

Q1: 'Everyone should have a right to free healthcare.' To what extent do you agree?

Concept Clarification & PoC:

- **Everyone:** every person regardless of race, nationality, income or socio-economic status
- **Right to free healthcare:** entitled to the provision of medical care without costs
- **PoC:** Whether every individual should be entitled to the provision of medical care without having to pay for it.

Suggested Approach & Stand

- Students need to understand why free healthcare may be viewed as a right and clearly unpack the reasons why.
- For balance, students should show why having such a policy may present problems in society, especially in the long run and how there are limitations that must be carefully considered. The key term 'should' requires an analysis of the likely merits, demerits, and limitations of such a policy in reality.
- Being an 'extent' question, students may use concessions as long as there is no self-contradiction. However, where possible, rebuttals to the OV would normally strengthen the argument.
- **Stand:** 1) To a large extent, everyone should have a right to free healthcare 2) The right to free healthcare should not be given to everyone because of problems that could possibly arise

Likely Pitfalls

- Students may discuss what has already been done in terms of providing healthcare for everyone eg provision of quality healthcare services, co-payments and subsidies. This does not address 'should', only 'could'.

Largely agree that everyone should have a right to free healthcare.	
1	Free health care should be viewed as a right, not a privilege. The right to health care has long been recognised internationally in Article 25 in UN's Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). Yet many developed countries do not really have free health care systems, only a health insurance system eg. United States, Singapore etc., thus making healthcare expensive and unaffordable for the poor and low-income groups. There should be a comprehensive system of health care, which is free and available to everyone without discrimination, hence making equality a reality when it comes to access to basic healthcare.
2	Making sure that everyone has a right to free healthcare can help to stop some of the world's biggest killers. The poorest and most marginalised populations usually bear the brunt of preventable maternal deaths and diseases like HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and non-communicable diseases (e.g. cancer and heart disease). Hence, giving everyone the right, and access, to free healthcare could save many lives in the world.
3	It is the state's responsibility to see to the well-being of every citizen, particularly in the wake of a pandemic, hence it is crucial that free healthcare is made available to everyone. Indeed, the social contract between an elected government and its citizens makes the government principally morally obliged to help citizens by providing free healthcare for everyone. The government is inextricably bound by such a social contract and has the moral obligation to alleviate sufferings and protect the lives of its citizens. (Eg. Free COVID-19 testing)
4	The lack of affordable and quality health care can further trap families and nations in poverty. Hence, it is imperative to ensure that everyone is able to gain access to medical care freely so as to break free from the vicious cycle of poverty.
5	There is a need to ensure that everyone has access to free healthcare so as to prevent profiteering at the expense of the lives and well-being of the poor. The state should ensure that even the most marginalised segments of any population should be able to live lives of dignity.
Largely disagree that everyone should have a right to free healthcare due to negative implications and problems that could possibly arise.	
1	Providing free healthcare takes away personal responsibility and accountability for one's own health. It could amount to socialism where the provision of benefits and social services is made available for everyone. This means that inadvertently government spending on healthcare would increase, and coupled with the growing trends of an ageing population, over time, this would decrease the quality and availability of health care services, and could lead to larger government debt and deficits. Research from George Mason University concludes that providing government funded health care to all could increase federal spending by \$32.6 trillion over the first ten years of implementation. Another survey showed that an excess of £140bn was spent on health across the UK - more than 10 times the figure that was ploughed in 60 years ago.
2	Having a free healthcare system can lead to abuse where people overuse healthcare resources and seek treatments over the slightest ailments. When people are not directly responsible for the costs of medical service, this may result in a 'moral hazard', where people utilise more health resources than necessary. This could result in rationing of medical service and shortage of medical staff. Eg. Countries with a universal right to health care have longer wait times than those who do not have. Statistical data has revealed that the average wait time to see a specialist in Canada is 60 days versus 24 days in the United States.
3	Providing a right to free health care could raise taxes, eventually causing much resentment among the people. In European countries with a universal right to health care, the cost of coverage is paid through higher taxes. In the United Kingdom and other European countries, payroll taxes average 37% – much higher than the 15.3% payroll taxes paid by the average US worker.

Q2. 'My life, my choice.' Is this good advice for the young people in your society?

Concept Clarification & PoC:

- My life, my choice: being in control of one's life, making decisions autonomously and taking personal responsibility
- Good advice: sound, sensible motto to adhere to
- Young people in your society: youth between 15 and 35 years old (as defined by Singapore's National Youth Council)
- POC: To consider if it is feasible for young people in Singapore to be given the autonomy to make their own decisions and choices in life.

Suggested Approach & Stand

- Student are to examine the context of youth in Singapore, considering their mentality, attitude and stance towards the matter. They should also explain **WHY** this is a piece of good advice for the youth in Singapore.
- They should also identify the different traits of young people in Singapore that will warrant such advice necessary, beneficial or detrimental. For example, characteristics like being overly sheltered by helicopter parents, reliant on parental guidance etc.
- Stand: 1) Yes, it is good advice for young people in Singapore to make their own choices in life. 2) No, it is not good advice for young people in Singapore to make their own choices in life.

Likely Pitfalls

- Students may not contextualise the question to young people in their society, with characteristics lacking.
- May lack concrete examples to substantiate arguments.

No, it is not good advice for young people in Singapore.	
1	Choices that are made do not concern the individual's life alone, especially in an Asian society like SG which emphasises communal values more than individualism. To allow the young people to do whatever they wish could lead to a rippling effect and result in far more severe repercussions. Eg. a 19-year-old youth was arrested for his involvement in inciting violence and posting hateful comments on social media with the intent to wound religious feelings. Eg. 2 Influencer Christabel Chua (@bellywellyjelly) was left picking the pieces after her private sex videos with ex-boyfriend of four years and fellow YouTuber Joal Ong were leaked and disseminated without her consent. Eg. 3 Amos Yee and his offensive remarks about Lee Kuan Yew and Christianity.
2	In a society like SG with helicopter parents, it is difficult for young people to make their own choices. Many parents exercise tight control and supervision over their children even until they enter the university and some support their children financially even after graduating from the university. Helicopter parenting has led to many young adults depending on their parents even until adulthood, hence it is difficult for them to make their own choices in life. Many suffer from thought paralysis, and are also unable to make good choices and decisions.
3	Youth in SG have been leading far too comfortable lives in an affluent society which is centred on self-gratification. To promote the notion of leading their own lives based on their own choices could further breed selfish behaviour. Such self-centredness will tear the social fabric of SG where highly competitive and self-serving individuals will stop at nothing to achieve personal goals at the expense of others. A survey done by the Singapore Kindness Movement in 2019 showed an unhealthy level of self-centeredness and self-absorption amongst the young people in SG. Hence, such advice will only encourage self-serving needs amongst youth in SG.
Yes, it is good advice for young people in Singapore.	
1	Given how young people in SG tend to receive an inordinate amount of support and handholding from their parents and/or teachers, especially during their childhood days, they should now be given the space to explore and learn to make their own choices. Such form of empowerment will help to build resilience and reduce apathy in them as they are actively involved in the decision-making process rather than being passive recipients. Besides, it is important as part of their growing process and helps to hone their decision-making ability and take responsibility for own decisions made. This is important for the youths who will inherit and shape the country's future. (Rebuttal to SV2)
2	In this day and age where individual rights are championed and upheld by many societies, it is only right to encourage independence and personal decision-making amongst the youth. This is especially so given the rising trend of youth activism in the form of micro-volunteerism, on-demand help provision, crowdfunding, giving circles and ground-up movements in SG. Hence, the advice is a sound one as the youth in SG can be trusted to make good choices, seeing how so many have chosen to do good with their lives, time and resources. Consequently, these trends - most of which are ground-up and social-media-driven - have power to shape the future landscape of social and civic participation in SG. From the two young founders of a 3D printing start-up who created face shields for front-liners, to the two 18-year-olds who started Comm.Unity SG to help SG's homeless; the two youths who started Back Alley Barbers and Social Development Initiative (SDI) Academy to offer free haircuts to migrant workers and train them in basic English respectively. Other recent eggs include the two young hawkers cooking for vulnerable groups during the circuit breaker, the two young civil servants who started Project Stable Staples to support households living in rental blocks so as to blunt the blow of the coronavirus. (Rebuttal to SV3)
3	With the YOLO mentality that most young people have in SG, they are more likely to embrace the notion of making their own decisions in life and be responsible for them. These young people are more willing and less risk-averse in taking the road less travelled to pursue their dreams and aspirations without much support from their family or the government. This will create an environment which moves beyond conformity and spur the

