Source B and Source C</p> <p>e.g. <b>As L2/4 (comparison of content) plus</b></p> <p><b>Source B can prove Source C right because Source B is reliable. Source B is a report by experts. The report is by a group of experts who has no personal agenda or political agenda. (Provenance)</b> It is only trying to convince/educate <b>(verb)</b> Singaporeans <b>(audience)</b> that online falsehoods can create serious social unrest <b>(Msg)</b> This is evident from "For example, the fabrication in 2015 that a Filipino family's complaints had sparked a scuffle between the police and Thaipusam participants set off a flurry of xenophobic reactions among netizens", implying that false news can lead to social unrest and "Between 2014 and 2016, foreign spies allegedly used fake accounts on social media to influence the USA presidential election campaigns", which show that fake news online has serious cross-boundary impact. - manipulate the political outcomes and cause social unrest. <b>(evidence and explanations of evidence)</b> Hence, the report is trying to convince the Singaporeans to support the passing of the new bill. <b>(outcome).</b> Hence <b>Source B is reliable, it will be able to prove Source C right.</b></p>	<b>6-7</b>

(c)	<p><b>Study Source D.</b></p> <p><b>Why was this joint public statement submitted to the parliament? Explain your answer.</b></p>	[6]
	<p><b>L1 Answer based on the provenance</b></p> <p>e.g. The joint statement was written because they are the nominated members of parliament and lawyers, hence are familiar with the workings of the law to share their own opinions.</p>	[1]
	<p><b>L2 Answer based on context – what was happening at the time/answers based on the (impact/outcome) of the answer.</b></p> <p>e.g. The joint statement was written because the debate of the anti-fake news law was on-going and they wanted to improve the law.</p> <p>The joint statement was written because they hope for the government to think about the possible problems that might be created as a result of the anti-fake news law.</p>	[2]
	<p><b>L3 Answers based on sub-message/inference</b>  <i>3 marks for unsupported sub-message</i>  <i>4 marks for supported sub-message</i></p> <p>e.g. The joint statement was written because <b>they wanted to express that they agree with the importance and rationale of the anti-online falsehood Bill due to the serious consequences as a result of online fake news. (sub-message)</b> This is evident by “We support the intent behind the bill. There are threats to national security and social harmony due to online falsehoods which require decisive government’s actions”, which implies that the law is important to deal with the issues of fake news and in addition also the evidence.</p> <p><b>Or</b></p> <p>e.g. The joint statement was written because they wanted to express that <b>they do not agree with the way the law might be implemented as the people are worried about that the government will abuse it. (sub-message)</b> This is evident by “But we like many in Singapore and globally have expressed concerns over the extent of this power” which implies that the NMP do not agree that the law will allow the government to have extensive power to decide the fake news.</p>	[3-4]

	<p><b>L4 Answers based on correct message and audience</b>  <i>5 marks for weak outcome</i>  <i>6 marks for complete purpose</i>  <i>Award L3/4 for unsupported main message</i></p> <p>e.g. The joint statement was written because they wanted to convince <b>(verb)</b> the Singapore government <b>(audience)</b> that they agree with the importance and rationale of the anti-online falsehood Bill due to the serious consequences as a result of online fake news but they do not agree with the way the law might be implemented as there is a possibility of abuse of power <b>(message)</b>. This is evident from the “We support the intent behind the bill. There are threats to national security and social harmony due to online falsehoods which require decisive government’s actions”, which implies that the law is important to deal with the issues of fake news and in addition also the evidence “But we like many in Singapore and globally have expressed concerns over the extent of this power” implies that the NMP do not agree that the law will allow the government to have extensive power to make decision about which news are considered fake news.<b>(evidence and explanations)</b> This is to convince the government to refine and change certain parts of the Bill/law. <b>(outcome)</b></p> <p><b><i>If students did not state message and instead only state the outcome, L3/3.</i></b></p>	<b>[5-6]</b>
<b>(d)</b>	<p><b>Study Source E.</b></p> <p>Are you surprised by Source E? Explain your answer.</p>	<b>[7]</b>
	<p><b>L1 Answers based on the provenance</b></p> <p>e.g. I am not surprised by Source E as Source E is by an opposition.</p>	<b>[1]</b>
	<p><b>L2 Answers based on content of Source E</b>  <i>2 marks for content, unsupported</i>  <i>3 marks for content, supported</i></p> <p>e.g. I am not surprised because Source E expressed that the government should not be having the rights and power to decide on what are considered false news. This is evident from “The Bill allows a minister to have power to decide what are online falsehoods and what punishments to mete out. It’s like during a match, the minister is both player and referee... But how can we be sure that the ministers from the ruling party will not manipulate opinions in order to win elections?” suggesting that the government might abuse their power to advance political agenda which will not protect public interests.</p>	<b>[2-3]</b>

