

**Question 1:** Consider the effectiveness of advertisements today.

**Descriptors for content mark:**

Mark range	Descriptors
10 - 12	<p>10:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Essay shows no understanding of what “advertisements” are.</li> <li>- Essay only talks about the negative impacts of advertising</li> </ul> <p>11-12:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Essay merely <b>describes functions</b> of advertisements with no evaluation of effectiveness</li> <li>• Essay discusses pros AND cons of advertising rather than the effectiveness of advertisements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E.g. Negative impacts of false advertising</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
13 - 15	<p>13-14:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some attempt to evaluate effectiveness of advertisements</li> <li>• However, it is not consistently done. Essay may digress to negative consequences at parts.</li> <li>• Examples are very general, lacking concrete details</li> <li>• Examples focus more on describing the advertisement or the thing that is being advertised rather than illustrating effectiveness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E.g. In trying to prove effectiveness of campaigns - “In Kenya, rhinos are sliced for their horns and military groups use helicopters to shoot down elephants for their tusks for ivory sales. <b>Singapore has raised awareness of such issues by making use of (billboards at) public transport such as train carriages and bus stops</b>”</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>15:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some attempt to evaluate effectiveness of advertisements</li> <li>• However, it is not consistently done. Essay may digress to negative consequences.</li> <li>• At least one paragraph that concretely illustrates effectiveness of advertisements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E.g. “The campaign using the hashtag “know your lemons” effectively <b>reached out to a large target group</b> and <b>attracted the attention of many.</b>”</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
16 - 18	<p>16:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most of the essay (at least two paragraphs) shows understanding of generic term “effectiveness”</li> <li>• Sustained quality of examples and reasoning (of effectiveness) in these two paragraphs</li> </ul> <p>17-18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Essay shows consistent understanding of generic term “effectiveness”</li> <li>• Sustained quality of examples and reasoning (of effectiveness) in every paragraph</li> <li>• Relevant characteristics of today’s world are fleshed out and tied to arguments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E.g. the use of technology to track consumer patterns to make more targeted advertisements (Zalora recommending users brands based on the things they were browsing earlier)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
19 - 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Essay shows consistent understanding of generic term “effectiveness”</li> <li>• Sustained quality of examples and reasoning in every paragraph</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevant characteristics of today's world are fleshed out and tied to arguments consistently</li> <li>• Examples cover a range of advertisements (by corporations, by governments, by non-profit organisations, social media influencers etc)</li> <li>• Original insight</li> </ul>
--	---

### Question Analysis (Generic/Ambiguous/Key Terms):

Topical term	Advertisements	<p>A notice or announcement in a public medium promoting a product, service, event or even job vacancy.</p> <p>Students should consider advertisements across different mediums (print, television, the internet, social media) and for different functions.</p>
Generic terms	Effectiveness	<p>Though some of the usual "effectiveness factors" can be applied here, eg reach and significance of impact, it is important to also talk about how well the methods of advertising deployed today meet the tastes and preferences of consumers today, especially the tech savvy ones.</p>
Context term	Today's world	<p>Relevant characteristics of today's world should be fleshed out e.g. increased exposure to different media platforms, globalisation leading to access to a greater variety of goods, more discerning / educated consumers who value product reviews and accuracy in product information.</p> <p>Because of the context, students should bring in new age forms of advertising such as social media influencers</p>

**Suggested Approaches:**

<b>Possible stand: Advertisements are largely effective in today's world.</b>	<b>Possible stand: Advertisements are largely ineffective in today's world.</b>
TS1: With the rise of the internet, advertising is now more powerful than ever in being able to reach out to consumers through viral marketing. These videos often are uploaded on social media platforms and spread beyond borders, quickly raising the profile of the product.	TS1: Given the dominance of the internet in today's world and the use of multiple platforms is important for a comprehensive reach, advertisements disseminated only on traditional forms of media platforms are no longer able to effectively reach out to consumers.
TS2: Furthermore, advertisers have adapted with the times, no longer merely creating generic advertisements for the masses, instead tapping on "influencers" to reach out to different target groups.	TS2: Furthermore, due to consumers having the platform of the internet to share their honest reviews with other consumers, people have grown more cynical of advertisements that exaggerate product benefits or strengths.
TS3: Additionally, in this age of globalisation where consumers have access to a wide variety of goods, Overseas advertisers have adjusted their marketing techniques to have local media producers make ads with a local flavour that appeal to the consumers there.	TS3: Moreover, given the information age that we are in, where we are constantly bombarded with information and messages from various different media platforms, advertisements often only have a fleeting impact on consumers.

**Question 2: 'Cultural and heritage sites have lost their relevance.' How far is this true of your society?**

**Descriptors for content mark:**

<b>Mark range</b>	<b>Descriptors</b>
10 - 12	<p>10:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question is misinterpreted - either 1) cultural and heritage sites - mistaken certain places as such 2) relevance - mistakenly addressed</li> <li>• Singapore is completely left out</li> </ul> <p>11-12:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Cultural and heritage sites" - are collapsed into the same thing - with "lost their relevance" both barely addressed accurately; for e.g. "Sites" seen as simply "old places", and so on, and "Relevance" seen simply and myopically as 'still around' or so on.</li> <li>• Evidence ranging from mostly none, and where there are any, they are factually wrong or not Singapore, to, those that are cliché and yet used 'narratively' and not as evidence</li> </ul>
13 - 15	<p>13-14:</p> <p>Understanding of Terms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spore "Cultural and heritage sites" - are collapsed into the same thing, and, "lost their relevance" both addressed with mere allusions to them without explanations of what they are.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extremely limited - cliché (one or two) and narratively used</li> </ul> <p>Issue is dealt with as such:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Ranging from limited to just barely acceptable range of address of key generic and topical terms</li> <li>• Reasoning is mostly absent or irrelevant</li> </ul>

