



CRESCENT GIRLS' SCHOOL
SECONDARY FOUR
PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION 2026

HUMANITIES	2260/1
	2261/1
	2262/1
Social Studies	19 August 2026

Marking Scheme

This mark scheme consists of **18** printed pages.

1	Study Source A. Why did the cartoonist draw this cartoon? Explain your answer.	[5]
L1	Inference based on provenance The cartoonist drew this cartoon to reach out to the Canadian readers of the newspaper.	[1]
L2	Inference based on message/intended outcome, unsupported	[2]
L3	Inference based on message <i>Award 4m for context</i> The cartoonist drew this cartoon to convince(V) Canadians(A) that the Canadian government was spending huge amounts of money in hosting the World Cup yet allowing FIFA to profit at the expense of Canadians(M) . This can be seen in how a man labelled "FIFA" has walked away with an arm and a leg – a metaphor for how much they are earning from the World Cup. This arm and leg came from a man labelled "Canadian Tax Payers", signifying Canadians, showing that this cost was being borne by the Canadian people instead. Meanwhile, a man in the middle, labelled "Politicians", is saying "No Foul", symbolising that the Canadian government is aware of FIFA's profiteering, but allows it to continue happening. <u>The cartoonist was likely responding to how the Canadian government has had to cut expenditure on social services, meant for the welfare of the Canadians, to fund the World Cup (Context).</u>	[3-4]

L4	Purpose based on Message and Intended outcome <i>Award 5m for context</i> The cartoonist drew this cartoon to convince(V) Canadians(A) that the Canadian government was spending huge amounts of money in hosting the World Cup yet allowing FIFA to profit at the expense of Canadians(M), so that they pressure the government to prioritise spending more on the welfare of the Canadians (I). This can be seen in how a man labelled “FIFA” has walked away with an arm and a leg – a metaphor for how much they are earning from the World Cup. This arm and leg came from a man labelled “Canadian Tax Payers”, signifying Canadians, showing that this cost was being borne by the Canadian people instead. Meanwhile, a man in the middle, labelled “Politicians”, is saying “No Foul”, symbolising that the Canadian government is aware of FIFA’s profiteering, but allows it to continue happening. <u>The cartoonist was likely responding to how the Canadian government has had to cut expenditure on social services, meant for the welfare of the Canadians, to fund the World Cup (Context).</u> Accept other reasonable interpretations E.g. The cartoon was drawn to convince the Canadian people that the cost of hosting the World Cup is not worth it so that they would pressure their government to cancel the World Cup. E.g. The cartoon was drawn to convince governments who want to host the World Cup that the cost of hosting the World Cup is not worth it so that they would not want to host future World Cup events.	[4-5]
----	---	-------

2	Study Sources B and C. How similar are the two sources? Explain your answer.	[7]
L1	Identifies agreement/disagreement in provenance/topic/source type Both sources are different because one is from research organisation while the other is from a football magazine. Both sources are similar as they both discuss the World Cup. OR False Matching Sources B and C are different because Source B talks about the 1998 World Cup but Source C does not	[1]
L2	Identifies agreement/disagreement in content, unsupported Both sources are similar in showing that the World Cup led to less economic benefits than expected. Both sources are different regarding the reason for reduced economic benefits.	[2]
L3	Similar OR different in content, supported <i>Award 3m for explaining 1 point of similarity OR difference, supported but no BOC</i> <i>Award 4m for explaining 1 point of similarity OR difference, supported with clear BOC</i> Both sources are similar in showing that the World Cup led to less economic benefits than expected. This is seen in Source B, which says, “80% of US hotel operators had less bookings than expected.” This shows that the hotels could not profit as much as they thought they would from the World Cup. Likewise, Source C says, “Steve's Sizzling Steaks had expected to benefit from the thousands of supporters travelling to the stadium during the tournament.” and “official traffic warnings and gridlock alerts have discouraged regular customers from visiting.” This shows that contrary to having more customers, they ended up earning even less, as even their usual customers did not patronise them.	[3-4]

Both sources are different regarding the reason for reduced economic benefits.

Source B states, "Due to the World Cup, non-football fans simply avoided the country due to its crowds." It is saying that there were less tourists than usual as the ones who would usually be travelling there decided to travel elsewhere to avoid the football crowds, leading to lower income from tourism. However, Source C states, "official traffic warnings and gridlock alerts have discouraged regular customers from visiting." It is saying that there were less customers than expected as traffic regulations prevented them from patronising the restaurants near the stadium, leading to lower income from potential patrons.