	<p><b>L3 Answer based on detailed explanation of the provenance</b></p> <p>e.g. <b>I am not surprised by Source E because it is by a member of an opposition party.</b> As an opposition, he will have his own political agenda especially when he labelled the government as one which wants to possess total power and might possibly abuse the power given to them as a result of the passing of the law. This will paint a negative picture of the government which will benefit the opposition.</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>e.g. <b>I am not surprised by Source E because it is by a member of an opposition party.</b> As an opposition presenting its view in the parliament, his role is to provide an alternative view to the new proposed Bill.</p>	<b>[4]</b>
	<p><b>L4 Answers based on reliability of the source by cross-referencing</b></p> <p>e.g. <b>I am surprised by Source E as Source B challenges Source E. Source F expressed that the government should not be having the rights and power to decide on what are considered false news.</b> This is evident from “The Bill allows a minister to have power to decide what are online falsehoods and what punishments to mete out. It’s like during a match, the minister is both player and referee... But how can we be sure that the ministers from the ruling party will not manipulate opinions in order to win elections?” suggesting that the government might abuse their power to advance political agenda which will not protect public interests. <b>However, this is contradicted by Source B which suggests that the government has the rights to intervene in a country like Singapore that is especially vulnerable.</b> This is evident from “Some recommendations towards falsehood include: government should have the powers to swiftly disrupt the spread and influence of online falsehoods especially for a case of falsehood having high-level impact”, implying that any impacts that threaten the security and social cohesion in a country like Singapore, where there are different social groups and nationalities should allow government exercising their power.</p>	<b>[5]</b>
	<p><b>L5 Answers based on provenance and purpose</b></p> <p>Award L2/3 for answers that do not address the provenance. Award 6 marks for weak outcome Award 7 marks for a complete purpose.</p> <p>e.g. <b>EXPLAIN PROVENANCE</b> <b>I am not surprised by Source E because it is by a member of an opposition party.</b> As an opposition presenting its view in the parliament, he is EXPECTED to criticise the government policies and his role is to provide an alternative view to the new proposed Bill.</p>	<b>[6-7]</b>

	He is trying to convince <b>(verb)</b> the parliament <b>(audience)</b> the possibility of government abusing power. <b>(msg)</b> This is evident in “But how can we be sure that the ministers from the ruling party will not manipulate opinions in order to win elections”, implying that the government is doing it for political interests and not public interests. <b>(evidence and explain evidence)</b> . Hence, it is trying to convince the parliament to review the Bill before implementing. <b>(outcome)</b>	
<b>(e)</b>	<p>“The government should be the main decision maker in deciding what is good for society”.</p> <p>Using sources in this case study, explain how far you would agree with the statement.</p>	<b>[10]</b>
	<b>L1 Writes about statement, no valid source use.</b>	<b>[1]</b>
	<b>L2 Yes/No, supported by valid source use</b> <i>Award 2m for using only 1 source</i> <i>Award 3m for using at least 2 sources</i> <i>Award 4m for using at least 2 sources and with good explanation</i>	<b>[2-4]</b>
	<b>L3 Yes + No, supported by valid source use</b> <i>Award 5m for 1 Yes and 1 No</i> <i>Award 6m for both 2 Yes and 1 No (vice versa)</i> <i>Award 7-8 m for both 2 Yes and 2 No, with at least 2 sources on each side</i> <i>Award 8m for good explanations</i> <p><b><u>I agree that government</u> should be the main decision maker in deciding what is good for society. Sources B, C, D and F show that the government play an important role especially in deciding what is safe and secure for the whole society.</b></p> <p><b>I agree that government should be the main decision maker in deciding what is good for society. Source c shows that the government should be the main decision maker to decide what is good for society</b> because Source c shows the serious consequences fake news can lead to. This is evident by “When there is a falsehood which affects public interest, it can spread very fast, very quickly.... I can give you an actual incident. In Indonesia, a false allegation that a Chinese woman had criticised and said nasty things about a mosque. Within 24 to 36 hours, buildings were damaged...”, implying that false news can lead to social unrest within a short time period, which is very serious outcome to the nation, <b>hence in this case, as it is serious and threaten the whole nation’s social harmony and lives, the government should be the main party to decide the actions and consequences. Hence, the government should be the main decision maker in deciding what is good for society.</b></p>	<b>[5-8]</b>