	spirit of innovation and entrepreneurship that SG needs. An online survey conducted by GoDaddy in 2016 showed that 41% youths had plans to launch a business of their own, and that SG ranks highest in the percentage of millennials who start their business while in school with 32%, compared to the global average of 24%. Eg. 1 ShopConcept.Co, an online store selling female apparels which was set up by six Millennial Entrepreneurs in SG. Eg. 2 Ms Delfina Utomo, 25, who spent eight years of studying to get two degrees but gave up a high-paying job to pursue her passion in music to become the lead editor for SG's first live local music gig finder website, Bandwagon.sg.
4	The ease at which young people in SG are able to obtain information or conduct research online compared with a decade or so ago, has also changed the process of how young people learn, internalise information and make decisions. They are very much influenced by the social media and trends and hence are more likely to challenge authority. Hence, autonomy in making personal decisions is necessary to prevent them from developing a penchant for breaking the rules. To push for more control may result in more rebellious youths in SG, hence it is advisable to give leeway for them to make their own choices and lead their lives independently.

Q3: Does education lead to greater or less social equality?

Concept clarification and POC:

- **Education:** formal schooling; an instituted form of teaching and learning knowledge.
- **Social equality:** A concept that sees all members of a society being given completely equal treatment, privileges, rights, status, opportunities and access to resources. Sociologists suggest that few societies achieve total equality because there are so many ways that societies separate its members into groups by gender, race, income level and religion, just to name a few.
- **POC:** Students need to evaluate whether education contributes to more egalitarianism or widens social inequality.

Suggested approach:

- Possible stands: Education leads to greater social equality OR Education leads to less social equality.
- Arguments should show an understanding of the important functions and known merits of education, as well as how education can contribute to inequality or serve as a social leveller.

Likely pitfalls:

- Students may end up merely listing the benefits or functions of education without comparison/evaluation of how it leads to greater or less social equality.
- Weaker students may interpret “social equality” as “income equality” and end up with very narrow scope.
- An area-driven approach which may yield similar points across paragraphs.

Education leads to greater social equality	
1	Good education reduces poverty and improves social mobility. Education has been called the ‘great equaliser’ of society - a major pathway to socioeconomic success. A good education increases the likelihood of higher incomes and possibly lowering poverty. E.g. It is estimated extreme poverty could be halved if universal primary and secondary education were achieved. E.g. UNESCO estimates that each year of schooling raises earnings by around 10% for men and up to 20% for women. Education also boosts opportunity for all. Social mobility, i.e. the possibility for children from poor families to end up better off than their parents, is intimately tied to the availability of education.
2	Bringing society together. Schools can be places where the children of rich and poor families, and of different races, religions and cultures can become friends. In schools, the barriers of inequality are broken down. They can challenge the rules that perpetuate economic inequality in broader society, and give young people the tools to go into the world and build more equitable societies. E.g. For the past 30 years, in a deeply divided society, Integrated schools in Northern Ireland have been intentionally and proactively developed to encourage more mixing in schools. Integrated Schools ensure that children from Protestant and Catholic religious and/or cultural backgrounds, as well as others who identify differently are educated together every day in the same classrooms
3	Good quality education has the power to challenge traditional social attitudes and eliminates gender inequality. Apart from helping to tackle gender disparities in wages and poverty, education improves reproductive autonomy and political power for women. The more educated women are, the more power they have over their lives, particularly over when they marry and how many children they have. E.g. If all girls in sub-Saharan Africa and South and West Asia completed secondary education, there would be a 64% drop in child marriages. It can also lead to more equitable health outcomes for women and their children. The more educated mothers are, the healthier they and their children are. E.g. UNESCO estimates that if all women had completed primary education, there would be a 66% reduction in maternal deaths globally, and a 15% reduction in child deaths.
4	Supporting democratic societies. Education offers individuals the tools to exercise their right to an equal say over the structures and policies that govern their lives, which boosts democracy. Extensive research shows that increased education leads to greater political and civic engagement. E.g. According to OECD, two independent studies have shown that the introduction of compulsory education laws in the United States and the United Kingdom provides evidence that education has a causal relationship to multiple forms of political engagement, including voter turnout, tolerance, and the acquisition of political knowledge.
Education leads to less social inequality	
1	Education can contribute to rising elitism and exacerbate a class divide. There is intensifying competition for places at elite schools, as evidenced by the 2019 College Admissions scandal in the U.S where wealthy parents/celebrities are buying spots in big name schools. Higher-income families invest more in private tuition for academic subjects, extracurricular enrichment activities, and parental attention. This enhances their children’s school performance and chances of getting into “good” schools and universities, thus achieving credentials that employers value and reward with “good jobs” and high salaries. Since school performance is heavily dependent on family resources, lower-income children could underperform relative to higher-income classmates in elite schools, reinforcing stigmatisation from priority admission, and lowering self-esteem which research shows is a major determinant of individual performance. Priority admission for lower-income children would also intensify competition among higher-income students for “fewer” elite school places, thus worsening the “education arms race” . [Possible rebuttal to point 1 above]
2	Expansion of higher education has been accompanied by a widening “college premium” — or gap between graduate and non-graduate incomes — even as the supply of graduates increases. And as university degrees become more common, institutional reputation becomes more important, intensifying competition for places at the most selective institutions, and widening their graduates’ salary premium over graduates of less selective

	institutions. Employers are known to use educational certification and school reputation as “screening devices” that differentiate between job candidates, and as proxies for behavioural characteristics and social networks they believe enhance employees’ contribution to the enterprise. E.g. in South Korea, a major wage difference is found between graduates from top-ranked universities and other universities, regardless of one’s labour productivity.
3	Social segregation in schools breeds social intolerance in communities and workplaces and undermines social understanding and cohesion. Schools segregated by class or race make it more difficult for children to develop a real understanding of people of different backgrounds and to break down barriers of social intolerance. E.g. The bitter struggle to break down racial distinctions in education lasted for decades in the U.S, yet now many American universities are reintroducing segregation, making race the primary determinant of student participation in some activities, such as black student unions or race-based housing facilities. E.g. In Australia, government policies have fostered highly segregated private schools by class, ethnicity and religion. Public schools are increasingly characterised by class and ethnic self-segregation. Many advantaged families have abandoned their local public schools in a search for better-resourced, high quality schools in neighbouring suburbs. Disadvantaged students, including many migrants and refugees, are increasingly concentrated in some schools, while neighbouring schools largely accommodate middle-class white students. White advantaged families are paying hundreds of thousands, even millions of dollars, to buy homes in suburbs to gain entry to coveted schools. [Possible rebuttal to point 2 above]
4	This failure of the education sector to harness and develop women’s talents curtails their ability to contribute meaningfully to society. Education systems may devalue young women’s contributions and underestimate young women’s intellectual abilities. This means that technical and vocational programmes remain a male bastion, for instance. E.g. According to the 2019 Gender GEM Report released at the G7 France – UNESCO, just a quarter of those enrolled in engineering and in information and communications technology programmes are women. In some higher education institutions, systemic gender inequality is seen through skewed enrolments, stereotypical course selection, and poor career progression. E.g. Women still aren’t fully represented in higher education in Kenya and South Africa, despite changes in law and policy over the years. In Kenya and South Africa women still struggle to access institutions of higher education. And they also struggle to succeed in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) related courses, and to progress into postgraduate studies. [Possible rebuttal to point 3 above]

Q4. Should businesses focus solely on making profits in today's world?

Concept Clarification & PoC:

- Businesses: organisations involved in profit-driven commercial activities. Includes MNCs and SMEs
- Focus solely: only pay attention to, care about
- Making profits: generating income, profiteering
- Today's world: current global forces and trends that could possibly account for why businesses should/should not only focus solely on making profits.
- POC: To examine the extent to which businesses should focus only on making profits in today's world, disregarding the implications of their actions on other stakeholders and other responsibilities they may have.