Also accepted:

- **Similar in showing that countries can benefit economically from hosting the World Cup:**
 - **B: "The US GDP increase is estimated at about 0.05%"**
 - **C: "The 2026 World Cup is expected to generate billions for host cities overall."**
- **Different in whether hosts benefit economically from the World Cup**
 - **B: "12 of the last 14 World Cups produced net economic losses for host regions"**
 - **C: "The 2026 World Cup is expected to generate billions for host cities overall."**
- **Different why countries want to host the World Cup**
 - **B: "elevating the country's global standing"**
 - **C: "The 2026 World Cup is expected to generate billions for host cities overall."**
- **Different regarding which industries have been negatively affected by the World Cup**
 - **B: "80% of US hotel operators had less bookings than expected."**
 - **C: "Steve's Sizzling Steaks had expected to benefit from the thousands of supporters travelling to the stadium during the tournament. Instead, manager Henry Ditonto says official traffic warnings and gridlock alerts have discouraged even regular customers from visiting."**

L4

Similar AND different in content, supported

Award 5m for similarity and difference, supported but no clear basis of comparison

[5-6]

	<i>Award 6m for similarity and difference, supported with clear basis of comparison</i>	
5	Different in perspective, explained Both sources are different in their perspective/stance on the impact of the World Cup. The economic report in Source B, being written by a research organisation, presents a balanced/objective perspective, <u>placing priority on presenting facts, whether positive or negative</u>. It presents how the World Cup has led to both higher and lower hotel room prices, as shown in “This led to lower hotel room prices in host cities like New York City. On the other hand, in Mexico, with fewer available hotels, prices were much higher.” It also states the monetary cost incurred by host nations as a matter of fact, as seen in “Canada’s hosting costs at more than \$1 billion, the event is less about boosting the economy and more about elevating the country’s global standing.” However, in Source C, the magazine presents a one-sided, critical perspective towards the traffic rules that had been introduced during the World Cup, as seen in “Local businesses would have hoped football’s biggest tournament would bring a surge in customers, yet traffic restrictions and public warnings appear to be having the opposite effect for businesses around the stadiums”. In prioritising the smooth running of events, the authorities had neglected the needs of the local businesses, which should also have benefited from the hosting of the World Cup.	[7]

3	Study Source D and E. Having read Source D, are you surprised by Source E? Explain your answer.	[7]
L1	Yes/No, based on provenance of E, superficial reasoning	[1]
L2	Yes/No, reasoning surprise based on content of E only <i>Award 3 marks for content, supported</i>	[2-3]
L3	Yes/No, based on comparison of content between D & E, supported <i>Award 5 marks for Surprised AND Not Surprised.</i> Having read Source D, I am not surprised by Source E on the immense expenditure by host cities to prepare for the World Cup. Source D states, "Host cities absorb most of the costs – including security, infrastructure upgrades and logistics." Likewise, Source E states, "Cities chosen to host World Cup matches have spent years preparing for the influx of visitors, investing in transportation, security, stadium operations and fan experiences." Both sources are saying that host cities spend a lot to ensure that they have the facilities to host fans for the World Cup. Since both sources are similar, I am not surprised. Having read Source D, I am surprised by Source E on the overall economic impact of the World Cup on host cities. Source D states, "If history is any guide, the 2026 World Cup will likely deliver a mixed outcome for host cities: Clear benefits for specific sectors like hospitality and entertainment, but potentially negative returns overall." In Source D, the journalist is saying that the cost will outweigh the benefits. However, Source E states, "The data provides an early indication that one of the world's largest sporting events is delivering on expectations of increased economic activity". In Source E, the journalist is saying that the World Cup is indeed leading to economic benefits from tourist expenditure. Since both sources are different, I am surprised. OR Yes, due to difference/No, due to similarity + both sources being written by the same author (focusing on <u>identity of author</u>) [5] Diff in economic impact + This is surprising as both sources were written by the same author with the same set of credentials, slightly more than a month apart. It is unexpected that he would change his	[4-5]

views and portray the World Cup positively so shortly after the negative portrayal. [5]