	<p><b>I agree that government should be the main decision maker in deciding what is good for society. Source B also shows that the government should be the main decision maker to decide what is good for society because Source B shows that falsehoods can manipulate the political outcomes and cause social unrest.</b> This is evident from “For example, the fabrication in 2015 that a Filipino family’s complaints had sparked a scuffle between the police and Thaipusam participants set off a flurry of xenophobic reactions among netizens”, implying that false news can lead to social unrest and “Between 2014 and 2016, foreign spies allegedly used fake accounts on social media to influence the USA presidential election campaigns”, implying that serious negative outcomes arise at different levels and have a widespread effect. <b>This will need the government to be the main decision maker as they have to put a stop to almost immediate for such high-level threats hence, government is a main decision maker in deciding then what is good for society</b></p> <p><b>I agree that government should be the main decision maker in deciding what is good for society. Source D shows that the government should be the main decision maker to decide what is good for society</b> because it shows that shows that the spread of fake news online leading to serious consequences which will need government’s intervention. This is evident “There are threats to national security and social harmony due to online falsehoods that which require decisive government’s actions”, implying that such negative consequences have far-reaching consequences, <b>which will need the government as the main mediator and decide what is good for society by coming up with solutions and deciding what is fake news.</b></p> <p><b>I agree that government should be the main decision maker in deciding what is good for society. Source F shows that the government should be the main decision maker to decide what is good for society</b> because it shows that online social media has the ability to throw a country into chaos if the government does not step in with more regulations in place. This is evident from “Governments need to set a common standard to prevent manipulation of the voters’ emotions by foreign states during election period.”, implying that a social media giant like Facebook will also require government to help in regulating the online space, implying the seriousness of consequences if any. <b>This shows that even a giant tech company cannot make decision when it comes to issues like national security, which will need the government to be the main decision maker.</b></p> <p><b>I do not agree that government should be the main decision maker in deciding what is good for society. Sources A, E and C show that there negative consequences like abuse of power or restriction of freedom of speech when government becomes main decision maker.</b></p>	
--	--	--



	<p><b>I do not agree that government should be the main decision maker in deciding what is good for society.</b> Source A shows that government should not be the main decision maker because if the government is the main decision maker, it will silence alternative voices and opinions of online news platforms and there will be restriction to the freedom of expression. Source A shows that passing of the anti-fake news laws as this law will give the government power to control the news industries from freedom of expression and reporting news freely. This is evident from a hand with a mouth which says parliament covering a person's mouth, (which represents the press/news industries) and speaking on the press behalf. This implies that the government will ability to censor news from various news sources and there will be a limitation to the extent of information as most of the news might come from only one main official source – the government.</p> <p><b>I do not agree that government should be the main decision maker in deciding what is good for society.</b> Source E also shows that in the case of Singapore, the government should not be the main decision maker as Source E expressed that the government should not be having the rights and power to decide on what are considered false news. This is evident from “The Bill allows a minister to have power to decide what are online falsehoods and what punishments to mete out. It’s like during a match, the minister is both player and referee... But how can we be sure that the ministers from the ruling party will not manipulate opinions in order to win elections?” suggesting that the government might abuse their power to advance political agenda. Hence, there is a danger that if government is the main decision maker, they might abuse their power and if no one has the power to keep them in check, there might be poor decision made.</p> <p><b>I do not agree that government should be the main decision maker in deciding what is good for society.</b> Source D shows that if this happens, government might have misuse/abuse the power they have. This is evident by ‘Many in Singapore and globally have expressed concerns over the extent of this power. We share these concerns, as future governments might use it to suppress online debates for their political interests’. This implies that the government might label any political discussion which is to their disadvantage as falsehood, which will then be a major concern and leading to a possibility of a dictatorial rule as they disallow other alternative views.</p>	
	<p><b>L4 Bonus 2 marks</b></p> <p><b>To score additional 2 marks (awarded at either L2 or L3), candidates can take any one of these 3 routes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analyzing at least 1 source in its usefulness, reliability or sufficiency</li> <li>Sharing examples from their contextual knowledge</li> <li>By giving a balanced conclusion or resolution</li> </ul>	[9-10]