	<p>15:</p> <p>Understanding of Terms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spore “Cultural and heritage sites” and “lost their relevance’ both addressed with acceptable paraphrase and explained simply as such: Sites of cultural importance/ important to heritage (without clear understanding of terms convincingly shown)</li> <li>• Reasoning is over-simplistic but relevant</li> </ul> <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Somewhat limited evidence - cliché (two or three) and with them mostly narratively used</li> </ul> <p>Issue is dealt with as such:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standard is of just about/barely acceptable address of key generic and topical terms</li> </ul>
16 - 18	<p>16:</p> <p>Understanding of Terms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spore “Cultural and heritage sites” and “lost their relevance’ both addressed with acceptable paraphrase and explained acceptably as such: Sites important to history and sense of who we are</li> <li>• Both ‘cultural’ (rituals and beliefs) and ‘heritage’ (shared history) are understood and explained accurately</li> <li>• Address of past - when these sites have significant cultural and heritage importance</li> <li>• Reasoning is acceptable</li> </ul> <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acceptable range of evidence that range from hints of apt use to some aptly used</li> <li>• Non-cliché evidence used</li> </ul> <p>Issue is dealt with as such:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acceptable address of key generic and topical terms</li> </ul> <p>17-18:</p> <p>Understanding of Terms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spore “Cultural and heritage sites” and “lost their relevance’ both addressed with acceptable paraphrase and explained acceptably as such: Sites important to history and sense of who we are and rather confidently employed</li> <li>• Both ‘cultural’ (rituals and beliefs) and ‘heritage’ (shared history) are understood and explained accurately</li> <li>• Address of past - when these sites have significant cultural and heritage importance</li> <li>• Reasoning is rather strong - such as: due to globalisation, capitalist goals... etc.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acceptable range of evidence that are all aptly used</li> <li>• Non-cliché evidence used</li> </ul> <p>Issue is dealt with as such:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good range of address of key generic and topical terms</li> </ul>
19 - 20	<p>All of the above +</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impressive list of evidence used aptly</li> </ul>
21 - 23	<p>All of the above +</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attempt to evaluate how far it has lost or has not lost relevance in a simple manner - either through arg by numbers etc.</li> </ul>
24 - 25	<p>All of the above +</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attempt to sophisticatedly evaluate how far it has lost or has not lost relevance in a simple manner - e.g. that whether or not it has lost its relevance depends not so much with what sites are kept or demolished, but how Sporeans as a whole utilise and view these sites, and how the government has managed to (or not) utilise these sites and leverage on them to build new, modernised infrastructures and architecture.</li> </ul>

**Question Analysis (Generic/Ambiguous/Key Terms):**

Topical term	Cultural and heritage sites	Cultural and heritage sites refer to an official location where pieces of political, military, cultural, or social history have been preserved due to their cultural heritage value such as the St. Andrews Cathedral Church, Fort Canning, Sentosa (Fort Siloso), Changi Museum, the Cenotaph, Botanical Gardens, Sri Mariamman temple, Har Par Villa, Sultan Mosque (in Kampong Glam), Malay Heritage Centre, Peranakan cultural places and restaurants, Chinatown as a whole, Little India as a whole...etc.
Generic terms	Relevance	Of use, applicable, serves a purpose or function
	How far is this true	The extent to which this statement is true and happening in Singapore – students should either quantify the extent of relevance (largely relevant versus not much relevant) or consider the conditions in which they are/are not relevant.
Context term	Your society	Relevant characteristics of Singapore should be fleshed out e.g. highly developed, pragmatic... Still retains or does not retain its function, with regard to areas such as lifestyle, work, stress, economy, political stability, social integration, and so on.

#### Suggested Approaches:

Possible stand: Yes, this is true to a large extent	Possible stand: No, this is mostly untrue.
TS1: Singapore, as LHL has mentioned in recent times, aims and needs to move into the future as a growing IT and science hub. For that to happen, many of the low-lying shop houses in Chinatown and Little India might have to go to make way for these, particularly due to our limited land space - as seen in Bukit brown incident (cultural site?)	TS1: It might seem as though cultural and heritage sites are of not much significance now, what with Singapore moving towards becoming an IT and science and Technological hub. However, buildings and sites such as Sri M temple and Chinatown have in fact had a major 'facelift' in recent times. Because the Govt recognises the allure of these sites, many of the old shophouses have now been transformed and renovated into modern, hip restaurants and pubs and shops, bringing about a new form of vibrancy to this cosmopolitan city that thrives and feeds on tourism. Let's not forget the millions of dollars used to renovate cultural and heritage sites like the Novena church and the church near City Hall, as well as Fort Canning, all of which have a part to play on tourism and even exhibitions.
TS2: Many of the younger generation of Singaporeans are already westernised, 'koreanised, and japanised', what with the influx of media-related influence in our highly globalised society. Hence, these sites no longer hold the same allure and significance for many of them, who are rather secularised and modernised.	TS2: These sites also play the crucial role in social integration. They are reminders of our forefathers, our heritage and history and the fact that we are all migrants at one point, coming together with a common goal of succeeding together regardless of race, language or religion.

	<p>TS3: These are crucial monuments of peace and calm for the majority of our migrant workers who come mostly from china, India and Bangladesh. Indeed, Filipinos like congregating in the St Andrews cathedral too, another of the cultural and heritage sites. Botanic Gardens too offer us a reprieve from stressful lives. Because they act as monuments that resemble their homeland, and are places that have culturally and historically been known to facilitate the congregation of their own peoples in this foreign land, they serve to bring about calm and peace as well as allay homesickness for them, which all translates to better social cohesion and less social problems regarding integration.</p>
	<p>TS4: They also serve as a reminder to the younger generations of the hardships and lives sacrificed for the land; and as for the elderly, they are a show of respect and gratitude to the pains and losses they have to endure, to allow for the country to become what it is today.</p>

### Question 3: Can a country afford to isolate itself from the rest?

#### Descriptors for content mark:

Mark range	Descriptors
10 - 12	<p>10:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Arguments with no clear idea of what it means to 'isolate itself from the rest'. E.g. Student talks about a country who wants to help another country but does not want to cooperate with other countries in doing so. Or student talks about wanting to have bilateral relations rather than relations with many countries.</li> <li>- Arguments merely offer advantages of self-isolation, without paying attention to the cost of doing so.</li> </ul> <p>11-12:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Student may be providing costs of isolation but lacks any real world examples (only hypothetical discussion) OR only pros and cons of being self-sufficient (if cons are evaluated to show if it is a cost the country can afford → can pass)</li> </ul>
13 - 15	<p>13-14:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Only with one aspect</u> of isolation is dealt with eg trade.</li> <li>- Superficial reasoning to evaluate the country's capability to go on its own E.g. They have their own resources, so they can go on their own OR list a disadvantage without weighing the disadvantage to see if it is something a country can afford, then merely say that is why the country cannot afford to isolate itself.</li> <li>- One good argument but has weak examples can get a pass.</li> </ul> <p>15: - Only one good argument evaluating a country's ability or inability to withdraw from the rest of the world ie showing that the costs are bearable or alternatives are available, supported by concrete examples</p>

16 - 18	<p>16: - All paragraphs may deal with <u>only one aspect</u> of isolation but there is sustained evaluation in at least two paragraphs, showing possible impact of such an action, with the appropriate characteristics of those nations which can or cannot afford to depart from the general norm of global participation, and supported by sustained quality of examples.</p> <p>17-18: - Arguments deal with a range of aspects of isolation, eg trade, information, migration, etc, but reasoning and examples lack the depth of those in the higher bands.</p>
19 – 20	<p>Arguments deal with <u>a range of aspects of isolation</u>, eg trade, information, migration, etc, showing implications of such an action, with the appropriate characteristics of those nations which can or cannot afford to depart from the general norm of global participation. Arguments are supported by sustained quality of examples.</p> <p>Student is able to not just consider the immediate cost but also considers long term sustainability</p>
21 - 23	<p>The script displays a deep understanding of the subject of isolation, showing the implications of such an action, with the appropriate characteristics of those nations which can or cannot afford to depart from the general norm of global participation. Arguments are supported by sustained quality of examples..</p> <p>Student is able to not just consider the immediate cost but also considers long term sustainability</p>