Suggested Approach & Stand

- The assumption here is that in today's world, businesses cannot afford to focus only on making profits. Hence, students need to consider why businesses should look beyond profit-making and shoulder social responsibility given the current trends that impact businesses today.
- Stand: 1) Yes, businesses should focus largely on making profits in today's world 2) No, besides profit-making, businesses need to see to other social responsibilities as well in view of changing trends in the world today.

Likely Pitfalls

- Students ignore the word 'solely', resulting in inadequate discussion of the extent.
- Not linking to today's context of increasing awareness of environmental issues and competitive world

Businesses should focus mainly on making profits	
1	Businesses first and foremost need to be profitable to enable workers to remain employable. Companies that emphasise ethical practices may not be able to sustain them in the long-run and neither will the workers be able to receive competitive wages. In a globalised economy, companies that are unable to improve their sales or bring in profits will not have the necessary financial means to expand its operations in a competitive industry. As business and operations costs escalate, firms will find it increasingly challenging to succeed without an emphasis on profits.
2	In a capitalist society, profit-making is the motivator for starting a business. Hence, its key focus should be to make profits so as to account to its investors and stakeholders. Moreover, profit is an essential part of business for its sustainability to contribute to society and environmental causes.
3	The smaller firms would not have the resources nor the financial clout to see to other social responsibilities. They need to prioritise making profits to stay afloat, hence corporate social responsibility is considered to be a luxury which they cannot afford.
Besides making profits, businesses are also required to see to other social responsibilities in view of changing trends in the world today.	
1	Consumers increasingly expect businesses to be ethical in their business practices. Companies that support community trade and improve the livelihood of the low income workers will benefit from a larger consumer base. Eg. The Ethisphere Institute is an American firm that released a list of ethical businesses in 2011, including Gap Inc., Colgate-Palmolive, illycaffè spa in Italy and Brazil's Natura Cosméticos. For the long-term survival of a company, it must satisfy the customers, employees, shareholders, and the society at large. Hence, making profits cannot be their only goal. For its sustainability, a business should aim at contributing to people, environment and to the society.
2	There is greater governmental support today to encourage corporate social responsibility. Government funding and subsidies will incentivise corporations to develop businesses models that look beyond profit-making and are centred on ethics or are able to contribute to society. Having such government support will also provide a conducive environment which will likely aid their businesses to thrive. Eg. shareholders and investors will have the confidence to pump in more funds, especially in support of government accredited businesses.
3	Even as making profits is foremost on the agendas of businesses, there is a need to ensure that these profits are not made unscrupulously at the expense of consumers' or employees' interest. Besides making profits, a successful business should also focus on other factors like employee well-being and job satisfaction as these are also important in determining the effectiveness of the operations. With staff welfare being taken care of, companies are more likely to see increased productivity and efficiency in business operations. Given how the corporate image must be taken into consideration, the quality of goods and services should also not be compromised at the expense of making profits.
4	Should businesses solely focus on maximisation of profits, they may end up causing inflation which will bring more harm to the society. There could be further negative implications like uneven distribution of wealth, unaffordability of necessities for the poor and disruption in economy. Hence, corporations should not only consider making profits as the only business as the impact on society should also be taken into consideration.

Q5. 'Digital technology is making humans intellectually and socially deficient.' Discuss.

Concept Clarification & PoC:

- Digital technology: Include artificial intelligence, computers, internet, smartphones, ebooks
- Intellectually deficient: one's ability to think is slowed down, or is less capable of critical thought (can be out of over-reliance or prolonged exposure)
- Socially deficient: lacks social skills, inability to communicate with others
- POC: To examine the extent to which digital technology is making humans intellectually and socially deficient.

Suggested Approach & Stand

- This is a double POC question, thus students should address each POC in separate paragraphs for ease of organisation.
- The question requires an analysis of the extent to which digital technology is causing humans to become intellectually and socially deficient and provide reasons as to **WHY** this is so. The causal relationship must be explained clearly.

Likely Pitfalls

- The question may be mistaken as a general technology question without a focus on 'digital' technology.
- Students may not fully understand what is meant by 'intellectually and socially deficient', and may go on to discuss the pros and cons of digital technology.

Yes, digital technology is making humans intellectually deficient.	
1	The use of digital technology, especially on the Internet, has eroded standards of proper grammar and language expressions, reducing complexity of ideas into sound bites . Many face difficulties in the formal conventions of writing and speaking especially in academic / scholastic work.
2	With increasing personalisation of content on digital technology, what people see and read, especially on the Internet, often conforms to their existing worldview, so confirmation bias makes it more likely that people will simply accept the information as true or at face value instead of challenging or questioning it . As a result, they are far less critical in their thought process.
3	Misinformation and half-truths that are easily found on social media or digital communication may be quickly spread and people may not be discerning enough to differentiate truth from lies and fact from opinion, etc. The speed at which people are receiving news gives them less response time to critically evaluate the information that is presented.
4	Due to high dependency on digital technology, one is rendered helpless without it. This applies to the use of AI which forms habits of reliance and seeking shortcuts in tasks. Research has shown that over time, such dependence dissipates our cognitive ability to form mental connections which may shrink the hippocampus, increasing the risk of dementia. Eg. Increased dependency on GPS, which reduces our ability to find our way without technology, and over time, this leads to the failure to form cognitive maps and mental navigation.
No, digital technology is not making humans intellectually deficient.	
1	Digital technology has given rise to greater educational opportunities , and there are more interactive approaches to teaching and learning for example, distance learning which allows students to learn at their own pace through the numerous correspondence courses found online. (Rebuttal to SV1)
2	There is a growing awareness of global issues through the prevalent use of digital technology. Given the quick access to information, it is so much easier to generate more discussion and thoughts . Today, it is common to find young people side-stepping traditional restrictions to express their controversial views which shows that more thinking is actually taking place. They are no longer seen as mere passive recipients of information. Moreover, the digital platforms used to disseminate information has given rise to more creativity in allowing individuals to express themselves distinctly, showing increased cognitive activity . (Rebuttal to SV2)
3	The digital age necessitates new sets of technical skills and brings about an evolution in the critical literacy skills people possess today . The learning curve is a steep one which requires constant upgrading of skills and knowledge to keep up with the rapid advancements of technology. Such processing and interpretation of knowledge means that people are more perceptive and equipped to differentiate between fact and opinion. (Rebuttal to SV3)
Yes, digital technology is making humans socially deficient.	
1	Youth today spend excessive amounts of time on digital technology and have become too engrossed in their virtual world, at the cost of face-to-face interaction. As a result, they find it increasingly difficult to build social ties and foster meaningful bonds with people . Over time, they lose their sense of socially appropriate behaviour and end up with awkward social skills that hinder them from functioning well in the real world (e.g. dating, work expectations, respecting elders, etc).
2	Addiction to digital technology can lead to social deficiency as well . Studies have shown that heavy use of platforms such as Facebook, Snapchat and Instagram is associated with feelings of social isolation. With the success of social media, there is an increased number of people addicted to social devices, games, social media for self-actualisation and self-worth. Such addiction usually results in socially deficient individuals who are unable to relate to others Eg. hikikomori individuals in Japan who are reclusive and withdraw from society and seek extreme degrees of isolation and confinement.
No, digital technology is not making humans socially deficient.	
1	As opposed to having poor social skills, people who make use of digital technology could actually gain confidence in their communication with others given the anonymity and space offered on the Internet . Social media, for instance, gives people the ability to connect with others when they wish to do so. The interconnectivity also results in them being far more socially connected with like-minded individuals. Eg. A British comedian, Sarah Millican, used Twitter to connect people who were feeling lonely during the Christmas season, using the hashtag #joinin . This gave people the opportunity to feel included during a time that can be particularly isolating.

Q6: Is there any point in preserving traditional dialects in your society?