Sim in economic cost to host cities + This is not surprising as both sources were written by a football journalist who is clearly well-researched and informed about the World Cup and the circumstances surrounding their stakeholders, having covered multiple World Cups and written multiple books about them. He would have been well-informed about what it takes for a city to be able to host the World Cup and would be expected to write about such challenges faced by host cities. [5]

L4	Yes/No, based on Cross-reference, grounded in the comparison (L3) between D and E (i.e using the cross-ref to make sense of the relationship between D and E) Diff in economic impact + Furthermore, Source D is corroborated by Source B on the negative impact of the World Cup. Source B states, "Research has showed that 12 of the last 14 World Cups produced net economic losses for host regions", saying that overall, host cities should expect to make more losses than profits. Thus, with Source B supporting Source D and challenging Source E regarding the impact of the World Cup, I am surprised by Source E, having read Source D.	[6]
----	--	-----

L5

No, despite difference in content, because of the difference in time frame (focusing on the events at different times)

[7]

Having read Source D, I am not surprised by Source E, despite the difference on the overall economic impact of the World Cup on host cities, due to the difference in time frame. Source D states, "If history is any guide, the 2026 World Cup will likely deliver a mixed outcome for host cities: Clear benefits for specific sectors like hospitality and entertainment, but potentially negative returns overall." In Source D, the journalist is saying that the cost will outweigh the benefits. However, Source E states, "The data provides an early indication that one of the world's largest sporting events is delivering on expectations of increased economic activity". In Source E, the journalist is saying that the World Cup is indeed leading to economic benefits from tourist expenditure. **This difference is not surprising because Source D was published on 4 May, more than a month before the 2026 World Cup began.** At that time, the author would only have been able to make his judgment based on his in-depth knowledge of past World Cup events as an experienced sports journalist, and this is indeed what he does. **However, Source E was published by the same author on 26 June, 2026, about two weeks after the World Cup began.** At this time, on top of his prior knowledge, new economic data on tourist activity became available for him to make a more updated judgment on the economic impact of the World Cup, and as an expert who would want to maintain his credibility, it would be expected for him to update his views based on new information, and this is indeed what he does.

4	Study Source F. How useful is this source regarding government spending for the World Cup? Explain your answer.	[6]
L1	Useful/Not Useful, based on provenance, superficial reasoning The source is not useful as, being the President of Mexico, she would want to glorify Mexico. The source is useful as, being the President of Mexico, she would know everything about Mexico.	[1]
L2	Useful/Not Useful, based on content, unsupported OR Not useful, based on typicality The source is not useful as its contents are only applicable to Mexico.	[2]
L3	Useful based on content, supported OR Not Useful, based on missing content/lack of credibility, without cross-reference <i>Award 3 marks for useful, supported</i> <i>Award 4 marks for not useful, developed</i> Source F is useful in saying that local governments need to spend exorbitant amounts of money to upgrade infrastructure for the World Cup. This is seen in “The federal government of Mexico City is investing \$489 million into the renovation of their airport.” It shows that a lot of money needs to be spent to ensure that the infrastructure can accommodate the large number of expected tourist arrivals for the World Cup. The source is not useful as it is a limited perspective, focusing solely on circumstances in Mexico. It can share its estimates, but these are specific to Mexico and may not be applicable to other home countries.	[3-4]

L4	Useful OR Not Useful by reliability (cross-reference) Source F is useful as it is reliable in saying that <u>local governments need to spend exorbitant amounts of money to upgrade infrastructure for the World Cup</u>. This is seen in “The federal government of Mexico City is investing \$489 million into the renovation of their airport.” It shows that a lot of money needs to be spent to ensure that the infrastructure can accommodate the large number of expected tourist arrivals for the World Cup. This is supported by Source D, which says “Host cities absorb most of the costs – including security, infrastructure upgrades and logistics”. This shows that to be able to host the World Cup, city governments end up spending a lot of money on their infrastructure. Therefore, since Source F is supported by Source D, it is reliable and therefore useful. The source is not useful as it is unreliable about the <u>benefits/outcomes that government spending would bring</u>. Source F says, “We are expecting an additional 5.5 million visitors across Mexico’s three host cities from this World Cup.” The source is justifying the high expenditure by sharing the expected increase in number of tourists in the host cities. However, this is challenged by Source B, which shows that hosting the World Cup may lead to fewer tourists instead, as seen in, “organisers predicted 500,000 extra tourists, yet fewer visitors came than in a normal June”. This shows that government spending to accommodate more tourists may not pay off, as there may be less tourists instead. Therefore, since Source F is challenged by Source B, it is unreliable and therefore not useful. Note: Answers should focus on government spending, as is required by the question	[5]
----	--	-----