#### Question Analysis (Generic/Ambiguous/Key Terms):

Topical term	Country Isolate from the rest	A nation with its own government To cut off connection from others / remain alone , whether in terms of diplomatic relations, or the flow of trade, information or movement of people
Generic terms	Can afford to	to be able to do or spare something, esp without incurring (financial) difficulties or without risk of undesirable consequences Students cannot merely see this as a “should” question where they examine pros (irrelevant to this question) and cons of isolation.
Context term	None	Default global and today’s society

### Suggested Approaches:

Possible stand: A country can ill-afford to isolate itself	Possible stand: A country can afford to isolate itself
TS1: For most countries, it is too much risk to not establish good diplomatic nations with other countries as it could potentially cost national security and peace	TS1: Countries that have strong military might and advanced defence technology could afford to not form close diplomatic ties with others since it is unlikely that other countries would want to risk attacking them.
TS2: For countries that are highly reliant on openness to information and trade, not participating in or withdrawing from global trade with the intention to boost its local industries is likely to reduce economic competitiveness leading to cost inefficiencies and economic hardship.	TS2: A country that has immense resources can rely on its own availability of such resources and be able to regulate its imports without fear of the country suffering from deprivation or insufficiency.
TS3: Similarly, restricting access to the Internet and information from the international media is suicidal as the country can ill-afford to stunt the intellectual development of its people, limit opportunities for cross-cultural exchange and stymie businesses which rely on time-sensitive information, all of which will have severe consequences on the economic and social progress of the country.	TS3: Stunted intellectual development as a result of isolation, arising from restrictions to information provided by the international media, can have serious consequences on development in political thought, scientific and technological advancements, and economic and social progress, but such a cost may be something the government is willing to bear, as the possibility of dissent is reduced and the people's dependence on, and perceived loyalty to, the government may be enhanced instead.
TS4: Likewise, restricting the liberal movement of people into and out of the country, especially for education or employment, is likely to limit opportunities for cross-cultural learning and business development and cause a shortage of manpower, leading to a less vibrant economy and a less culturally-diverse society, which may have severe implications for the country's development.	TS4: The liberal movement of people in and out of the country may bring immense benefits to economic growth and the reputation of the country, but giving it up may be a cost that a government is willing to bear, considering that the context now is that such a curtailment brings more benefits – in terms of improved security (eg reduced threat of terrorism) and increased job opportunities to the local people.

**Question 4: 'Medical science should seek to heal rather than enhance.' Comment.**

### Descriptors for content mark:

Mark range	Descriptors
10 - 12	<p>10:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student approaches question as a pros and cons of medical science (<b>no awareness of generic terms "heal" or "enhance"</b>)</li> <li>Student misinterprets and shows NO understanding of generic terms "heal" AND "enhance" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>E.g. Student sees "enhancement" as "prevention of diseases" without clearly explaining what is being "enhanced" to achieve this better ability to prevent diseases</li> </ul> </li> <li>Student talks about other types of S&amp;T that are not medical <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>E.g. "Medical science enhanced food stock" (GM food)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>11-12:</p>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student describes instances of medical science healing/enhancing without evaluation the pros and cons (“should”)</li> <li>• Student digresses to limitations of medical science <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E.g. “Medical science is too costly and hence people cannot afford to be healed”</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Student only talks about healing/enhancement</li> </ul>
13 - 15	<p>13-14:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shows a general understanding of key terms in the question (both “healing” and “enhancement” must be addressed at some point in the essay)</li> <li>• May digress in some paragraphs</li> <li>• Very generic/thin examples <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E.g. Vitamins, steroids, medication referred to in general terms, no real world reference</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>15:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shows a general understanding of key terms in the question (at least one paragraph clearly addresses both generic terms)</li> <li>• May digress in some paragraphs</li> <li>• At least one paragraph that concretely illustrates pros/cons of healing/enhancing</li> <li>• Sees “enhancement” as purely “making our bodies stronger/enhancing our immunity system” <i>throughout the essay</i> making the contention limited to “prevention is better than cure”</li> </ul>
16 - 18	<p>16:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least two paragraphs understanding of generic term “should...heal/enhance”</li> <li>• Sustained quality of examples and reasoning in every paragraph</li> <li>• Range of arguments: student also considers “enhancement” as cosmetic/unnecessary improvements to an otherwise healthy individual</li> </ul> <p>17-18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Essay shows consistent understanding of generic term “should...heal/enhance”</li> <li>• Sustained quality of examples and reasoning in every paragraph</li> <li>• Essay attempts a weighing/comparison of the two functions in reasoning (rather than evaluating them in isolation) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E.g. “medical science should be meant for helping those in need, and enhancement should be of less priority”</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Range of arguments - students can see beyond the pragmatic costs and benefits of healing/enhancing and considers also the moral/ethical issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E.g. Moral obligation to use limited funds on ending suffering rather than developing performance-enhancing drugs”</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
19 - 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Essay shows consistent understanding of generic term “should...heal/enhance”</li> <li>• Sustained quality of examples and reasoning in every paragraph</li> <li>• Essay attempts a weighing/comparison of the two functions in reasoning (rather than evaluating them in isolation)</li> <li>• Range of arguments - students can see beyond the pragmatic costs and benefits of healing/enhancing and considers also the moral/ethical issues</li> <li>• Essay shows understanding of the false choice and shows that were possible (i.e. resources are not limited), both aims can actually be met</li> <li>• Original insight - Showing that the two are interlinked/don't have to be separate</li> </ul>

#### Question Analysis (Generic/Ambiguous/Key Terms):

Topical term	Medical science	The branch of science concerned with the study of the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of disease.
--------------	-----------------	--

Generic terms	Should seek to heal rather than enhance	Pros and cons of focusing on healing (recovering from / treatment of illnesses, injuries, diseases, terminal conditions) rather than enhancing (cosmetic changes to the body not for health reasons) and vice versa. Students can also choose to argue that it should seek to do both. This is technically not a comparative question, though the comparative approach can be adopted to deepen the analysis.
Context term	Default global and current	

### Suggested Approaches:

Possible stand: Medical science should seek to heal rather than enhance.	Possible stand: Medical science should seek to both heal and enhance.
TS1: Medical science should seek to heal rather than enhance since afflictions that require healing are often more pressing. In contrast, a healthy person's desire to improve their physical features is not a necessary procedure.	TS1: Certain enhancement procedures serve the important function of raising self-esteem of individuals.
TS2: The enhancement of the human body sometimes brings with it certain moral quandaries, so it can be argued that medical science should focus on providing solutions to current medical problems instead.	TS2: Furthermore, if patients are willing to pay money for medical enhancements, it should not be turned away since ultimately this can generate money for the industry to continue to improve and fuel innovations.
TS3: When resources are limited, medical science should seek to prioritise healing rather than enhancement since saving a human life is more important than merely making it better.	TS3: Given the rate of advancement of medical science, it can and should seek to do both. To limit it to only achieving one aim would be limiting the potential of medical science.