	<p><b>Analysing at least 1 source in its usefulness, reliability or sufficiency:</b></p> <p><b>I agree that government</b> should be the main decision maker. <b>Despite Source A's disapproval of the government to be the main decision maker in deciding whether a news is false or not, Source A is an unreliable source.</b> Source A shows that the government should not be the main decision-maker as it will shows that government should not be the main decision maker because if the government is the main decision maker, it will silence alternative voices and opinions of online news platforms and there will be restriction to the freedom of expression. <b>However,</b> Source A is not a reliable source because the source is by the Human Rights Organisation that focuses on the importance of freedom of speech, hence it will tend to be one-sided/bias by illustrating that there will only be one official voice and that the government restrict other voices. <b>Hence, I do not believe Source A and I agree that the government should be the main decision maker.</b></p> <p><b><u>Sharing examples from their contextual knowledge</u></b></p> <p><b>I agree that the government</b> needs to be the main decision maker for the good of our society especially when fake news can bring about high level and serious impacts to the entire nation. We should not be allowing fake news to disrupt our everyday lives neither should they pose a danger to our nation. Back in 2016, a report of a roof collapse at the Housing and Development Board project Punggol Waterway Terraces, with a photo of the upper storeys in a crumbled state, set social media abuzz. In the case of the roof collapse, the police, the Singapore Civil Defence Force as well as HDB and town council officers rushed to the scene, only to learn that it was fake news – wasting resources and causing alarm. A government poll last year found that 75 per cent of respondents had read fake news at least occasionally, and 25 per cent had shared information they later discovered to be false. With a quarter of the population unable to identify fake news, and extent of spread can be fast and impact uncontrollable. Hence, the government needs to, in such a case, be the main decision maker to quickly put an end to the equally fast transmission.</p> <p><b><u>By giving a balanced conclusion or resolution</u></b></p> <p><b>In my opinion, both the government and other players like the tech companies as well as individuals need to play a role in ensuring the good of society.</b> Source B and F show that social media company Facebook and the government need to work together to review the content of the social media. Hence, what is needed is the collaboration from both bottom up and top down. With social media deciding what accounts are false and quickly closing them down, government should only step in when the false news has</p>	

	the possibility of causing harm to the entire nation in terms of economic loss, lack of social cohesion and national security. Also, the government's role, according to Source B, will involve very much on educating the people about false news and coming up with guidelines to regulate the cyber landscape. This is especially important when the transmission will involve diverse platforms and channels of communication.	
--	--	--

### Section B (Structured-Response Question)

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

(a)	<p><b>Extract 1 shows that cyber threats have continued to grow in frequency and impact.</b></p> <p><b>In your opinion, why do you think these threats have been occurring in Singapore? Explain your answer with reference to two reasons.</b></p>	<b>[7]</b>
	<p><b>L1 Describes the topic.</b></p> <p>Cyber threats are increasing in Singapore. Information, both government and individuals are no longer safe.</p>	[1]
	<p><b>L2 describe the reason(s)</b>  Award 2 marks for identifying one reason and 3 marks for identifying two reasons. Award 3 marks for describing one reason and 4 marks for describing two reasons.</p> <p>The internet has made it possible for cybercriminals to operate from any part of the world. For example, Interpol had to work with the Philippines police in the past to deal with cyber extortion cases.</p> <p>Another reason is that our country is moving towards a digital and technology landscape. One example is the move towards Smart Nation. Hence, we are more connected to the cyberworld, where valuable and large amount of information are stored online.</p> <p>One reason is the gaps in habits when it comes to password management and updating of software. Individuals and small businesses are usually careless or complacent when it comes to updating their passwords or their security software.</p> <p><i>Any of the two points.</i></p>	[2-4]
	<p><b>L3 Explain the cause(s)</b>  Award 5-6 marks for explaining one reason. Award 6-7 marks for explaining two reasons.</p>	[5-7]