Concept clarification and POC:

- **Any point-** refers to benefits and value in which doing so is advantageous/produces a favourable effect
- **Preserving:** Efforts to prevent traditional dialects from dying or disappearing eg creating recorded and printed resources; using digital and social media; encouraging the younger generation to learn the traditional dialects through language classes; funding to language experts interested in conducting research or preservation efforts.
- **Traditional dialects in your society:** Long-established, spoken vernacular codes without a standardised written system, and varieties of a language that signal one's ethnic affiliation, ancestry and area of origin (as opposed to a language which is the standardised code used in spoken and written form. The 4 official languages in Singapore, Malay, Mandarin, Tamil, and English, are also afforded more official recognition and prestige as they are enshrined in Singapore's constitution). Examples of traditional dialects in Singapore include Hokkien, Hakka, Hainanese and Teochew for the Chinese; Baba Malay and Javanese for the Malays; Urdu, Sinhalese and Punjabi for the Indians.
- **POC:** The assumption here is that there may not be any benefit or value in doing so. Students are highly encouraged to evaluate and point out possible benefits (or lack thereof) from preserving traditional dialects in Singapore.

Suggested approach:

- Stand: 1) there is much value in preserving traditional dialects 2) there is no point in preserving traditional dialects especially with certain practical challenges. It may more defensible to argue that there is much value.

Likely pitfalls:

- Confusing dialects with the official languages in Singapore or failing to contextualise arguments to Singapore.
- Students may merely describe efforts/suggest possible ways to preserve traditional dialects and fail to explain the value/function of preserving them.

There is much value in preserving traditional dialects in Singapore	
1	It is important to preserve our cultures and heritage, especially with rising cultural homogeneity that comes with globalisation. Such traditional dialects speak of Singapore's rich and diverse roots. E.g. Traditional dialects like Javanese, Malayalam, Punjabi and Hainanese were featured at The Languages of Singapore Trail at Asian Civilisations Museum in 2017, which aimed to spark interest in documenting and preserving Singapore's "beautiful linguistic diversity." Traditional dialects are also a tangible symbol of cultural identity. Many verbal expressions reflect a way of life or the history of a community. E.g. The ethnic Chinese in Singapore who now make up 75 percent of the population, had immigrated over the centuries from several mostly southern Chinese provinces, especially Fujian (where Hokkien is spoken) and Guangdong (home to Cantonese, Teochew, and Hakka). It can even evoke a sense of warmth and belonging as people reconnect with a lost mother tongue. In recent years, more Singaporeans are committing to learn their ancestral language in an attempt to connect with their cultural roots. E.g. The Char Yong DaBu Association, is working hard to bring Hakka back to life in song. The group with close to 20 members, aged from 30 to 70, has noticed more young people signing up to connect with their roots and history – some, after their grandparents died without teaching them the dialect. E.g. Business undergraduate Jasmine Tan began uploading basic Teochew tutorial videos on YouTube in 2012. Her channel, Teochew Gaginang (which means "our own people" in the dialect), was started as a means of cultural preservation.
2	It strengthens intergenerational communication and fosters closer family bonds. In Singapore, the youngest and oldest generations can barely communicate with each other as the elderly are usually more fluent in dialects. This makes it difficult for family members to build strong relationships as they cannot understand one another and the seniors cannot share their wealth of life experiences or teach moral values to the young. Today, more young Singaporeans are going back to school to learn their grandparents' tongues – in large part, to bridge that linguistic gap between the generations. E.g. Groups like Viriya Community Services, which started free Learn My Dialect classes in 2007 to build awareness and promote intergenerational bonding. Classes in Hokkien, Teochew and Cantonese have boomed in popularity in recent years. E.g. LearnDialect.sg, is a social enterprise founded to help Singaporeans communicate with older Chinese citizens—including within their own families.
3	Since Singapore is facing an ageing society, learning traditional dialects could be especially valuable in helping working professionals (e.g. social workers, doctors, therapists, lawyers etc.) improve communications with older clients/patients and provide better care to them. E.g. Even when the patients do speak Mandarin, pharmacy students on home visits with voluntary service and learning initiative NUS CHAMP (Community Health Angels Mentoring Programme) note how these old folks build a closer rapport with – and sometimes reveal personal details only to – volunteers who can speak their dialect. E.g. Viriya Community Services has observed a growing interest from those in the medical field and those doing community outreach programmes, because they deal mainly with the elderly who understand only dialect.
4	From an economic perspective, knowing dialects such as Cantonese and Hokkien will also help a great deal with doing business/opening up career options in Hong Kong and Taiwan. Hong Kong is an important financial hub for Asia, and often, a top choice for job relocation for bankers and lawyers. For individuals who are keen to work in Hong Kong, speaking Cantonese would provide them with a great competitive advantage. It would enable them to make local friends easily, immerse in Cantonese culture and adapt to the foreign country faster. The same applies to picking up Hokkien, if one is seeking a job in Taiwan's manufacturing and industrial sectors. Even if one is not travelling for business, being familiar with traditional dialects can help

	Singaporeans to build rapport with dialect-speaking clients and colleagues in certain industries (e.g. construction or manufacturing), communicate skillfully and build stronger relationships in the workforce. [Possible rebuttal to point 1 below]
5	For children, language and literacy-related skills that were mastered in their dialects can be transferred across to benefits in learning another language. This means that the experience of learning a family's dialect would not impede a child's grasp of English or Mandarin but rather complement their development instead. E.g. Many studies have also demonstrated that learning multiple languages would improve not only a child's linguistic abilities, but also their cognitive and creative abilities as well. This means to say that learning a dialect would not harm a child's development, but even enhance his/her capacity to excel in other abilities that contribute to their academic development. [Possible rebuttal to point 3 below]
There is no point in preserving traditional dialects in Singapore	
1	There is little economic value in preserving traditional dialects in Singapore. We should focus on the global language of commerce, English, and Chinese, China's official language, in order to boost our competitive edge and promote economic ties. Indeed, for Singapore's first generation of leaders, preserving traditional dialects was perceived as a barrier to progress, and the value placed on them is seen as mainly sentimental. E.g. Starting with a series of measures in the late 1970s, the leaders of this city-state effectively banned Chinese dialects, the mother tongues of about three-quarters of its citizens, in favour of Mandarin, China's official language, as China was embarking on economic reforms that captivated Former PM Lee Kuan Yew.
2	Could be a waste of time and resources since they are dying out anyway and most of the younger generation lack the interest to learn these traditional dialects. In Singapore, three decades of the 'Speak Mandarin Campaign' and the rise of English-speaking families have caused dialects to disappear. E.g. Only 12 percent of Singaporeans speak a Chinese dialect at home, according to the survey, compared with an estimated 50 percent a generation ago. Efforts to launch preservation campaigns cost a lot, with only very minimal returns. There is even no guarantee that the right words are being preserved and understood. Over the years along with Singapore's progress, more youngsters have lost the ability or even interest when it comes to their dialects, especially with increasing emphasis on academics. Pop culture plays a part as well. Youths these days would rather learn Korean, Japanese instead of their dialects.
3	Parents and educators may be concerned that speaking traditional dialects would hinder a child's academic development, especially since English is the main (and more prestigious) language of instruction in Singaporean schools. Parents might worry that speaking a traditional dialect may cause their child to have a weaker proficiency in other standard languages, and as a result be at a disadvantage in this increasingly competitive society. E.g. Former PM Lee Kuan Yew believed that the learning of dialects would interfere with one's mastery of Mandarin, English and even "multiplication tables or formulas in mathematics, physics or chemistry".

Q7. 'Both developed and developing countries should bear equal responsibility for climate change.' Discuss.

Concept Clarification & PoC:

- Developed and developing countries: Rich, affluent first world nations vs poor, third world nations
- Should bear equal responsibility: should be equally answerable for, be equally obliged to, make comparable efforts.
- Climate change: Change in global or regional climate patterns, attributed largely to the increased levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide produced by the use of fossil fuels
- POC: To examine the extent to which the developed and developing countries should bear responsibility for climate change.

Suggested Approach & Stand

- Students must clearly take a stand as to whether it is a shared responsibility for both the rich and poor countries to address the problem of climate change or should it be a case where one party should be more obligated than the other in tackling the environmental problem. Reasons to support their stand as well as the limitations faced by both developed and developing countries must be clearly explained.

Likely Pitfalls

- Students may organise their points according to why developing countries and developed countries should be responsible for climate change, ignoring the evaluative keyword 'equal'.
- There may be a listing of measures adopted by countries to control climate change without addressing the POC.