**Question 5: How far can we alleviate poverty when discrimination exists?****Descriptors for content mark:**

Mark range	Descriptors
10 - 12	<p>10:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Arguments discuss the alleviation of poverty without any mention of discrimination. Other solutions may be discussed instead.</li><li>• Arguments may also discuss discrimination without a convincing link to poverty.</li><li>• There are no examples provided, merely generalisations.</li></ul> <p>11-12:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Arguments discuss the alleviation of poverty and make passing mention of discrimination either as an obstacle or as a factor that is unrelated to poverty.</li><li>• The alleviation of poverty is merely asserted.</li><li>• The causal relationship between discrimination and poverty is merely asserted.</li><li>• There are no examples provided, merely generalisations.</li></ul>
13 - 15	<p>13-14:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Arguments should consist of either:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Poverty cannot be alleviated due to the presence of discrimination.</li><li>• Poverty can be alleviated despite the presence of discrimination.</li></ul></li><li>• The relationship (or lack of) between discrimination and poverty is clearly/convincingly explained.</li><li>• Successful/failed alleviation of poverty may be asserted.</li></ul> <p>15:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Additionally, at least one argument attempted contains evidence of poverty and discrimination.</li><li>• Successful/failed alleviation of poverty is clearly/convincingly explained.</li></ul>
16 - 18	<p>16:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• All paragraphs contain evidence of poverty and discrimination.</li><li>• One paragraph contains evidence of P and D, but there are examples of alleviation/failure.</li><li>• Successful/failed alleviation of poverty is clearly/convincingly explained.</li></ul> <p>17-18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• All paragraphs contain evidence of poverty and discrimination.</li><li>• Successful/failed alleviation of poverty is support with evidence in at least one argument.</li></ul>
19 - 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Every argument is fully relevant and may consider how poverty may be alleviated despite the presence of discrimination, or how it cannot be alleviated due to the presence of discrimination.</li><li>• Examples are present in all paragraphs.</li></ul>

**Question 6: 'Dictatorships are more efficient than democracies.' Discuss.****Descriptors for content mark:**

10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>→ Script demonstrates gross misunderstanding of key terms 'dictatorships'* and 'democracies'</li><li>→ Script demonstrates gross misunderstanding of key term 'efficient' eg efficient in promoting human rights without showing how human rights are a function to be protected by the govt.</li><li>→ Script does not even attempt comparison between dictatorships and democracies.</li></ul>
----	--

	<p><a href="https://www.britannica.com/topic/dictatorship">*https://www.britannica.com/topic/dictatorship</a></p> <p><b>Dictatorship</b>, form of government in which one person or a small group possesses absolute power without effective <u>constitutional</u> limitations. The term dictatorship comes from the Latin title <u>dictator</u>, which in the <u>Roman Republic</u> designated a temporary magistrate who was granted extraordinary powers in order to deal with state crises.</p>
11-12	<p>→ Script <b>does</b> demonstrate some understanding of key terms 'dictatorships' and 'democracies'</p> <p>→ Script <b>does</b> demonstrate some understanding of key term 'efficient' (even if understanding is not 100% accurate).</p> <p>→ Script <b>does</b> attempt a comparison between dictatorships and democracies.</p> <p>→ <b>Script has <u>zero</u> concrete examples</b></p>
13-14	<p>→ <b>SPECIAL RULE: 1 <u>pass-quality</u> para (relevant reasoning + concrete example) guarantees 13 marks.</b></p> <p>→ Script <b>does</b> demonstrate some understanding of key terms 'dictatorships' and 'democracies'</p> <p>→ Script <b>does</b> demonstrate some understanding of key term 'efficient' (even if understanding is not 100% accurate or if it is limited to speed / how quick, in various situations).</p> <p>→ Script <b>does</b> attempt a comparison between dictatorships and democracies.</p> <p>→ <b>Script has some (at least 1) concrete examples</b></p>
15-16	<p>→ <b>SPECIAL RULE: 1 <u>good quality</u> para (relevant and valid reasoning + <u>good quality</u> concrete example) guarantees 15 marks; 2 of such paragraphs guarantee 16 marks.</b></p> <p>→ <b>Script shows a consideration of some of the advantages (in terms of efficiency) of dictatorships OR some of the weaknesses (in terms of efficiency) of democracies.</b></p> <p>→ Script does demonstrate some understanding of key terms 'dictatorships' and 'democracies'</p> <p>→ Script does demonstrate some understanding of key term 'efficient' (even if understanding is not 100% accurate).</p> <p>→ Script has some <b>good quality</b> concrete examples</p>
17-18	<p>→ Script shows a consideration of some of the advantages (in terms of efficiency) of dictatorships OR some of the weaknesses (in terms of efficiency) of democracies.</p> <p>→ Script does demonstrate some understanding of key terms 'dictatorships' and 'democracies'</p> <p>→ Script does demonstrate some understanding of key term 'efficient' (even if understanding is not 100% accurate).</p> <p>→ Script makes a <b>fair and sensible</b> (i.e. not biased, myopic, or uninformed) comparison between dictatorships and democracies.</p> <p>→ Script <b>consistently</b> makes a comparison between dictatorships and democracies.</p> <p>→ Script <b>consistently (at least 3 paragraphs)</b> has good quality concrete examples</p>
19-20	<p>→ Script shows a consideration of some of the advantages (in terms of efficiency) of dictatorships OR some of the weaknesses (in terms of efficiency) of democracies.</p> <p>→ Script does demonstrate some understanding of key terms 'dictatorships' and 'democracies'</p> <p>→ Script does demonstrate some understanding of key term 'efficient' (even if understanding is not 100% accurate).</p> <p>→ Script makes a fair and sensible (i.e. not biased, myopic, or uninformed) comparison between dictatorships and democracies.</p> <p>→ Script <b>consistently (at least 3 paragraphs)</b> has good quality concrete examples</p> <p>→ <b>Scripts have a good range of points (i.e. not just talking about 1 type of efficiency).</b></p>
21 and above	<p>→ <b>Script raises good insights (e.g. "The type of efficiency that dictatorship promotes is not as important as the type of efficiency that democracy promotes.").</b></p>

#### Question Analysis (Generic/Ambiguous/Key Terms):

Topical term	Dictatorship Democracy	<p>A dictatorship is one in which the leader has absolute rule / total power over a nation or state, and usually obtained his position of power by force.</p> <p>A democracy is one in which the people rule, and the leader is often more concerned with meeting the people's wants and feeding their citizens' needs.</p> <p>The leader often gets elected into office through voting.</p>
--------------	---------------------------	--

Generic terms	More efficient than	Comparison required. Efficiency with regards to speed of processes, maximum productivity, minimum wasted effort or expense. Note that measuring efficiency is quite specific and students should not digress into which is “better”. [For a democracy, students need to be aware of the range of democracies and what political processes can be voted over in which nations, as the rules of each type of democracy can differ from country to country. Dictatorships are more straightforward (but examples should be varied). ]
Context term	General	Since the context is not specified, students can bring in both past and present examples to prove the comparison between the two systems of governance.