	<p>The internet has made it possible for cybercriminals to operate from any part of the world. For example, Interpol had to work with the Philippines police in the past to deal with cyber extortion cases. <b>As the world becomes increasingly interconnected, it is easier for hackers and cybercriminals to use the internet to their advantage to prey on online users without revealing their real identity online. Hence, these hackers can stay anonymous, it becomes easier for them to carry out cyber threats and hence, the threats occur in Singapore easily and frequently.</b></p> <p><b>Another reason is that our country is moving towards a digital economy.</b> It is the economic activity that results from billions of everyday online connections among people, businesses, devices, data, and processes. The backbone of the digital economy is hyper-connectivity which means growing interconnectedness of people, organisations, and machines that results from the Internet, mobile technology. The move towards such an economy will mean that other than our banks, and businesses are being interconnected. important infrastructure like our MRT as well as personal living space will also be highly inter-twined. One example is the move towards Smart Nation. Smart Nation transformed key domains like health, transport, urban solutions, finance, and education. Smart Nation involves every person and organisation to learn about and adopt digital technologies. <b>Hence, everyone is more connected to the cyberworld, where valuable and large amount of information are stored online. This interconnectivity may tempt people to steal valuable information like bank account numbers and any form of personal identification. Also, as we are in a hyperconnected world, it becomes easier for cyber threats to occur in a form of threats towards transport infrastructure/health. It will be much easier for cybercriminals to create massive destruction to a country by disrupting the citizens' daily lives. Hence, the occurrence will become more frequent and at a much higher rate as now there are many more domains interconnected in the cyberworld, which makes carrying out of cyber threats easier. Hence, they will occur frequently.</b></p> <p><b>One reason is the poor habits and complacency when it comes to password management and updating of software.</b> Individuals and small businesses are usually careless or complacent when it comes to updating their passwords or their security software. This is made worse with an increase in online transactions. With globalisation, the nature in which we purchase products and services have changed. For example, there have been a rise in the number of online platforms to purchase items. <b>Hence, hackers might be able to hack into one's private computer, allowing them too steal credit card information and gaining money for themselves. This is also made possible as people becomes more complacent with the way they manage their private and personal information online. This will make it easier for hackers to hack through the system. Hence, cyber threats will keep occurring.</b></p>	
--	--	--

(b)	<p><b>Extracts 2 and 3 account for the roles of the Singapore government and Singapore citizens in managing transnational terrorism.</b></p> <p><b>Do you think that the Singapore government plays a more important role than citizens in managing transnational terrorism? Explain your answer.</b></p>	[8]
	<p><b>L1 Writes about the topic i.e. Transnational Terrorism</b></p> <p>Transnational terrorism is a complex security challenge because the threats can come from within and beyond a country's border. Hence, it will require both the efforts of the government and the citizens to manage it.</p>	[1-2]
	<p><b>L2 Describes the factor(s)</b>  Award 3 marks for describing either factor 1 or factor 2  Award 4 marks for describing both factor 1 and factor 2</p> <p>The Singapore government can deploy preventive measures. For example, there can be tighter border controls at the airport. In Singapore, the biometric passport is used where unique biological data such as fingerprint data, facial image and passport details is captured on a contactless chip. Other than preventive measure, the country can also deploy protective measures like an increase vigilance and surveillance e.g. Singapore Police.</p> <p>The individuals can take on preventive measures to be prepared and be vigilant. For example, they can play a part in the defence of Singapore through the five pillars of Total Defence.</p>	[3-4]
	<p><b>L3 Explain the factor(s)</b>  Award 5-6 marks for explaining either factor 1 or factor 2  Award 6-7 marks for explaining both factors</p> <p><b>The Singapore government plays an important role in managing transnational terrorism</b> by deploying different measures to reduce a country's vulnerability to transnational terrorist threats. Such measures can deter terrorists and help prevent loss of lives. They include the following:  <u><b>Preventive response</b></u>  (Effective border controls and collaboration between countries. The Immigration &amp; Checkpoints Authority (ICA), which is in charge of fortifying our borders, has introduced biometric technology in the immigration and clearance process and radiographic image analysis of cargo vehicles crossing Singapore borders. <b>By strengthening ICA's effectiveness &amp; efficiency in monitoring and regulating the movement of people, goods and conveyances across Singapore's borders, this will prevent the movement of foreign terrorists as well as</b></p>	[5-7]