L5	Useful/Not useful by critical analysis of content in context OR Useful AND Not Useful by reliability (cross-reference) Source F is useful about the <u>steep cost of hosting</u> based on its <u>provenance and context</u>. At this press conference, she would be under a lot of scrutiny by both the <u>FIFA president</u> and the <u>Mexican public</u>. Thus, she needs to be mindful about what she presents, to maintain her credibility as the leader of Mexico, while also reassuring all stakeholders, who would have conflicting interests in the World Cup. FIFA would be <u>expecting her to show Mexico's commitment to spend to make the World Cup a success</u>. On the other hand, citizens might be <u>concerned about how much taxpayers' money is being spent on hosting the World Cup</u> instead of other government services [Analysis of how Provenance might shape content]. In such a situation, it would be <u>difficult to either exaggerate or downplay the amount that Mexico would be spending on the hosting World Cup</u>. She would be better off being upfront to these stakeholders about the steep costs being incurred. Therefore, <u>when she shares that "Mexico City is investing \$459 million", we can regard it to be true, making the source useful</u>. Source F is not useful about the <u>benefits that government spending would bring</u>. At a press conference <u>meant to announce the FIFA World Cup to the Mexican public and the rest of the world</u>, with FIFA's president in attendance, she would be <u>likely to frame the World Cup positively to her audience to garner support for the event</u>. She would also have a <u>vested interest to focus on favourable projections to justify amount the government will be spending on infrastructure to host the World Cup in Mexico</u> [Analysis of how Provenance might shape content]. Therefore, in sharing that they are "expecting an additional 5.5 million visitors across Mexico's three host cities from this World Cup", she is likely trying to convince(V) the Mexican people (A) that <u>their huge investments in infrastructure would boost tourism in Mexico and create more economic opportunities from tourism (M)</u> so that <u>they would support the government's decision and look forward to the World Cup (I)</u>. <u>Such projections could have been exaggerated or skewed, making the source not useful</u>. Notes: 1. Answers should focus on government spending, as is required by the question 2. There are two different premises in this source that are relevant to the question – cost incurred, and outcome of spending. The premise in focus will impact the analysis of utility	[6]
----	--	-----

5	“Major international sporting events bring more economic opportunities than challenges for the host country.” Using sources in this case study, explain how far you would agree with this statement.	[10]									
L1	Writes about statement, no valid source use	[1]									
L2	Yes OR No, supported by valid source use <i>Award 2m for using only 1 source</i> <i>Award 3m for using at least 2 sources</i> <i>Award 4m for using at least 2 sources and with good explanation</i>	[2-4]									
L3	Yes AND No, supported by valid source use <i>Award 5m for both Yes and No, for valid use of 2 sources</i> <i>Award 6m for both Yes and No, for valid use of 3 sources</i> <i>Award 7-8m for both Yes and No, for valid use of 4 sources and no imbalanced treatment</i> <i>Award 8m for both Yes and No, for valid use of 5 sources and no imbalanced treatment</i> <i>Imbalanced treatment: Capped at 6m</i> To score additional 2m, candidates can use any of the following methods: Analysing at least 1 source in its usefulness, reliability or sufficiency Sharing examples from their contextual knowledge By giving a balanced conclusion or resolution <i>Award 1m for any one of the above</i> <i>Award 2m for more developed answers</i> E.g. Note: Challenges/opportunities must be clearly shown For whom? In what way? <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Source</th><th>Agree</th><th>Disagree</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td><td></td><td>Presents challenges, as it results in less expenditure for the welfare of citizens</td></tr> <tr> <td>B</td><td>Presents opportunities if there are fewer hotels, as profits can be higher</td><td>Presents challenges if there are too many hotels, as the profits can be less than</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Source	Agree	Disagree	A		Presents challenges, as it results in less expenditure for the welfare of citizens	B	Presents opportunities if there are fewer hotels, as profits can be higher	Presents challenges if there are too many hotels, as the profits can be less than	[5-8]
Source	Agree	Disagree									
A		Presents challenges, as it results in less expenditure for the welfare of citizens									
B	Presents opportunities if there are fewer hotels, as profits can be higher	Presents challenges if there are too many hotels, as the profits can be less than									