### Suggested Approaches:

<b>Possible stand: Dictatorships are more efficient.</b>	<b>Possible stand: Dictatorships are not always more efficient. Democracies can be more efficient, and some forms more so than others.</b>
TS1: Decisions to expand a nation’s assets and land are often more speedily made in a dictatorship, as the ruler has a good vision over what he wishes to achieve with his conquests. Once plans are made, the strike can occur at the leader’s command. Democracies can cause a simple decision to become a long-drawn process due to the process of voting and seeking public opinion on issues; dictators can make a more specific call in such times.	TS1: Democratic rulers are able to know their people’s wants and desires more clearly than dictators, and be able to establish policies that meet these desires in a more targeted manner. Hence while it may take longer for decisions to be made and policies to be rolled out, in the long run, it minimises unnecessary time and effort spent making changes.
TS2: Political objectives are often clearer when the leader has his way to pave the way forward for the nation. This is opposed to a democracy where voice is given to not only the people but opposing parties within the government, causing a lack of focus in direction at times.	TS2: There are forms of democracies that actually do not require the consultation of the people for most of the decisions made, and thus are as efficient as dictatorships.
TS3: In dictatorships, decisions/policies can be rolled out without unnecessary expenditure of time and resources to garner feedback and approval.	

### Question 7: Should there be any limits placed on artistic expression?

#### Descriptors for content mark:

Mark range	Descriptors
10 - 12	<p>10: - Students merely state the various functions of art eg escape from reality</p> <p>11-12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Arguments with no clear idea of what ‘artistic expression’ means (talks about pop culture/media rather than art or freedom of speech (amos yee)).</li> <li>Arguments show some understanding of key terms but lacks any concrete examples</li> </ul>

13 - 15	<p>13-14: - One good argument (either moral or pragmatic) but has weak examples can get a pass.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Throughout essay arguments do not address the possible harm eg threat social cohesion / moral values that artistic expression can cause to society and do not raise the need for setting any limits on such expression.</li> <li>Where examples are provided, they are merely described and not evaluated.</li> </ul> <p>15: - But there is only one good argument that is convincing and examples are well-evaluated.</p>
16 - 18	<p>In order to get 16 and above, student should not have contradictions in stand (i.e. "there should not be any limits", next paragraph "there should be limits in this case")</p> <p>16: - Arguments deal with a narrow range of points (at least two relevant arguments) but there is sustained evaluation, supported by quality examples.</p> <p>17-18: - Arguments show consistent (at least 3 paras) relevance and are supported by examples, but lack the depth of those in the higher bands.</p>
19 – 20	<p>The script displays a deep understanding of the subject of artistic expression, and portrays clearly the polarising tension that unlimited expression can bring to bear on society. Arguments are supported by sustained quality of examples.</p>

#### Question Analysis (Generic/Ambiguous/Key Terms):

Topical term	Artistic expression	Declarations of one's ideas and feelings through the medium of art, whether music, dance, drawing, writing, theatre etc
Generic terms	Should Any limit	<p>Moral and pragmatic arguments (for and against setting limits on artistic expression)</p> <p>A point beyond which people should not cross / censorship / regulations</p> <p>Absolute proposition</p>
Context terms	Default global and current	

#### Suggested Approaches:

Possible stand: There should be limits set on artistic expression.	Possible stand: There should be no limits set on artistic expression.
TS1: The protection of an individual's rights ends when these rights impinge on the safety and rights of others. To create an exception for art would be hypocritical and justifying content such as hate speech as a form of art is providing a loophole for its existence.	TS1: Stifling free expression, particularly the creative abilities of human beings, is a violation of the individual's right as a human being. Civil rights should not be restricted so long as no illegal acts are committed in the creative process.
TS2: Many forms of modern art seek to push the boundaries on topics like sex, race, religion or politics, beyond what is acceptable, and such content may not be suitable for everyone, eg children have to be protected, and it should be up to the society to decide on the level of tolerance for itself and impose limits, where necessary.	TS2: The public should have a choice in deciding whether to view or access the content without the need for limits to be imposed. Everyone should exercise his personal discretion, eg parents should refrain from taking their children to view art that they deem offensive.

	TS3: Art is often a platform for political commentary and for limits to be imposed by the government, it would defeat this purpose of art and potentially hinder any chance for change.
--	---

### Question 8: To what extent are wars and conflicts due to poor leadership?

#### Descriptors for content mark:

Mark range	Descriptors
10 - 12	<p>10: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Question is misinterpreted:</b> e.g. no mention of poor leadership, or no mention of other factors, or no mention of cause of effect from these three elements.</li> </ul> <p>11-12:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Poor leadership” barely addressed acceptably <b>[student tried to address but did a very poor job]</b></li> <li>“Wars” and “conflicts” barely addressed acceptably</li> </ul> <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extremely limited - one relevant one - (e.g., Singapore only, or only mention of a cliché case, such as those of Hitler or merely historical contexts and no recent ones) <b>[The clichéd Hitler example cannot be accepted even if well-explained?]</b></li> </ul> <p>Issue is dealt with as such:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Simply stating “Wars” or “conflicts” are caused by “Poor leadership”, without necessarily proving it <b>[no attempt even to show how war/conflict brought/not brought about about by poor leadership]</b></li> </ul>
13 - 15	<p>13-14:</p> <p>Understanding of Terms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Poor leadership” addressed by merely alluding to it</li> <li>“Wars” or “Conflicts” collapsed into 1 topic instead of being dealt with separately; meaning, only one is addressed <b>[Are we then expecting students to (i) deal with both tensions and armed conflict and (i) deal with both international and domestic war?]</b> <b>[Possible to shift this requirement for scope/range of points to the 19-20 band?]</b></li> </ul> <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extremely limited - one relevant one - (e.g., Singapore only, or only mention of a cliché case, such as those of Hitler or merely historical contexts and no recent ones)</li> </ul> <p>Issue is dealt with as such:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Poor leadership” has led to wars; Other factors have led to wars/conflicts too - this is proven through examples (example driven) without being able to name exactly what the other factor other than poor leadership is, that has led to wars.</li> </ul> <p>15:</p> <p>Understanding of Terms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Poor leadership” addressed by some attempt to paraphrase and explain it (such as, “short-sighted, rash...etc.”); but minimal</li> <li>“Wars” or “Conflicts” both are being dealt with <b>[Possible to shift this requirement for scope/range of points to the 19-20 band?]</b></li> <li></li> </ul> <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Somewhat limited - two - and cliché as well (e.g., Singapore only, or only mention of cliché cases, such as those of Hitler or merely historical contexts and no recent ones); they are mostly ‘narrative’ <b>[Are we able to shift this requirement for original (non-cliché) examples to a higher band?]</b></li> </ul> <p>Issue is dealt with as such:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Poor leadership” such as (such and such...) have led to conflict and wars; Other factors have led to wars too - this is proven through examples (example driven) without being</li> </ul>

