

## **Suggested Answers to 2018 O level Humanities (Social Studies) 2272/ Paper 1**

### **Section A**

- 1(a)** The cartoonist's message is that globalisation can unite the world, overcoming differences. This is evident through the fact that all the four individuals, despite their differences in terms of skin colour and dressing indicating the possibility of different races, nationality and social class, all sharing the same food preference. All the four of them ordered "big mac. Fries. Large coke", representing the takeover and influence of American fast food culture as a result of globalisation. The man at the back of the queue is dressed vastly different from the other three; he is wearing formal office attire, and the rest are dressed in hip-hop style clothes. Yet, all of them are ordering the same food and the last man said "me too! Who says we all can't get along", thus showing that the globalised fast food culture makes all of us the same.
- 1(b)** The cartoonist of Source B would agree with the author in Source C in terms of the consequence of globalisation, in the sense that similar brand items can be found in different parts of the world. In source B, the cartoonist suggests that Nike can be found in Paris, Disney in London and Gap in Rome despite them originating from America. Similarly, source C suggests that "your morning cappuccino is the same no matter whether you are sipping it in Tokyo, New York, Bangkok or Buenos Aires" suggesting that globalisation has resulted in the same products being found worldwide.

However, the cartoonist of Source B would disagree with the author in Source C in terms of whether globalisation is truly beneficial. This is because Source B is mocking the impacts of globalisation, thus suggesting it is not beneficial whereas Source C truly embraces and supports the idea of globalisation as it can bring about benefits to our society. This is evident through the fact that source B is mocking globalisation as the three individuals have been to different countries but ended up buying items belonging to American companies. For an instance, "great shirt at the Disney store in London" and "Nike Town in Paris" when Disney and Nike are clearly American. This shows that globalisation is not beneficial as everywhere you go, you will be purchasing the same things. On the contrary, source C states that "it increases our sense of togetherness via the sense of shared culture, increasing harmony" thus showing that globalisation is beneficial as it is an agent that unites people.

- 1(c)** Source D raises a few concerns with regards to the rise of Pokemon Go in the world. It suggests that there could be an addiction to the game, disrespect and dilution of others' cultures and traditions. This is evident in that "the game might provoke many to enter places of worship, disturbing prayer and creating law and order problems". Also, another concern raised is with regards to physical safety as the "game has been blamed for a wave of crimes, traffic violations and injuries".

Cross-referencing to source E; source E does prove that Source D's concerns are unjustified. This is because Source E states that Pokemon Go actually provides an opportunity to foster a deeper understanding of different culture, and in this case foster a deeper understanding of British wildlife. I know this because source E states that "it is free advertising with a huge audience" and with a wider audience, a deeper understanding of others culture will be inculcated. In addition, Source E did not flag out any concern with regards to physical safety and the only point raised was to make good use of this opportunity to educate and raise awareness of the museum and its collection of wildlife species as it states that "Maybe museums need to do something to convert their visiting Pokemon Go players into visitors of the displays and exhibits in the museum". As such, since Source E does not support any of the concerns raised by Source D, Source E does prove that Source D's concerns are unjustified.

- 1(d)** I am not surprised by Source F in talking about the negative consequences of globalisation. Source F states that globalisation has led to the dilution of local Bhutan culture as people now look up to the Western culture and there is dominance and growing prevalence of Western culture in Bhutan. I know this as Source F states that "People admire western culture and prefer western sports and games to traditional pastimes". This means that Western culture is preferred over the local.

Similarly, when I cross-refer to Source A, Source A also agrees that Western culture is taking prevalence in society today. This is evident from the fact that everyone, regardless of their differences, is eating fast food and ordering the same order of Big Mac, fries and a large coke. This means that society is largely dominated by Western culture, and local culture is slowly being diluted away.

Thus, since Source A supports Source F, I am not surprised by the source.

