

4G3 Social Studies Revision

General approach to SBCS:

1. Read the main issue question for an understanding of the broader case study.
2. Read the questions, identify the type of skill(s) needed to ATQ.
3. Analyse the question – is there a specific focus or is it about the broader topic?
 - E.g. specific focus: How far do the journalists agree about the challenges to improving birth rate? → must compare information related to the challenges to improving birth rate.
 - E.g. broader focus: How useful is this source in the discussion on birth rate? → what about the birth rate? Whether it has been improving? Whether citizens are willing to have children? Whether governments are effective in managing the low birth rates? What is it? Select 1 and focus on that throughout.
4. Read the background information.
5. Read the sources and attempt questions.
6. Always ATQ, follow question phrasing.

Time management:

Section	Total number of marks	Suggested time allocated
A: Source-Based Case Study	35 m	70 mins /1h 10mins
B: Structured Response Questions	15 m	30 mins

- ❖ Although time is a constraint, do not rush through the source(s). Read them purposefully with clarity. Do not rush through writing your response, make sure that you've answered the question clearly (i.e. clear stand with one main point for each paragraph)

Stay calm to remain clear-headed for the exam!

The mind is like water. When
it's turbulent, it's difficult to
see. When it's calm,
everything becomes clear.

Source-Based Case Study (SBCS)

No.	Skill	What it means	Approaches; how to write	Tips	Time management
1	Inference	a logical conclusion based on evidence from the source	Based on question, infer: - Content - Attitude - Perspective Inference Evidence Explanation	- Should be related to the main issue question - For an inference on the author's attitude, you'll need to infer the author's thoughts and/or feelings: ➤ Thought – opinion or judgement about an issue (e.g. 'serious problem', 'government's responsibility') ➤ Feeling – e.g. satisfied, optimistic, hopeful, pessimistic etc. ➤ Examples of attitude: encouraging, optimistic, supportive, welcoming, critical, hostile, pessimistic, mocking etc. - Select specific evidence that supports your inference: ➤ Vague evidence: "Canada, the story goes, is a supporter of multiculturalism." ➤ Specific evidence: "The Canadian government has resettled more refugees than any other country and with little negative reaction from the public."	~ 5-10mins
2	Message	The <u>overall idea</u> the author wants to convey in relation to the main issue question.	Message	- Read the source in totality to find the overall message, avoid nitpicking ideas from a specific part of the source.	~ 10-12mins
3	Purpose	Motive / reason why something was done or said	Purpose word Audience Message Outcome Support (Evidence)	- Read the provenance in relation to the content of the source to determine the author's purpose. - Purpose word is meant to show the intent of the author. Examples include: Convince/ Persuade/ Encourage/ Warn/	~ 10-12mins

				Justify/ Defend/ Educate/ Reassure/ Criticise / Mock - Outcome: The change in Feeling / Action / Thoughts of the audience that the author wants to create.	
4	Comparison	Finding out the similarity and difference between 2 sources.	Approaches: Compare 1 similarity and 1 difference of the source's: 1. Content 2. Perspective 3. Purpose - PAMOS 4. Tone For each similarity or difference: Basis of comparison Infer both sources Evidence from each source Explanation of each source	- Always ATQ and follow question phrasing - Potential basis of comparison between 2 sources: ➤ Impact (benefit or drawback? Positive or negative?) ○ E.g. The author in source B would agree with the author in source C that the <u>minimum wage disadvantages low-wage workers</u> . <i><explain the drawback></i> (GCE O-Level SS 2020 Q2) ➤ Cause (reason why something happens) ○ The cartoonist in source B would disagree with the author in source C that <u>large multinational corporations are responsible for the haze</u> . <i><explain why MNCs are responsible/not responsible></i> ➤ Effectiveness of a strategy or stakeholder in addressing the problem ○ Source B and C are similar in saying that <u>government's initiatives to encourage couples to have children are ineffective</u> . <i><explain why govt. initiatives are ineffective></i> (GCE O-Level SS 2024 Q2) ➤ Reaction from a group of people ○ Source B and C are similar in saying that <u>British citizens are dissatisfied with Dyson's move to Singapore</u> <i><explain why British citizens are dissatisfied></i> (GCE O-Level SS 2021 Q2)	~ 10-15mins
5	Reliability	Whether a source can be trusted.	Approaches: 1. Infer, ATQ: Inference	○ ATQ, have a clear stand to conclude if the source is reliable. ○ Cross-reference must match what you've inferred in the	~ 10-15mins