	able to name exactly what the other factor other than poor leadership is, that has led to wars. <b>[Can we shift this requirement to bring in other factors (to evaluate extent) to the 16-18 band?] [To get 15 student does not need to mention other factors than leadership.]</b>
16 - 18	<p>16:</p> <p>Understanding of Terms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Poor leadership” addressed by acceptable attempts to paraphrase and explain it (such as, “short-sighted, rash...etc.”)</li> <li>• “Wars” or “Conflicts” both are being dealt with</li> </ul> <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acceptable range of evidence that range from simply ‘narrative’ with hints of apt use, to some aptly used</li> </ul> <p>Issue is dealt with as such:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Poor leadership” such as (such and such...) have led to conflict and wars; Other factors (such as geographical location, having aggressive neighbours, history of violence and tensions, land and capital ...etc.) have led to wars too, with some evidence that range from simply ‘narrative’ with hints of apt use, to some aptly used <b>[To get 16 student must mention <u>specifically</u> other factors than leadership.]</b></li> </ul> <p>17-18:</p> <p>Understanding of Terms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Poor leadership” addressed by acceptable attempts to paraphrase and explain it (such as, “short-sighted, rash...etc.”)</li> <li>• “Wars” or “Conflicts” both are being dealt with</li> </ul> <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acceptable range of evidence that are all aptly used</li> </ul> <p>Issue is dealt with as such:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Poor leadership” such as (such and such...) have led to conflict and wars; Other factors (such as geographical location, having aggressive neighbours, history of violence and tensions, land and capital ...etc.) have led to wars too, with a range of evidence all aptly used</li> </ul>
19 - 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All the above +</li> <li>• Impressive list of evidence all aptly used</li> </ul>
21 - 23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>All the above +</b></li> <li>• Attempt to evaluate how far <b>[e.g. within this case/scenario, the degree to which poor leadership caused war and conflict]</b> and how true <b>[e.g. across cases, how many wars and conflicts are caused by poor leadership?]</b> it is that wars and conflicts are caused by poor leadership or by other factors as mentioned; not sophisticated but acceptable; e.g., by number of cases...etc.</li> </ul>
24 - 25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>All the above +</b></li> <li>• Attempt to evaluate how far and how true it is that wars and conflicts are caused by poor leadership or by other factors as mentioned; sophisticatedly done; e.g. wars and conflicts are caused by a combination of both poor leadership and other factors, as history as shown... or... that largely it is due to poor leadership, as history has shown how good leadership can help avert these imminent (brought about by other factors) wars and conflicts, many a times, as well as, how poor leadership has led to many of them.</li> </ul>

#### Question 9: Should science progress without any influence from religion?

##### Descriptors for content mark:

Mark range	Descriptors
------------	-------------



10 - 12	<p>10:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question is misinterpreted: e.g. DOES NOT show understanding that 'religion' here implies the whole host of moral implications it professes to teach and uphold (e.g. Belief that one must not 'play God', 'manipulate nature as it is intended to be', must not 'hurt or kill people, even the unborn or those with the potential to be alive', and that one must follow these rules and precepts, regardless of the benefits progress).</li> <li>• No relevant evidence</li> </ul> <p>11-12:</p> <p>Understanding of Terms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Science progress", "Religion" and "Influence" are addressed by merely alluding to them – there is no clear attempts to explain the CONNECTION between religion and science, but allude to them as almost like separate entities.</li> <li>• "Should" barely addressed; merely stated as claims without reasoning.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Range from none to extremely limited evidence of "should/should not influence" - limited to merely cliché ones that are somewhat outdated and used as mostly as 'narrative'.</li> </ul> <p>Issue is dealt with as such:</p> <p>Basically, attempts at proving (through reasoning and evidence) that science is being hampered by religion, or religion being useful for science progress, are mostly made as (ranging from) none to basic sweeping claims (such as R will hinder S, R is important as it teaches morals...etc.)</p>
13 - 15	<p>Understanding of Terms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Science progress", "Religion" and "Influence" are addressed by merely alluding to them – there is no clear attempts to explain the CONNECTION between religion and science, but allude to them as almost like separate entities.</li> <li>• "Should" barely addressed and unconvincingly proven with weak reasoning; such as "should because it is right; it is beneficial" or "should not because it is against it; obstructs it" WITHOUT any or much elaboration on how it is 'right', 'beneficial', or how it 'obstructs' it.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extremely limited evidence of "should/should not influence" - limited to merely cliché ones that are somewhat outdated and used as mostly as 'narrative'.</li> </ul> <p>Issue is dealt with as such:</p> <p>Basically, attempts at proving (through reasoning and evidence) that science is being hampered by religion, or religion being useful for science progress, are mostly made as (ranging from) basic sweeping claims (such as R will hinder S, R is important as it teaches morals...etc.) to general, unsubstantiated claims to claims that are poorly substantiated by evidence</p>
16 - 18	<p>16:</p> <p>Understanding of Terms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Science progress", "Religion" and "Influence" acceptably paraphrased and explained as (types of science progress: cloning, stem cell research, IVF, abortion, animals testing, cryogenics, sex change, transhumanism...etc.; types of religion: Islam, Christianity, Hinduism, Buddhism, and their ideals: Belief that one must not 'play God', 'manipulate nature as it is intended to be', must not 'hurt or kill people, even the unborn or those with the potential to be alive', and that one must follow these rules and precepts, regardless of the benefits progress).</li> <li>• Clear attempt to consistently show the connection between religion and science and whether it helps promote a safer and more humane form of scientific progress or whether it hinders it much.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence moves away from cliché to more recent and significant cases, and instead of being narrative, now is used sometimes aptly to show the religion promotes or hinders science progress.</li> </ul> <p>Issue is dealt with as such:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Religion" is shown in acceptable manner how it either hinders or promotes science progress. Evidence sometimes aptly used.</li> </ul>