Yes, both developed and developing countries should bear equal responsibility for climate change.	
1	It is often argued that the richer countries should bear more responsibility for climate change but the state of a country's economy should have no bearing on the extent of responsibility one should bear . Climate change is a planetary-scale threat caused by a multitude of complex factors, hence both developed and developing countries should be equally responsible for the problem of climate change.
2	Climate change is hard to resolve as climate negotiations are often conducted in a competitive framework with countries who are far more interested to safeguard their own economic self-interests. With income levels far below those of developed countries, developing countries will continue to increase their emissions as they strive for economic growth and a better quality of life. While developed nations can tackle climate change through clean energy and green technologies, they are not willing to help developing nations who may not have the resources to invest in such technologies as yet. Hence this global challenge must involve international cooperation from the different stakeholders , where the responsibility is shared between both developed and developing countries.
No, developed countries should bear greater responsibility for climate change.	
1	The developed countries are the more influential ones on a global stage, and therefore should first set an example for other poorer nations to follow suit (e.g. G-20 summit). Efforts made to tackle climate change are already stymied by global warming skeptics who dismiss the scientific opinion on anthropogenic global warming as pseudoscience, including US President Donald Trump who made the decision to withdraw US from the Paris Agreement in 2017. The withdrawal of US from the most comprehensive international agreement on carbon emissions represents a huge setback for climate change efforts, since the US is the largest carbon emitter in the world.
2	Tackling the problem of climate change requires funding and expert knowledge. As compared to the poorer nations, the developed countries are the ones with the means, knowledge and expertise to tackle the problem of climate change. In fact, the poorer nations are already doing what they can currently. As the main victims of climate change and suffering from its impacts, many developing countries have already adopted energy frugal methods of growth and limiting waste within the limits of their own resources. They could do much more if the developed countries could provide adequate financial resources and transfer appropriate technologies to enhance their domestic efforts. Eg. offer aid and policies to reverse deforestation in the Amazon, Indonesia and other vital forests that remove carbon from the atmosphere, help developing countries create sustainable energy grids.
3	The developed countries have a much larger carbon footprint than the developing countries due to their rapid rates of industrialisation and therefore should be the ones responsible for solving the problem they primarily created. If developed countries do not make significant reductions in their emissions, there will be a progressively smaller carbon space available to accommodate the development needs of poor countries. Eg. The US has emitted far more CO ₂ than any other country: a quarter of all emissions since 1751 have occurred there.
No, developing countries should bear greater responsibility for climate change.	
1	Making the richer nations bear more responsibility does not solve the environmental problem, especially when the poorer countries are spared. This simply creates an excuse for the poorer countries to take a back seat, which could further escalate the problem of climate change.
2	Developing countries rely heavily on the environment for economic survival and thus, they should focus on tackling the problem of climate change as environmental degradation exacerbates poverty conditions and also reflects badly on them. Eg. The burning of Sumatran forest fires that created haze affected many neighbouring countries, including Singapore. The people who burned the forests were plantation owners and as well as poor farmers (shifting cultivators) in Indonesia. Tackling the environmental problems took precedence because in addition to causing serious health risks in Indonesia and its neighbouring countries, it created diplomatic embarrassment for Indonesia as its neighbouring countries were unhappy that the haze became a yearly occurrence since 1997.

Q8: To what extent are museums still relevant today?

Concept clarification and POC:

- **Museums:** An institution in which objects of historical, scientific, artistic, or cultural interest are stored and exhibited for the purposes of education, study and enjoyment.
- **Still relevant:** The term 'still' implies that in the past, museums were relevant; they played an important role/function in fulfilling the needs of the world then. However, we should question the significance/impact/value of museums in the face of the changing needs/interests of the world today.
- **POC:** To examine the extent to which museums still serve a purpose/function/value today.

Suggested approach:

- The characteristics of the world **today** needs to be evaluated to justify museums' enduring role OR to explain a possible change in that role: has it either become less important or not important at all?
- Students may argue that museums are still relevant or largely irrelevant/no longer relevant today.

Likely pitfalls:

- Discussing the functions/benefits of museums without considering their relevance to the world today.
- Students may provide a limited range of examples or only cite examples from Singapore.

Museums are still relevant today.	
1	Learn from the past. Museums and galleries provide an insight into the history of humankind . This is especially true in times of turmoil. Today, it is impossible to ignore the escalating tensions between nations, between political parties and between different cultural groups. To help the public re-establish this common ground and learn to build bridges rather than breed division, many believe that museums have a role to play in giving us perspective – be it through intellectual exercises or merely holding up mistakes of the past as evidence of where such behaviour will lead us once more. E.g. With the threat of neo-Nazism rising in countries such as Germany, US and Britain, the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum inspires citizens and leaders worldwide to confront hatred, prevent genocide and promote human dignity. E.g. The Killing Fields Memorial Museum of Cambodia aims to educate people about the factual history of the Khmer Rouge atrocities and help prevent future crimes against humanity.
2	Preserve local culture and boost cultural tourism. At the rate in which cultures are disappearing due to globalisation , careful preservation of daily life is the only hope a heritage group has for recovering its culture. Daily life encompasses rituals, religion, foods, art, and any other facets that make a culture unique. With careful documentation and artefact preservation, a culture can be recorded and remembered regardless of its future. In order for a culture to be respected and survive globalisation, those of the dominant culture must be educated about minority cultures and their way of life. E.g. The Peranakan Museum in Singapore explores the culture of Peranakan communities in Southeast Asia, and possesses one of the finest and most comprehensive collections of Peranakan objects. Museums also play an important role in cultural heritage tourism, which is a powerful economic tool. E.g. Museums are a big part of the cultural tourism industry in the US -- a \$192 billion industry. And studies show that cultural tourists spend more and stay longer than other tourists. E.g. The Louvre is the world's most-popular museum, according to the 2015 Museum Index and welcomed 8.7 million visitors.
3	Bring communities together. Museums have the power to create unity on both a social and political level, but also on a local one. Local museums are able to provide a sense of community and place by celebrating a collective heritage, offering a great way to get to know the history of a particular area. As technology and digitalisation see us becoming more and more globalised, institutions such as these offer a welcome reminder of the achievements and discoveries located closer to home, bringing communities together. E.g. the Discovery Museum in Newcastle Upon Tyne, UK celebrates the Northern Powerhouse. In centuries past, the region led the way in engineering and entire communities flourished on the back of innovation. Museums can also bring people together through public events, workshops and lectures. E.g. the Museum of Street Culture in Dallas, Texas create exhibitions designed to support vulnerable local people. It recently launched a project designed to engage the public in dialogue with people experiencing homelessness, challenging stigma and increasing awareness.
4	Educate future generations. Museums and other cultural institutions will always have a role to play in the education of future generations. From creating exhibitions targeted towards children to teaching children in a quasi-classroom environment, institutions around the world are doing their bit to pass down knowledge. E.g. In the United States alone, around 80% of museums provide educational programmes for children, and spend more than \$2 billion per year on educational activities, according to the American Alliance of Museums. Museums for children have been a staple part of museum culture for decades. E.g. From Eureka in Halifax, West Yorkshire, to the Natural History Museum and the Science Museum (both located in London), there are endless institutions designed to help children engage with and enjoy learning. Traditional museum spaces are also offering interactive exhibitions and opportunities for children. E.g. The Tate in London offers a dedicated website for children about art – Tate Kids – which allows children to play games and quizzes, watch videos about art and be inspired to make their own creations at home. They can also share their creation with other children around the world via the site's online gallery.
5	Museums have reinvented themselves through digitalisation, innovation and interactivity. Curators are thinking outside the box and developing more immersive, social and collaborative ways of learning for visitors, which shows the changing faces of museums. Thanks to the rise in technology over the last two decades, what it means to be a museum is being questioned and challenged. Modern technology is transforming