			Evidence Explanation 2. Cross-reference to another source / BI to check for reliability of given source: X-ref, ATQ Evidence Explanation 3. Critical analysis to check for reliability of given source (i.e. Provenance and purpose; tone)	first paragraph. ○ For critical analysis, do note that: ○ agenda to benefit self → unreliable ○ agenda to benefit others (part of their job/role) → reliable ○ Tone: objective, optimistic, pessimistic, critical, biased?	
6	Utility	A piece of information will be useful if it is relevant. It will be even more useful if it is reliable.	Approaches: 1. Infer, ATQ (useful?) Inference Evidence Explanation 2. X-ref to check for reliability and utility. Provide stand and ATQ. X-ref, ATQ (reliable? Useful?) Evidence Explanation 3. Critical analysis to check for reliability and thus, utility.	- Check if the question has a specific focus or a broad topic. (refer to general approach to SBCS) - Cross-reference point must match what you've inferred in the first paragraph.	~10-15 mins
7	Surprise	Does it meet your expectation?	Approaches: 1. Logical/ common sense reasoning → ATQ	- Always explain why it is expected or unexpected, provide a reason for it.	~10-12 mins

			2. X-ref to check if information is also said in another source → ATQ (follow question phrasing) 3. Critical analysis to explain why the source content is expected or unexpected.		
8	Hybrid Surprise (Double source surprise; Compare and Surprise)		Approaches: 1. Compare content, ATQ 2. X-ref to 3rd source to check if information is commonly found → ATQ, refer to all 3 sources in your stand. <i>e.g. Since source C supports source A, it is surprising that source A would contradict source B about ...</i> 3. Critical analysis to explain why the authors are expected or unexpected to agree or disagree		~15 mins
9	Hybrid Proving (Double source reliability; Compare and Reliability)	Using one source to prove a claim on another source.	<i>e.g. How far does Source C prove that Source D is correct?</i> Approaches: 1. Compare, ATQ 2. X-ref to check for reliability of the source used to prove (<i>i.e. source C</i>) 3. Critical analysis of the source used to prove (<i>i.e. source C</i>). → reliable or not? Can prove?	Do note that question phrasing may change, just remember to ATQ. E.g. The two sources differ in their opinion about Canada. Does this mean that one of them is less believable? → in this case, you can check the reliability of any source.	~15 mins

10	Synthesis	Explain the various perspectives regarding an issue.	Approaches: - Analyse claim in question - positive vs negative impact? So what? - who is responsible? Why? - Categorise sources - Explain why the sources agree or disagree with the statement. One source per paragraph. Minimally 2 sources agree, 2 sources disagree (alternate) Inference Evidence Explanation (MUST give a clear reason; refer to tips on the right) - Bonus 2 marks - Attach it to one source you've used previously. Use it to further support that stand (agree/disagree)	- Select ONE piece of evidence that has room for explanation. If you can't explain it, don't use it. - Explanation needs to be specific and clear. - Each source should have a unique or distinctive reason. Your explanation for each source should not be repeated. E.g. 2025 'O' level: "Canadians have a positive attitude towards diversity" - o Good evidence: "It's easy for people who come through sponsorship to adapt to the new life. We have friends already." - o Valid explanation on the attitude (thoughts, feelings, actions): This suggests that Canadians are willing to go the extra mile to interact with and develop genuine friendships with these refugees, helping them feel welcomed and less lonely being in a foreign land. → Explain what locals did/feel, how this action/feeling help foreigners feel welcomed (i.e. positive impacts). - o Invalid explanation: This suggests that Canadians are very friendly and have a positive attitude towards diversity. → Explanation is the same idea as evidence, DO NOT do this. Bonus 2 marks: Choose 1 of 3 routes for a source you've IEE previously: - Analyse at least 1 source in relation to its reliability (purpose/tone), utility → if the source is reliable, useful OR sufficient, it can prove that this perspective is valid. - o Tag this perspective to a source - o Explain why the source is reliable/unreliable	~20 mins
----	-----------	--	---	--	----------