	<p><b>materials that can be used to produce explosives into Singapore through land, sea and air checkpoints.</b></p> <p><b><u>Protective response</u></b></p> <p>Enhance surveillance for key installations and infrastructure like power stations, as well as public places with many people because they are perceived to be more vulnerable to terrorist attacks. Eg. Installing cameras at MRT stations to check on suspicious characters/activities &amp; full body scanners at airport custom checkpoints to detect hidden and potentially dangerous objects under passengers' clothes. <b>Through protective response, any suspicious characters or dangerous actions can be deterred before becoming a full-blow threat and endangering the lives of the people. Hence, people's lives and properties are protected.</b></p> <p><b><u>Responsive measures</u></b></p> <p>Responsive measures are aimed to deal with damages or harm brought by security threats if they occur. They include the following Emergency Preparedness Exercises. The Singapore Police Force and the Singapore Civil Defence Force frequently hold emergency preparedness exercises to test their contingency plans for acts of terrorism. Eg. Exercise Heartbeat are held annually, where Home Team agencies work with the community and private corporations. <b>These exercises help Singapore to be better prepared to deal with a range of security threats. They also help to enhance our resilience to stand united as a community and recover quickly after an incident.</b></p> <p><b>And/Or</b></p> <p><b>Individuals also can play an important role in managing transnational terrorism.</b> Individuals can take preventive measures to defend the country. For example, through learning about the 5 pillars of Total Defence, and understanding the role of a citizen, it will help to build a strong, secure and cohesive country. For example, through learning about the importance of social defence during the Total Defence Day, Singaporeans can make an effort to participate in events like Inter-Racial and Religious Confidence Circles to gain a better understanding of different races and their cultures. <b>When a crisis happen, individual Singaporeans will be able to prevent escalation of the crisis as there will be high cohesion in Singapore, the external threats will not be able to threaten the security of the country. Staying united would make us strong and resilient as a people, regardless of race or faith, and be emotionally and mentally ready to defend Singapore against terrorism.</b></p>	
--	--	--

	<p><b>However, Singaporeans must also be prepared to protect and save ourselves, our loved ones and other people when a terrorist attack occurs.</b></p> <p><b>Individuals can also help to manage terrorism by being prepared for any forms of terror threats that might occur.</b> For example, Singapore citizens can download SGSecure application. This app can broadcast important alerts during major emergencies and provide information on ways to prevent and respond to terrorist attacks. Citizens can also send messages, photos or videos of incidents and request for help at times of emergencies. <b>Singapore citizens can now be more prepared and play a more active role by keeping an eye out for suspicious behaviour and report it to the authorities. They also learn how to protect themselves and their family during a terror attack and become active responders and help others in times of crisis.</b></p>	
	<p><b>L4 Both aspects in L3 AND explains the relative importance of each group</b></p> <p>Answers must explain why 1 factor is more important and why the other factor is less important.</p> <p><b>Singapore citizens play a more important role than the Singapore government in managing transnational terrorism in Singapore.</b> Even though the government continually find ways to protect its citizens, these efforts become futile if Singapore citizens do not take the threats to Singapore seriously and refuse to play an active role to safeguard Singapore. Some may even be complacent about the safety of Singapore and their lack of vigilance to their surroundings can lead to hazardous impact. Hence, at the ground level, the managing of transnational terrorism will still require the effort of Singaporeans to stay alert and make the first step to inform the authorities of any suspicious person or items before the authorities can even take any actions to arrest the problems before it become a full-blown attack.</p>	[8]

-----End of Answer-----