	Presents opportunities if the spending on improving the country's reputation translates to future profit	expected, which is a problem if a lot of money was invested. Presents challenges as it may drive the usual tourists away, reducing income Presents challenges as it can lead to overall monetary losses for the home country
C		Presents challenges as officials may prioritise smooth traffic at World Cup venues, diverting patrons away from nearby restaurants, leading to loss of income
D	Presents opportunities for specific sectors like hospitality and entertainment, where tourists end up spending more money	Presents challenges as host cities spend a lot to prepare for the World Cup, but are not entitled to all the profits
E	Presents opportunities for various industries to earn income from tourists	
F	Presents opportunities, since it is expected to attract 5.5 million more tourists who would spend money in the country	

Using reliability/utility/sufficiency (needs to focus more on information in the provenance and fully developed typicality)

I disagree with the statement as Source B is useful in telling me that the World Cup presents economic challenges for host countries. Source B is published by an independent European research organisation. This would mean that it is able to conduct its analysis objectively without being biased by affiliated organisations. Indeed, its focus is factual, using a lot of statistics to back up its reports.

Its claims are also made as a matter of fact, not attaching any overly positive or negative connotation to points like the immense cost of Canada's hosting. Overall, this makes the source useful in its analysis that the World Cup presents economic challenges for host countries.

Contextual Knowledge (needs to be a concrete example that reflects the ideas examined in the source)

Overall, I disagree with this statement due to my contextual knowledge about when Singapore hosted the 2010 Youth Olympics. The event was touted to showcase Singapore as a venue for even bigger, major events, which would lead to more tourist spending these events in the future. However, the cost of hosting was severely underestimated, reaching \$387 million, more than three times the initial expectations. This meant over \$200 million that could have been used in other ways such as social services that would have yielded more tangible positive results. This aligns with the concerns expressed by the cartoonist of Source A. Furthermore, the event was also poorly managed, not reaching the promised levels of attendance that would have made a significant impact on Singapore's economy. Therefore, I disagree that hosting major sporting events presents economic opportunities for host countries.

Balanced Conclusion/Resolution (needs to be on a comparable element, using points that go beyond source content)

Overall, I believe it depends on the government's commitment to distributing the economic opportunities equitably in the country. As seen in Source C, many local businesses are well-positioned to benefit from event attendees. However, care must be taken to ensure that the event rules and regulations do not inadvertently end up preventing tourists from patronising these businesses and cause losses in earnings. The government needs to take targeted measures to promote local SMEs to ensure that the tourists from these events continue spending beyond their initial expenditure on match tickets and accommodations. This can help offset the income losses resulting from the reduced number of tourists who avoid the country during major events, as seen in Source B, and ensure economic benefits for more parties in the host country.

Section B

6	Extract 1 discusses how Singapore's society can be targeted by other countries via social media platforms. In your opinion, what are some ways in which Singapore should react to such attempts to undermine us? Explain your answer with reference to two ways.	[7]
Level	Description	Marks
L1	Discusses the topic but no valid way given Singapore is targeted because our society's multiculturalism model may be unacceptable to/incompatible with some countries' policies/ politics/ social model etc. <i>(Answers which deal with context, reasons, impacts of the attempts without Singapore's reactions.)</i>	[1]
L2	Identifies and/or describes ways <i>Award 2 marks for identifying one way</i> <i>Award 3 marks for identifying two ways</i> <i>Award 3 marks for describing one way</i> <i>Award 4 marks for describing two ways</i> Valid description outlines reason(s) how some reactions can be useful but may not demonstrate, with examples, how such reactions mitigate/ prevent/ pre-empt/ negate such attempts.	[2-4]
L3	Explains ways <i>Award 5-6 marks for one way explained</i> <i>Award 6-7 marks for two ways explained</i> <i>Award higher mark for fully developed explanations</i> Answers <u>must</u> justify the reactions, either at level of the country, individuals or communities. Details of the potential harm caused by the attempts are <u>not required</u>, though may be helpful for justification. Possible justifications can be along 2 lines: 1. The reactions <u>mitigate/negate</u> the harms caused 2. The reactions <u>prevent/pre-empt</u> such attempts from occurring again in the future Candidates can use the extract's examples but <u>must</u> demonstrate their own understanding by either adding the aftermath or cite similar policies.	[5-7]