	<p>museums from spaces of looking and learning to spaces of interaction, participation and engagement. Museums are starting to use virtual and augmented reality to enhance the visitors' experience. E.g. museums such as the Smithsonian's National Museum of Natural History in Washington, D.C. and the National Museum of Singapore, Singapore, are using this exciting new technology to bring exhibits to life. Museums are also beginning to embrace the digital age to promote their exhibits and attract new visitors. E.g. The famous Metropolitan Museum of Art offers virtual tours of its most popular attractions and spaces through the The Met 360° Project.</p>
Museums are no longer relevant today.	
1	<p>Decline in museum attendance as people in the digital age are more attracted to viewing and researching material on the internet. It is easy to access online content, especially in developed countries and the internet becomes a substitution to visiting and spending our time at a museum. Furthermore, with video streaming services, social media and video games, people can easily find better sources of entertainment on the internet. E.g. According to the Arts Management and Technology Laboratory there has been a steady decline in museum attendance since 2002.</p>
2	<p>Museums are perceived as intimidating and boring to the "average person." Some big museums have such vast collections that it seems confusing and overwhelming, or too abstract/inaccessible for the ordinary person. Some museums are also woefully outdated and are not appealing to young people. E.g. some museums remain stubbornly stuck to antiquated policies that forbid photography which prevents young people, who are active social media users, from sharing images and visual memories with their friends online.</p>
3	<p>In times of economic hardship and uncertainty, people have more pressing priorities. Learning more about culture, history and the arts can seem like a luxury when people are preoccupied with making ends meet, finding employment or surviving in an increasingly competitive world. The Covid-19 pandemic has devastated many sectors of the global economy. Travel restrictions have led to plunging fortunes for the aviation, hospitality and tourism industries; lockdowns all over the world have shuttered retail and food and beverage businesses, spurring historic highs for unemployment figures and government relief measures.</p>
4	<p>Furthermore, with travel restrictions and the need to watch the bottom line, some museums may no longer be viable in the aftermath of a global pandemic. As Covid-19 spread across the globe, museums found themselves confronted with plummeting visitorship numbers and unprecedented revenue losses. 2020 has turned out to be an annus horribilis for museums as well as the arts and culture sector. E.g. By April 2020, almost all the museums around the world were closed, according to a report released by the International Council of Museums. E.g. Likewise, a report by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation painted an equally dire picture, with 90 per cent of museums worldwide closing their doors and more than 10 per cent indicating that they may never reopen again.</p>

Q9: Do statistics really reflect the truth?

Concept clarification and POC:

- **Statistics:** Branch of mathematics concerned with collection, classification, analysis, and interpretation of numerical facts, for drawing inferences on the basis of their quantifiable likelihood (probability).
- **Reflect the truth:** An accurate sign/representation of the actual fact(s) of a matter.
- **POC:** Consider whether statistics are an accurate representation of reality/actual facts or not.

Suggested approach:

- Really' is intended to cast doubt so students should consider why statistics may be misleading or unreliable, and why they may not always be effective in measuring trends.
- Students may argue that a) statistics really reflect the truth OR b) statistics do not reflect the truth. It may be more defensible to argue that statistics do not really reflect the truth.

Likely pitfalls:

- Weak students may list the functions/applications/value of statistics without evaluating whether they really reflect the truth.
- Not addressing the underlying assumption behind 'really.'
- As this requires niche content knowledge, students may not have sufficient points and examples.

Why statistics really reflect the truth	
1	Statistics is concrete evidence based on studies: a search for possible connections between disparate facts that nonetheless have a connection. Statistics is a well-researched discipline that involves a range of procedures for gathering, organising, analysing and presenting quantitative data. It is a scientific approach to analysing numerical data in order to enable us to maximise our interpretation, understanding and use. E.g. In major hospitals, medical schools and government agencies, statisticians study the control, prevention, diagnosis and treatment of diseases, injuries and other health abnormalities. They also investigate the efficiency of health delivery systems and practices. E.g. In the pharmaceutical industry, statisticians design experiments to measure the efficacy of drugs in treating illnesses and to assess the likelihood of undesirable side effects.
2	Statistics depict a society in its entirety, and to do so in an objective fashion. They enable journalists, citizens and politicians to discuss society as a whole, not on the basis of anecdote, sentiment or prejudice, but in ways that can be validated. This allows for governments to implement policies and make decisions. E.g. in an economic recession, statistics of unemployment would allow the government to implement measures to help citizens. E.g. Statisticians work with social scientists to survey attitudes and opinions. They explore differences in viewpoints and in opportunities for persons with varying cultural, racial and economic backgrounds.
3	In the academic field, statistics is the most efficient and easiest way of measuring a person's ability. As statistics are based on results from the same examinations, this is thus the fairest way of comparing candidates. E.g. In education, statisticians are involved with the assessment of educational aptitude and achievement and with experiments designed to measure the effectiveness of curricular innovations.
Why statistics do not really reflect the truth	
1	Many developing countries have weak statistical systems and mechanisms for measuring results. There is a lack of relevant, quality and timely data. The challenge for statisticians in these countries is not to develop new concepts and methods—appropriate internationally recommended methods being available—but to break a vicious cycle where inadequate resources restrain output and undermine the quality of statistics, while the poor quality of statistics leads to lower demand and hence fewer resources. E.g. In 2015, 65% of the Millennium Development Goals' indicators for countries in Central Africa were either estimated, derived from statistical models, or were last measured prior to 2010. The truth is that data in Africa are not produced on time, are not frequently produced, are of poor quality and are not accurate. This makes it difficult to make data driven decisions.
2	Not every aspect of a given population can be captured by statistics. Statistics tend to be limited because these are merely quantitative and there is a tendency to reflect quantitative measures over qualitative ones. The welfare of citizens cannot be taken at statistical face value as there are other factors that are harder to measure such as the quality of life and the happiness level. There is also always an implicit choice in what is included and what is excluded, and this choice can become a political issue in its own right. E.g. The fact that GDP only captures the value of paid work, thereby excluding the work traditionally done by women in the domestic sphere, has made it a target of feminist critique since the 1960s. E.g. In France, it has been illegal to collect census data on ethnicity since 1978, on the basis that such data could be used for racist political purposes. (This has the side-effect of making systemic racism in the labour market much harder to quantify.)
3	Problems with sampling and polling: Data collected needs to be the right amount, statistics with small sample size is usually less accurate. One thing that can affect data collection is how the survey was done. The purpose of sampling is to collect, calculate and analyze statistics so that we can make inferences from the sample for the population. The results collected need to adequately represent the population that is being studied. At other times, statistics do not really reflect the truth due to faulty polling. The manner in which questions are phrased can have a huge impact on the way an audience answers them. Specific wording patterns have a persuasive effect and induce respondents to answer in a predictable manner. E.g. faulty polling botched the 2016 US Presidential elections. Many polls predicted that Hilary Clinton would win but in a stunning turn-of-events, Trump vastly outperformed what everyone was anticipating from state and national polls.

4	<p>While numbers don't lie, they can in-fact be used to mislead with half-truths. This is known as the "misuse of statistics." Marketers and politicians use and abuse statistics and fabricate when it suits their purposes. E.g. A statistics expert slammed the Trump administration's statements on the coronavirus as misleading, and accused him of downplaying the outbreak so he could get re-elected. It is often assumed that the misuse of statistics is limited to those individuals or companies seeking to gain profit from distorting the truth, be it economics, education or mass media. However, the telling of half-truths through study is not only limited to mathematical amateurs. E.g. A 2009 investigative survey by Dr. Daniele Fanelli from The University of Edinburgh found that 33.7% of scientists surveyed admitted to questionable research practices, including modifying results to improve outcomes, subjective data interpretation, withholding analytical details and dropping observations because of gut feelings.</p>
5	<p>Statistics can also be subject to rigging and corruption. In countries accused of being corrupt, statistics may not be an accurate reflection of reality. E.g. In May 2019, nearly 62 million Filipinos voted in midterm elections which were marred somewhat by vote-buying and faulty counting machines. 302 campaign workers were arrested purportedly with cash. They were said to be offering voters 300 pesos to 3,000 pesos (\$8 to \$80) for their votes.</p>

Q10. 'The pursuit of scientific advancement comes at the expense of our values.' Discuss.

Concept Clarification & PoC:

- The pursuit of scientific advancement: the systematic use of scientific and technical knowledge to meet specific objectives or requirements in society, be it altruistic or commercially driven.
- At the expense: compromises, undermines, a trade-off
- Values: ethics, a set of moral principles
- PoC: Whether the pursuit of scientific advancement compromises our ethics and morality

Suggested Approach & Stand

- The assumption here is that there is a negative correlation between the pursuit of scientific advancement and morality – scientific development undermines our ethical choices and priorities. This can be in the form of scientific decisions (the purpose of the study or invention, data finding methods and accuracy in data recording and presentation) and the applications of the scientific invention (its use or misuse, its affordability, and the way in which scientific products or processes are 'marketed' or sold to the public.
- Students are required to consider if the pursuit of scientific advancement indeed violates ethics, or that it does not necessarily do so. They should also acknowledge or describe the assumed tension that exists between the pursuit of scientific advancements and values.
- Stand: 1) The pursuit of scientific advancements comes at the expense of values 2) The pursuit of scientific advancements does not necessarily come at the expense of values.