	17-18: All the above + Evidence is all aptly used to substantiate stand.
19 - 20	All the above + Impressive list of evidence used Reasons are more sophisticated – Sci needs Rel in order to 1) curb the rampant capitalistic and financial exploitation of research materials for profit rather than humanity due to R's persistence in fighting for the rights of individuals and society and keep science progress for the sake of humanity instead of profit-making MNCs; or, Rel should not be allowed to influence Rel because 1) its own precepts are questionable and outdated, 2) its hindering science progress has led to lives 'lost', led to 'lands uncharted', slowing down progress which might be extremely detrimental given our environmental predicament or health-related issues of pain, death, etc, 3) Rel is not needed for a society to be deemed as moral (as logic and open discussion is the way to go)
21 - 23	All the above + Attempts to address 'any' (the extent portion) of question by explaining, rather unoriginally, that because of the overwhelming number of cases...etc.
24 - 25	All the above + Attempts at a sophisticated address of 'any' (the extent portion) of question, by explaining, rather originally, that both need each other, in all areas of research, because doing away with religion is in fact going against the idea of freedom of ideas and speech and discussion, and might end up hampering more progress for science, as ultimately science is a tool that is used to serve humanity, and not be a ruler of all. Science, in many cases, requires the portion in Rel that grounds universal morals strongly in society, and ought to have such positive influence and backing indeed, but at the same time, be allowed to do away, or at least question, other Rel moral implications (such as right to abort, IVF, stem cell research ...etc. as history has shown, since Galileo, that in time, Rel can be more open, and somehow, ironically, even be made more progressive, by Science, to become a positive influence of Science as well.

- "should be present or not" or "should we have religion or not"

**Question 10: To what extent can Singapore be optimistic about the future given her limitations?**

**Descriptors for content mark:**

Mark range	Descriptors
10 - 12	10: - Arguments with no clear idea of what it means to 'be optimistic about her future' + no clear unpacking of the condition  11-12: <b>No projection to the future</b> , merely describes Singapore currently (our strengths and weaknesses) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No mention of Singapore's limitations (or a mere repeat "Singapore's limitations" without explaining or mentioning what it is)</li> </ul>

13 - 15	<p>13-14:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- One good argument with <u>evaluation of Singapore characteristics to warrant a sense of optimism</u> can get a pass.</li> <li>- <u>Every paragraph deals with 'pessimistic' without a single paragraph dealing with various degrees of optimism</u> but clearly discusses Singapore characteristics. (<u>cap at 13</u>. Reasoning: you can have little optimism yet not be pessimistic)</li> <li>- Superficial treatment of Singapore characteristics (whether strengths or weaknesses) and little evaluation of characteristics of Singaporeans eg resilience, and of actions (eg policies to overcome weaknesses)</li> <li>- Every paragraph deals with <u>international events that Singapore is unable to tackle, without providing characteristics of Singapore</u> (in terms of vulnerabilities and actions being taken to overcome the vulnerabilities) - essentially the same argument repeated over and over again with different examples</li> <li>- <u>Superficial discussion of characteristics of the possible future landscape that warrants concern</u> (what does 'optimistic' or 'having a bright future' mean?) i.e. student projects to the future but rather generally without surfacing a specific aspect of the future to be optimistic about.</li> </ul> <p>15:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- One very good argument (well illustrated), with evaluation of Singapore's vulnerabilities or strengths, to meet the challenges ahead.</li> </ul>
16 - 18	<p>16: - All paragraphs deal with <u>only one aspect</u> of Singapore's future eg economic aspect but there is sustained (at least two paragraphs) discussion of Singapore characteristics and sustained quality of examples</p> <p>17-18: - Arguments deal with a <u>range of aspects</u> concerning Singapore's future, eg social and economic, and are able to consider the various government policies / characteristics of its people to deal with both domestic as well as global challenges leading to Singapore's ability to weather the uncertainties ahead.</p>
19 – 20	The script displays a <u>deep understanding</u> of the various domestic, regional and global limitations and challenges confronted by Singapore and is able to evaluate the extent of success of a range of solutions to weather the challenges presented.
21 - 23	Beyond surfacing the range of challenges faced by Singapore, the script consistently displays evaluation of extent eg degree of optimism, eg short-term vs long-term, reach of effect, root cause, etc, within each paragraph (i.e. internal evaluation of extent of optimism)

#### Question Analysis (Generic/Ambiguous/Key Terms):

Topical term	Optimistic about the future	Confident about the future, assessed in terms of the nation's ability to mitigate external and internal threats
Generic terms	To what extent	Students should qualify the degree to which this statement is true in their overall stand by either quantifying the optimism (very optimistic, not that optimistic) or providing conditions or areas in which we can be optimistic, and other areas in which we may not be able to be so optimistic.
	can	Ability to achieve something
Context term	Your society	Relevant characteristics of Singapore context should be considered

Condition	Given her limitations	The condition has to be acknowledged throughout the essay. The condition is not up for debate. Students should consider relevant limitations that might affect Singapore's ability to be optimistic e.g. small land size, ageing population etc.
-----------	-----------------------	--

### Suggested Approaches:

Possible stand: Singapore can hardly be optimistic about the future	Possible stand: Singapore can largely be optimistic about the future
TS1: Given Singapore's geographical location and limitations such as lack of resources and smallness of its population causing it to be highly dependent on the actions of major economies, no matter what Singapore does, it is unable to tackle external threats of geopolitics and economic and political uncertainties on a global level.	TS1: Recognising its geographical limitations, the government has successfully established diplomatic relations with many countries and leveraged on its location in South East Asia to form a strong regional grouping, ASEAN, to negotiate its relations with the world on a collective basis. So far, this has led to regional stability and more opportunities for employment, business, trade and travel.
TS2: On the domestic front, given Singapore's persistent low birth rates despite many years of government incentives, a rapidly ageing population and a reluctance to embrace a liberal foreign talent inflow, productivity and domestic growth rates will always be capped by such limitations.	TS2: While low birth rates may be a persistent problem, Singapore has tweaked its immigration policies to place priority on jobs for Singaporeans, while at the same time, leveraging on technology to overcome manpower issues, resulting in reasons for optimism.
TS3: Within the country, the multi-religious and multi-racial composition of its population presents challenges in the form of prejudice and discrimination which are inherently hard to overcome, a crisis along the lines of a racial riot which had happened before, such as a terrorist attack, can fracture the society along racial lines.	TS3: Given the multi-religious and multi-racial composition of its population which may be a potential cause for divisiveness, the government has managed race relations well through policies encouraging social cohesion and laws on censorship that lay down out-of-bounds markers to prevent actions that can spread ill-will, so there is no reason to worry.