				based on critical analysis or contextual knowledge (NOT cross-ref) ○ You cannot evaluate the reliability of source X if it has been analysed in an earlier question (e.g. Q1-4) ○ You cannot evaluate a source that you did not use in your answer 2. Share a valid example from your contextual knowledge → If your CK can support this viewpoint, this viewpoint is more valid (i.e. agree or disagree with the statement). ○ Tag this perspective to a source you've used previously. ○ Use examples that you have read/known about the case study 3. Reach a balanced conclusion/ resolution → therefore, both perspectives are valid ○ Justify why the two perspectives are valid → e.g. [2025 O Level] on a larger societal scale, why are there always some people who feel that Canadians have a positive attitude, while others feel otherwise? ○ Make reference to at least 1 source used previously for each viewpoint.	
--	--	--	--	--	--

Structured-Response Questions (SRQ)

	Question type	What is it about?	Approaches; how to write?	Tips
1	SRQ 6	Test your ability to analyse societal issues in SG through different perspectives, construct reasoned arguments and make informed judgement and recommendations.	1. Plan your answer, including one clear example per paragraph 2. Write your response, for each paragraph: Point Elaboration Example Link	- Analyse a societal issue in terms of: ○ Causes – reason to explain why something in society is the way it is ○ Impacts – Impact of something happening in society ○ Strategies – solution to address an issue in society - Quality over quantity (1 well developed paragraph is better than 2 undeveloped paragraphs) - Do not copy or lift from the extract wholesale. If you wish to use the example in the extract, you'll need to include additional and details not found in the extract. - When planning your answer, do include: ○ Context in Singapore (i.e. background or situation within which something exists) ▪ E.g. [2025 'O' level] "What dreams do you have for Singapore?" → Singapore is now a super-aged society → Dream is to be more compassionate towards the elderly in Singapore. ○ Significance or importance of this issue ○ Outcome/ impact ○ Relevant example per paragraph
2	SRQ 7	Construct reasoned arguments for two different factors and make an evaluation based on a given criteria.	1. Analyse question – identify the 2 factors and the question focus. 2. Plan your answer, including a relevant example for each factor 2. One factor per paragraph:	- Do not copy or lift from the extract wholesale. If you wish to use the example in the extract, you'll need to include additional and details not found in the extract. - DO NOT weigh both factors at the start. ○ E.g. [2025 'O' Level] Is managing differing needs, interests and priorities more challenging for a government than managing trade-offs?" ▪ First, establish why each factor is challenging: • Para 1: Managing differing needs, interests and priorities is challenging for the

			Point Elaboration Example Link 3. Weigh the two factors Possible stand: - Factor 1 > Factor 2 - Factor 2 > Factor 1 - Factor 1 = Factor 2	government • Para 2: Managing trade-offs is challenging for the government ▪ Second, weigh both factors to determine which is MORE challenging: • Is there an inevitable challenge? • Does one challenge eventually lead to another? → if so, perhaps this is the root cause of all challenges. - Tips for weighing the 2 factors: ○ Do not summarise or repeat your points here. ○ Compare the 2 factors and establish their relationship. ▪ Are the 2 factors complementary? Why? → factor 1 = factor 2 ▪ Is factor 1 dependent on factor 2? → factor 2 is more important (depending on question phrasing)
--	--	--	--	--