Likely Pitfalls

- Merely presenting the pros and cons of science without addressing **HOW** the pursuit of scientific advancements compromises morality
- Equates 'technology' with 'scientific pursuits/research'
- Lacks balance in treatment, focusing exclusively on why scientific advancements are necessary and beneficial even if there is a need to compromise values
- Students should also not be replacing 'morality' with specific religious beliefs

Yes, it is true that the pursuit of scientific advancement comes at the expense of our values,	
1	The pursuit of scientific development has resulted in the pushing of ethical boundaries, creating more moral dilemmas and questions that mankind seems to be ill-prepared or are not ready to answer. Eg. The creation of autonomous killer machines and self-driving cars raises the question of whether machines should be given the power to make moral decisions concerning death. 'Organic' drones and robots also raise questions of whether it is ethical to take away the full autonomy of an animal and use it as a plaything or a tool to fulfil our selfish agendas.
2	As modern science becomes increasingly profit-driven, scientific development is inordinately focused on the interests of the rich or the powerful, sacrificing the needs of poor communities who need medical intervention the most. Eg1: Medical developments in the form of genetic therapy, genetic screening and gene-driven personalised medicine are accessible primarily to the rich. Similarly, medical science has been focused on expanding its targeted cancer therapies which only the developed world can afford, while diseases that affect the developing world receive scant attention. Eg2: The new era of genetic modification via scientific developments such as CRISPR can potentially create a generation of designer babies and lead to the commodification of human life. As only wealthy individuals are able to afford such technology, this inevitably entrenches the existing income gap and lead into greater class divide/social stratification – extremely legitimate ethical concerns. Eg3: The trend of Big Pharma carrying out price hikes to cover R&D costs and inflation shows how scientific development compromises morality. Recent news reports show that pharmaceutical companies raised the prices of more than 3,400 drugs in the first half of 2019, surpassing the number of drug hikes they imposed the year before.
3	The pressure to make significant breakthroughs in scientific developments has prompted some scientists to compromise their integrity and falsify their findings. Eg.1 In 2014, Japanese stem-cell biologist Haruko Obokata published two significant studies, claiming success in turning ordinary body cells into embryonic stem cells, which was eventually uncovered to be a hoax. Eg. 2 Disgraced Korean biotechnology researcher Hwang Woo Suk experienced a similar downfall in 2006 for fabricating his stem cell research findings. Eg.3: Chinese scientist He Jiankui's ground-breaking genetic modification of two twin girls via CRISPR technology also possibly points to a fame-hungry motivation that implies that scientific development is carried out at the expense of moral bearings. Such cases of scientific misconduct show how morals are sacrificed in the desire to create ground-breaking scientific discoveries.
4	The pursuit of scientific development requires huge funding and very often, the need for funding pressures scientists to abide by the goals of private companies with great financing power. Ethics are compromised so as to secure continuous funding. Scientists publish false information to boost sales for the companies, manipulate study designs, and selectively publish results that suit these companies' interests. Eg. Scientists working for tobacco companies have repeatedly published studies which dismiss the links between harmful diseases and smoking to dissuade existing smokers from quitting the habit. Researchers in recent years have uncovered mounting evidence of how tobacco companies funded epidemiological and biological research that was designed to support claims that second-hand smoke posed little or no harm to people.
5	The need for science to produce statistically conclusive results and engender effective solutions means that scientific development takes place at the expense of morality as humans or animals are used as subjects of clinical trials. This is especially so when the most scientifically rigorous trial design is very often not

	the most ethical. Eg1: Poor and vulnerable communities have been repeatedly exploited to serve the medical research of big pharmaceutical companies and major research institutions. They have tested their new, unapproved drugs on unsuspecting victims from poorer, less educated regions before, where they are lured by money or food in exchange for their participation in the trials. Eg2: In the mid-nineties, the world's largest research-based drug company, Pfizer, administered the experimental drug, Trovan, during a meningitis outbreak in Kano in northern Nigeria without prior ethical approval. Pfizer did not inform patients of the side effects of Trovan when tested on animals and used Nigerian children to test the drug's efficacy. 11 children died and dozens were left disabled after receiving the drug.
No, the pursuit of scientific advancement does not necessarily come at the expense of our values,	
1	Scientific development continues to be driven by the altruistic goal of producing life-saving or life-enhancing solutions for individuals and communities which do not necessarily entail immoral decisions or outcomes. Eg1: The development of vaccines has removed the threat of deadly diseases including polio, smallpox, and MMR. The fact that some of these scientists chose not to patent their vaccines (polio) to make them available to the larger community that needs it shows that scientific development does not necessarily compromise ethical moorings. Eg2: Scientific strides into geoengineering and bioremediation can help to reduce global warming and clean up contaminated water, giving us hope for a more environmentally sustainable future.
2	There has been a notable shift in the ethos of pharmaceutical companies, who now try to score big in terms of helping the poor. As they compete on the Access to Medicine Index, which scores their charitable efforts in redistributing medicines to the world's poor, many of the world's biggest pharmaceutical companies now turn their focus to helping poor countries and fight neglected diseases. Eg. Nearly 20 million Africans are now on H.I.V. treatment — for less than \$100 a year. Top-quality drugs for malaria, tuberculosis, hepatitis C and some cancers are now sold at rock-bottom prices in poor countries.
3	Governments and regulatory boards have stepped in to ensure that scientific development does not take place at the expense of morality by ensuring that human rights are not violated and people are given a fairer access to medically important innovations. Eg1: The government of India has taken on a momentous stand to break the pharmaceutical monopoly on drugs, stopping mercenary companies from the practice of "evergreening" – making minor alterations to existing drugs in order to secure a new patent – thereby ensuring that life-saving drugs are made available to people who need it. Eg2: Although it is technically possible for human embryos to be cloned with varying degrees of success, most countries today have outlawed it, with several prohibiting various controversial scientific practices such as cloning stem cells and growing human embryos for research purposes (eg. Canada). This moral stance taken by many countries show how scientific development may not necessarily take place at the expense of morality as governments desire for greater clarity on the various social, legal and biological implications that the technology poses on human lives before legalising it.

Q11: Should governments protect individual freedoms even in times of political unrest?

Concept clarification and POC:

- **Protect individual freedoms:** Uphold or preserve individual rights/civil liberties to pursue life and goals without interference from other individuals or the government. In contemporary democracies, individual freedoms have special value and importance, eg the right to assembly, to vote, to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures of one's property, freedom of press and freedom of speech, to privacy etc.
- **Political unrest:** A political situation in which people protest or behave violently in the form of riots, strikes, anti-government demonstrations, political assassinations, even revolutions and civil wars. Possible causes include poverty, perceived social inequality, a sense of being treated unfairly, oppressive regimes and increasing alienation with the political system.
- **POC:** Considering the responsibilities that governments have towards their citizens, should governments still be expected to uphold individual liberties when there are threats to national security, public safety and the government's ability to maintain power.

Suggested approach:

- The assumption is that political unrest leads to the need for governments to restore peace quickly so as to ensure the safety of citizens. However, restoring peace usually involves clamping down hard on the source of unrest, usually in the form of oppressive action.
- This is a conditional question. Students should argue why governments, especially democratic states, should protect individual freedoms despite political unrest.

Likely pitfalls:

- Students may merely list the functions of a government or the types of individual freedoms.
- Ignoring the condition and just providing points for the importance of protecting individual freedoms.