### Question 11: 'Consumerist lifestyles should be discouraged, not promoted.' Do you agree?

#### Descriptors for content mark:

10	→ Script demonstrates gross misunderstanding of key terms 'consumerist lifestyle'. → Script does not address the 'should' in the question, and merely describes how things currently are, rather than how they ought to be.
11-12	→ Script <b>does</b> demonstrate some understanding of key terms 'consumerist lifestyle'. → Script <b>does</b> address the 'should' in the question. → <b>Script talks about either (i) the pros of consumerism or (ii) the cons of consumerism.</b> → <b>Script has <u>zero</u> concrete examples</b> → <b>NOTE: Credit scripts that attempt to weigh pros against cons.</b>
13-14	→ <b>SPECIAL RULE: 1 <u>pass-quality</u> para (relevant reasoning + concrete example) guarantees 13 marks.</b> → Script <b>does</b> demonstrate some understanding of key terms 'consumerist lifestyle'. → Script <b>does</b> address the 'should' in the question. → Script talks about either (i) the pros of consumerism or (ii) the cons of consumerism. → <b>Script has some (at least 1) concrete examples</b> → <b>NOTE: Credit scripts that attempt to weigh pros against cons.</b>

15-16	<p>→ <b>SPECIAL RULE: 1 <u>good quality</u> para (relevant and <u>valid</u> reasoning + <u>good quality</u> concrete example) guarantees 15 marks; 2 of such paragraphs guarantee 16 marks.</b></p> <p>→ Script does demonstrate some understanding of key terms 'consumerist lifestyle'.</p> <p>→ Script does address the 'should' in the question.</p> <p>→ Script talks about <b>both</b> (i) the pros of consumerism <b>and</b> (ii) the cons of consumerism.</p> <p>→ Script has some <b>good quality</b> concrete examples</p> <p>→ <b>NOTE: Credit scripts that attempt to weigh pros against cons.</b></p>
17-18	<p>→ <b>Script shows a consideration of some of the <u>major</u> advantages and drawbacks of consumerism (i.e. student must demonstrate a more-than-superficial knowledge of this topic).</b></p> <p>→ Script does demonstrate some understanding of key terms 'consumerist lifestyle'.</p> <p>→ Script does address the 'should' in the question.</p> <p>→ Script talks about both (i) the pros of consumerism and (ii) the cons of consumerism.</p> <p>→ Script has <b>a good number of</b> good quality concrete examples</p> <p>→ <b>NOTE: Credit scripts that attempt to weigh pros against cons.</b></p>
19-20	<p>→ Script shows a consideration of some of the <u>major</u> advantages and drawbacks of consumerism (i.e. student must demonstrate a more-than-superficial knowledge of this topic).</p> <p>→ Script does demonstrate some understanding of key terms 'consumerist lifestyle'.</p> <p>→ Script does address the 'should' in the question.</p> <p>→ Script talks about both (i) the pros of consumerism and (ii) the cons of consumerism.</p> <p>→ Script has a good number of good quality concrete examples</p> <p>→ Script <b>convincingly</b> weighs pros against cons.</p> <p>→ <b>Scripts have a good range of points.</b></p> <p>→ <b>Script raises good insights.</b></p>

#### Question Analysis (Generic/Ambiguous/Key Terms):

Topical term	Consumerist lifestyles	A lifestyle characterised by buying and buying, always seeking the most fashionable, the latest product or the better-than-before. The assumption that people will discard the old for the newer items as well.
Generic terms	Should be + discouraged vs promoted	Consider benefits vs problems OR pro and cons of such a lifestyle or the pragmatic considerations of whether to encourage such a lifestyle and Consider the moral / ethical standpoint of whether such a wasteful, materialistic lifestyle has only negative impacts to the environment, to the self, to future generations.
Context term	General	Though the context is not specified, relevant characteristics of today's world should be fleshed out e.g. media / advertising promoting consumption habits like buying the latest product, globalisation leading to access to a greater variety of goods, goods of other nations, or leading to constant product improvements as well.

**Suggested Approaches:**

Possible stand: Consumerist lifestyles should be discouraged, not promoted	Possible stand: Consumerist lifestyles should be promoted, not discouraged
TS1: Knowing that buying more means more waste as the older and outdated products likely get thrown away, people should be advised to turn away from such a materialistic pursuit of the latest things as global waste is a growing problem.	TS1: The only way to push innovation and creation of better products is to constantly target the desires of consumers and meet their wants. With this in mind, it is only right to encourage purchases and luxurious pursuits.
TS2: In addition, natural resources get used up ever more quickly as such wasteful lifestyles are adopted and the use of these resources are often for rather intangible or inconsequential purposes like making one look trendy and fashionable.	TS2: After a nation has reached a level of development, the next step to make life better for the people is to encourage a higher standard of living. A consumerist lifestyle is a natural rite of passage for such nations who have a growing purchasing power.
TS3: In this age of globalisation where consumers have access to a wide variety of goods, promoting the consumerist lifestyle only serves to raise our carbon footprint as we produce more and transport them over long distances to overseas markets.	TS3: Moreover, given the information age that we are in, where it is easy to learn of the cultures and the fashion styles of other nations, promoting products and services to other nations is a way of growing a particular brand's market share and earn greater profits.
TS4: From an ethical standpoint, we cannot continue to encourage such irresponsible lifestyles without regard for the environment and future generations.	

**Question 12: 'There is too much emphasis on image today.' Do you agree?****Descriptors for content mark:**

Mark range	Descriptors
10 - 12	<p>10:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incorrect understanding of the term 'image' - photos, pictures, posters etc.</li> <li>No clear understanding of the notion of having too much emphasis.</li> </ul> <p>11-12:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Somewhat limited understanding of the term 'image' mainly as physical appearance and looks.</li> <li>AND Anecdotal description of how being concerned with image has negative impacts/can be beneficial.</li> <li>AND Presentation of negative impacts fails to capture the severity required to prove 'too much emphasis'.</li> </ul>
13 - 15	<p>13-14:</p> <p>TO PASS, STUDENT MUST SHOW EXTENT+NEGATIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understanding of image may still be limited to the individual level (physical appearance and looks).</li> <li>There is at least an argument that addresses image in a relevant manner.</li> <li>Explanation of argument captures the severity of 'too much' or that there is not 'too much'.</li> <li>Evidence might still be anecdotal/general.</li> <li>There might be concrete evidence that fails to support the yardstick.</li> </ul>

	<p>15:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is at least one relevant argument that successfully proves 'too much' or not 'too much'.</li> <li>• Concrete evidence is present for this argument too.</li> </ul>
16 - 18	<p>16:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are relevant arguments (at least two) but there is a lack of consistency in explaining the yardstick or providing concrete evidence.</li> </ul> <p>17-18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arguments may be limited to individual but should go beyond just physical appearance</li> <li>• There are at least three relevant arguments with yardstick clearly explained/addressed, concrete examples are present.</li> </ul>
19 - 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All arguments contain concrete evidence and clear explanation of the yardstick.</li> <li>• <b>Arguments cover a good range of 'image', going beyond just the individual level.</b></li> </ul>