- 1(e) Sources C and E agree that globalisation of culture has positive effects whereas Sources D and F disagree with it.

From Source C, I can infer that globalisation of culture is positive as it unites people together as they can identify towards the same things. I know this as source C states that “even if it makes a loss of cultural diversity, it increases our sense of togetherness via the sense of shared culture” and can “increase harmony”. As such, there will be less fighting. Thus this speaks of the positive aspect of the globalisation of culture.

From Source E, I can infer that globalisation of culture is positive as it can educate and lead to the spread of ideas globally. This is evident from the fact that Pokemon was created “to give city-living children a chance to collect creatures”. This means that it will help children to be more curious and allow the spread of positive ideas and experiences across generation and space.

However, Source F begs to differ as Source F feels that the globalisation of culture has led to a dilution of local culture and in fact, divides society. This can be seen from the fact that “it is quite embarrassing to see our own cultural identity and values have diminished” and “social media has made individuals more individualistic” thus stating the ill-effects of the globalisation of culture.

Lastly, Source D also states of the ill effects of globalisation of culture as it may lead to the disrespect of local culture. For instance, the source states that “might provoke many to enter places of worship, disturbing prayers and creating law and order problems” thus stating that cultural globalisation has led to global ideas being more influential and important than local beliefs, thus leading to the disrespect of local culture.

In sum, I agree to a larger extent that globalisation of culture has positive effects on society. This is because the globalisation of ideas will promote understanding across cultures and inculcate in individuals that we are ultimately but human innately and that these differences make us better individuals.

**2(a)** The first reason is due to ageing population. An ageing population means that there will be more elderly in society and a smaller working population. Since there is lesser working population supporting the elderly, the government has to step in to help with the needy elderly. As such, more spending is required on healthcare. This is so that we have a larger number of nurses, caregivers, allied healthcare staff, doctors and also the infrastructure to support to growing number of elderly. With more elderly, more hospitals and hospices need to be constructed and that would mean more spending on healthcare as well. This is to cater to the growing number of elderly who would require more hospital beds as well.

The second reason could be due to a widening income gap. As a society, Singapore has a widening income gap, that is the poor become poorer and the rich are getting richer. As such, since the divide is getting bigger, the government needs to provide more subsidies for the less wealthy and this would then result in a greater expenditure on healthcare. This is especially so when there are more in the category of “very poor” as compared to the previously middle-class individuals. With more needy individuals, more subsidies at a higher rate need to be given, and as such, healthcare spending in Singapore is likely to increase in the coming years.

**2(b)** Healthcare can be managed in various ways. In some countries, such as the US, a market-based approach is taken to manage healthcare. A market-based approach means that individuals have to take responsibility for their healthcare cost completely. For instance, in the US, there is no single national policy guiding healthcare system, and both public and private hospitals provide healthcare to American citizens. The government does not intervene. The middle and higher income group individuals can obtain their medical insurance as a part of their employment package. Everything related to healthcare in the US is extremely expensive as the market-based system is one that is made to make profits. As such, not everyone can afford medical insurance in the US. As such, Americans have to cope with healthcare costs on their own, and those in the lower income group are more likely to be affected due to the high cost which may result in them stopping their treatment.

An alternative way to manage healthcare is via the government-financed approach. Under this approach, the government provides substantial subsidies and services for most of the healthcare needs of its citizens as it is believed that



all citizens should have access to healthcare services regardless of their background or socio-economic status. For an example in Sweden, Swedish pay a high tax rate to support universal healthcare. As such, governments can play a huge responsibility in managing healthcare as well.

In conclusion, I believe that the individual should play a greater role in healthcare cost. This is so that the individual will take responsibility for his health. If healthcare were to come so freely and easily, it might be taken advantage of. Furthermore, it may also lead to the exploitation of healthcare services which may be detrimental to those who genuinely require the healthcare services. As such, individuals should play a greater role in healthcare cost to ensure the quality of healthcare provided.