Yes. Governments should be expected to protect individual freedoms	
1	Governments must respect the human rights of all citizens even in times of political unrest as such individual freedoms are necessary for democracy. If the people do not have political rights in times of political crisis, such as the right to vote and to form political parties, then democracy does not even exist because democracy is defined as that form of government in which the people have the right to govern themselves. E.g. In August 2020, anti-government demonstrations grew in Belarus, Minsk because of a rigged presidential election and violent police response to civilians. U.S. Secretary of State Mike Pompeo condemned the electoral process in Belarus as neither free nor fair.
2	Governments are accountable to the citizens: People need rights of political participation, such as the freedom to speak, to associate for political purposes, and to protest publicly against their government's actions in order to hold the government democratically accountable. In fact, citizens increasingly turn to mass protests to address grievances in the face of unresponsive elites, and these protests often drive significant changes in the political agenda. If the government does not respect individual freedoms/human rights, it can quickly become despotic. E.g. in 2019, Chile became the epicentre of mass protests that shook Latin America. Chile's protests began over transit fare hikes driven by President Sebastian Piñera's economic belt-tightening but quickly grew to a wave of demonstrations in multiple cities calling for long-pending reforms to address inequality.
3	In a highly polarized political environment, citizens might well distrust official motivations behind the clamping down of individual freedoms, and that could generate even more public unrest. E.g. The escalation of mass protests in Hong Kong due to the extradition bill and National Security Law which are seen by citizens as Beijing's attempt to curtail protest and freedom of speech.
4	A poor human rights record can tarnish a country's reputation and affect diplomatic relations with other countries. E.g. US & EU imposed sanctions on Myanmar over human rights abuses. E.g. European Union threatened sanctions against Belarus over a rigged presidential election and violent crackdowns on protestors.
No. Governments should not be expected to protect individual freedoms	
1	In times of political unrest, governments need to prioritise public safety first. Mass protests can escalate into chaos and erupt into violence, lawlessness. Individual freedoms need to be sacrificed for the greater good in such times. E.g. Protesters in Iran destroyed more than 700 banks, 70 gas stations, 50 police stations and 34 ambulances in an uprising that began in Nov 2019 after officials announced a 50 percent increase in gas prices. Amnesty International said at least 143 people died in the clashes. To curb the violence, Iran arrested close to 4000 protestors. E.g. Curfews were imposed in multiple cities in the US, after unrest and protests spread across the country over the death of an unarmed black man, George Floyd, in police custody. In some cases, demonstrators clashed with police, set police cars on fire, vandalised property or looted shops. The National Guard activated 5,000 of its personnel across 15 states and Washington DC to curb the violence, and restore law and order.
2	In times of emergencies such as terrorist attacks/ war, governments need to make swift decisions for the sake of national security. Hence reducing individual freedoms are warranted. E.g. In 2017, martial law was imposed on Mindanao island in the Philippines, while the army fought against Islamist militants. Martial law allows the use of the military to enforce order and the detention of people without charge for long periods. But President Duterte argued that the harsh measures were necessary to protect the people and combat terrorism.
3	The government tends to see the bigger picture, so citizens need to trust in the leaders whom they elect to make the right decision in restricting individual freedoms for the greater good. E.g. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, many governments have implemented various measures that restrict the basic rights of citizens. For example, social distancing and contact restrictions in public spaces. Despite protests from citizens over Covid-19 curbs in some countries such as Germany, India and Lebanon, these measures were deemed as necessary by the authorities to protect public health.
4	Prolonged political unrest can have severe repercussions on the country's economy which will in turn negatively affect people's livelihoods/standard of living. Hence governments should intervene and curtail individual freedoms in such instances. E.g. Hong Kong's economy shrank 1.2% in 2019 as massive pro-democracy protests paralysed the city's streets and scared away tourists.

Q12: 'History has shown that Man never learns from his mistakes.' Is this a fair comment?

Concept clarification and POC:

- **History:** The study of past events, particularly in human affairs. A continuous, typically chronological, record of important or public events or of a particular trend or institution.
- **Man:** The human race
- **Never learns from his mistakes:** Has not gleaned valuable lessons from past events/actions or made amends for wrongdoings. Could be repeating similar mistakes or even be unrepentant.
- **POC:** Evaluate whether Man has failed to learn from mistakes which occurred in the past by analysing historical and current trends.

Suggested approach:

- The use of the absolute term 'never' hints at the underlying assumption that Man (both individuals and societies) tends to repeat mistakes from the past. Students should examine WHY this is so.
- An OV-R approach is recommended if students disagree with the statement.

Likely pitfalls:

- Area/Example-driven essay where each paragraph merely describes a past event without evaluating why Man never learns/does learn from past mistakes.
- History essay detailing the different lessons drawn from past events. (Note: If too area-driven and repetitive then no more than 18 marks for content)

Fair comment. History has shown that Man never learns from his mistakes.	
1	Nationalist views could lead to whitewashing of history. To uphold/boost national pride or further political agenda, countries may choose to 'reinterpret' history, which essentially allows them to put a positive spin on everything. E.g. The latest edition of a history text book used in more than 50 junior high schools across Japan makes no mention of the over 300,000 deaths in the Nanjing Massacre of 1937, skips allegations that as many as 400,000 girls and women were press-ganged into serving as prostitutes for the Japanese military during World War II and hints that the 1941 attack on US forces at Pearl Harbor was justified as the US embargo on Japan was a form of undeclared war. E.g. Turkey continues to deny its primary role in the Armenian Genocide, which killed over a million people during and after World War I.
2	Human nature does not change. All the human emotions are the same today as in Egypt of the pharaohs or China in the time of Confucius: love, hate, ambition, lust for power, kindness, generosity, and inhumanity. The good and bad of human nature remains in different generations, and ongoing tensions between different groups and societies still continue. Therefore history tends to go through cycles and repeats itself. E.g. Years after the American Civil Rights Movement, systemic racism is still alive in America, as evidenced by the "Unite the Right" rally in Charlottesville, 2017, which was designed to galvanize a wide array of white supremacists and white nationalist organizations and to promote racial, religious and ethnically motivated hatred and violence. Among the more notable aspects of Charlottesville was the prevalence of Nazi rhetoric and symbols.
3	As memories fade and complacency creeps in, history repeats itself. We believe that our societal advancements, progress in modern science and technology have lifted us above the lessons of history. E.g. Even though we had built strong regulations, sound institutions, highly networked central banks since the Great Depression (1929–c. 1939), a massive financial crisis still took place and wreaked havoc throughout the world in 2008. E.g. We have developed modern welfare states and universal education for all and a government capable of immense economic redistributive capabilities yet economic inequality persists.
4	We do not think historically. We do not use the lessons of the past to make decisions in the present and to plan for the future. Leaders have plenty of trouble learning from the lessons of history. Perhaps it is because business and political leaders are supposed to be looking forward. E.g. If American political and business leaders thought historically, American troops would not be fighting in Afghanistan and Iraq. The financial crisis would not have happened.
Unfair comment. History has shown that Man has learnt from his mistakes.	
1	Some countries have made efforts to confront their history and make amends/seek reconciliation. This is especially necessary if there is a form of "collective trauma" experienced by citizens for grave mistakes that were committed, or if countries seek to rejoin the international community and repair their global reputations. Eg. Germany has rehabilitated its international reputation after World War II by reconciling with Nazi victims and acknowledging the atrocities Germany had committed. In 1952, Germany agreed to formal reparations for the Holocaust, which were paid to Israel. Today, all Germans are taught about the Holocaust in their school curriculums; Holocaust denial is a crime in the country. E.g. removal of confederate statues in US; reparations to Aboriginal people in Australia.
2	Some historical mistakes were so fatal that it has led to a shift in national policies. Such grave errors would force countries to relook their national policies in order to secure the future of their nation. Eg. Singapore's commitment to maintaining a strong defence force is the result of the lessons learnt from 3½ years of brutal Japanese Occupation, which occurred during World War II after the British surrendered Singapore, then a British colony. This is the reason the pioneer generation of Singaporeans introduced National Service to keep the country safe and independent. E.g. China's one-child policy, in place since 1981, led to China's most precipitous decline in population in decades, setting the stage for potential demographic, economic and even political crises in the near future. In response to the challenges arising from this, the Chinese government announced in 2015 that it would transition to a new two-child policy.
3	Different countries have memorials and other means to commemorate the past. This serves as a reminder and prevents current and future generations from forgetting the past and repeating past mistakes. A memorial is an object which serves as a focus for the memory or the commemoration of something, usually an influential, deceased person or a historical, tragic event. Popular forms of memorials include landmark objects or works of art such as sculptures, statues or fountains and parks. E.g. Yad Vashem, Israel's memorial to the Holocaust; New York's 9/11 Memorial and Museum.