	One possible reaction by Singapore government is to require the platforms to remove and block such content. As such content can only harm Singapore's social cohesion, violates our country's laws against inciting racial tensions, and is entirely baseless, the government is entirely justified in taking actions to remove and block access to them to protect our society. For example, in the case described by the extract, MHA evoked the Online Criminal Harmful Acts to block access to such content within Singapore and some of the platforms, on top of complying, are reviewing their policies to pre-empt such harmful content from being posted. One possible reaction by individuals in Singapore is to exercise vigilance/discernment when consuming similar online content. With globalisation, countries, groups or individuals with their own agenda and ideologies will continue to use social media platforms to spread their ideologies/propaganda and target segments of our society. Hence, only when individuals learn to recognise such attempt can Singapore society be safe from the potential harm they pose. In Singapore schools, for example, students are taught to apply the S.U.R.E framework/ CRAAP test/ 5W1H to see if online content can be trusted and if individuals apply them to such posts, they would recognise that there was malicious intent/ untruths/ distorted perspective in those posts and not fall for it.	
--	--	--

7	Extracts 2 and 3 discuss the negative economic impacts of globalisation and the responses by countries and individuals. Do you think the responses by countries are more significant than the responses by individuals in dealing with the negative economic impacts? Explain your answer.	[8]
Level	Description	Marks
L1	Discusses the topic of globalisation and economy	[1-2]
L2	Describes the responses to the negative economic impacts of globalisation <i>Award 3m for describing one factor</i> <i>Award 4m for describing both factors</i> <i>Answers <u>must</u> address negative economic impacts directly. If candidate cites response to positive economic impacts (e.g. encourage more investments overseas to take advantage of bigger market overseas) it has to be very clearly and explicitly linked by the candidate to a corresponding negative impact (e.g. locals face intense competition from overseas and Singapore's small market means that there is less room for relative success -> therefore, encouraging more investments overseas to take advantage of bigger market overseas mitigates that competition within Singapore somewhat)</i>	[3-4]
L3	Explains the responses to the negative economic impacts of globalisation <i>Award 5-6m for explaining one factor</i> <i>Award 6-7m for explaining both factors</i> <i>Award higher mark for fully developed explanation</i> Individuals can save and invest appropriately to ensure they have sufficient financial resources if they are forced to switch job or take time to develop new skills. For example, when a 48-year-old Singaporean who is a 20-year veteran in the marine and offshore industry got retrenched, he remained jobless for more than 8 months despite seeking assistance from Workforce Singapore's Careers Connect and finally managed to find a job which required him to attend a Career Conversion Programme. Without a minimum amount of savings/investments to tide him through the period before he finally found a suitable job and go through re-training, he might be forced to settle for any available job, even if they are not suitable. <i>(Other responses found in the textbook: continually acquire new knowledge and skills to remain relevant in the job market; have a</i>	[5-7]

	<i>flexible mindset about exploring employment and careers in different field)</i> Governments can provide financial support to cushion the impacts on various sectors and/or individuals in the short term. For example, during the COVID-19 pandemic, Singapore's government came up with a S\$4 billion 'Stabilisation and Support Package' to support affected workers and businesses with job retention, cash flow, property tax rebates, rent waivers and defraying costs. These measures help businesses and workers tide over a short-term crisis, so that they are not forced to make suboptimal choices – like selling their businesses/assets cheaply or declaring bankruptcies – and will be able to recover when the crisis is over. <i>(Other responses found in the textbook: set up agencies to provide resources and advice to help businesses innovate, develop expertise, and expand – so that they will be able to adapt or transform their operations during emergencies and disruptions)</i>	
L4	Both aspects in L3 plus explains the relative significance of each factor on dealing with negative economic impacts. Overall, governments' responses are going to have more significant impact than individuals' responses as the government is more likely to have the resources required to deal with the long-term negative economic impact of globalisation. While individuals' savings and investments might help them tide over a short-term shock, most individuals are not wealthy to the extent that they can survive years of joblessness, which can result from global industrial trends like AI-related job losses. In contrast, governments usually have the resources, expertise and authority to enact changes which can either deal with impact at the root – such as preparing the entire population skills-wise – or mitigate it at a societal level – such as ensuring 'no jobless growth'.	[8]