

MARKING SCHEME / LORMS

1). To what extent would the immigrant in Source A agree with the view of the United Kingdom government in Source B? Explain your answer. [6]

Marker's Comment:						
L	DESCRIPTORS	M				
L1	False Match The immigrant in Source A will not agree with the UK government in Source B because Source A mentions about “discrimination”, but this information is missing in Source B.	1				
L2	Agree / Disagree, without support. 2m – 1-sided 3m – 2-sided - The immigrant in Source A would agree with the UK government in Source B because both say that immigration policy is causing tension in the society. - The immigrant in Source A will disagree with the UK government in Source B on whether immigrants bring harm or benefits. In Source B, it paints immigration as something that may be harmful to the country. However, in Source A, the immigrants claims that he brings benefits to the host country. <table><tr><th>Does not agree</th><th>Agree</th></tr><tr><td> - Public perception of immigrants is valid vs invalid. - Immigrants take away resources vs contribute resources. </td><td> - It is important for immigrants to contribute. - Immigrants should integrate into the local community. - Tension between immigrants and locals. </td></tr></table>	Does not agree	Agree	- Public perception of immigrants is valid vs invalid. - Immigrants take away resources vs contribute resources.	- It is important for immigrants to contribute. - Immigrants should integrate into the local community. - Tension between immigrants and locals.	2-3
Does not agree	Agree					
- Public perception of immigrants is valid vs invalid. - Immigrants take away resources vs contribute resources.	- It is important for immigrants to contribute. - Immigrants should integrate into the local community. - Tension between immigrants and locals.					
L3	Agree and/or Disagree, with support. 4m – 1-sided 5m – 2-sided - The immigrant in <u>Source A would agree with the UK government in Source B on how immigration policy is causing tension in the society.</u> In Source B, the UK government states that the previous immigration policy has “serious consequence ... on community cohesion.” This shows that community cohesion is threatened with the presence of immigrants. Similarly, Source A states that “locals are told that we take their jobs or dilute their culture.” This means that the locals do not like the presence of immigrants. - The immigrant in Source A will disagree with the UK government in Source B on whether immigrants bring harm or benefits. In Source B, it paints immigration as a cause of strain on jobs, housing, and social cohesion, which is <u>harmful to the country.</u> However, in Source A, the immigrants claims that he brings <u>benefits to the host country.</u> It is stated that he “brings creativity, technical expertise, and fresh perspectives. Immigrants like me pay taxes, support local businesses, and add value through diversity.”	4-5				
L4	Disagree, due to stance/intention of author For L4 response, it should have the following key considerations: € ATQ: Disagree € Authorship & position € Intention / Stance Both sources will never agree with each other. Source B is from an official UK government document {author} to justify tighter immigration controls because of public concern over immigration’s impact on jobs, housing, and social cohesion. It is definitely not supportive of open immigration policy because it uses critical and loaded tone such as “the previous government lost control not just the numbers of people arriving, but of the entire immigration system, with serious consequence...” It sounds like the previous immigration policy was a total failure and wrecked the entire	6				

country. On the other hand, Source A is an **account from an immigrant {author}** who is trying to justify that his/her presence in Canada. He/she talks about how much **value-adding has been made to the host country with his/her expertise and is also boosting the economy of Canda** via tax contribution and supporting local businesses. By doing so, he/she hopes that the public can be more supportive of open immigration policy.

OR

Both sources will never agree with each other. Source B is from an **official UK government {author}** document to **justify tighter immigration controls** because of public concern over immigration's impact on jobs, housing, and social cohesion. By doing so, it hopes that the public will align and support the government's policy to restrict immigrants coming into UK. On the other hand, Source A is an **account from an immigrant {author}** who is trying to justify that his/her presence in Canada. He/she has **value-added to the host country with his/her expertise and is also boosting the economy of Canda** via tax contribution and supporting local businesses. By doing so, he/she hopes that the public can be more accepting of immigrants.

2). Do you think the cartoonist in Source C supports the United Kingdom's immigration policy? Explain your answer using evidence from the source. [5]

Marker's Comment:		
L	DESCRIPTORS	M
L1	Response based on literal interpretation of source Supporter, because it ensures locals have a job and they do not need immigrants.	1
L2	Supporter, based on misinterpretation of UK immigration policy - not aware that UK is tightening the policy - Supporter because immigrants are useful in the work force as there is a shortage of British labour. - Supporter because it shows that immigrants are important. It is meant as a satire by the cartoonist.	2
L3	Not a supporter, based on valid interpretation of source, content. <i>For L3 response, it should have the following key considerations:</i> € ATQ: Not a supporter € Immigration policy: Restrict foreign workers in care sectors. € Negative impact: Shortage of care worker / quality of care for elderly dropped 3m –ATQ + Either 1 of above 4m –ATQ + Both above, supported - No, the cartoonist does not support the United Kingdom's immigration policy. The cartoon shows the negative impact of the policy, such as a shortage of care workers and a drop in the quality of care for the elderly. In the cartoon, a sign reads "Nursing Home," but the elderly residents are seen cleaning windows, mowing the lawn, and pushing each other in wheelchairs. The caption states, "We employ only British workers. The elderly residents look after themselves while our staff work from home." [3] - No, the cartoonist does not support the United Kingdom's immigration policy. The cartoon criticises the policy of restricting foreign workers in the care sector. This is shown through the sign that reads "Nursing Home" and the caption that states, "We employ only British workers. The elderly residents look after themselves while our staff work from home." The absence of professional caregivers in the cartoon suggests that foreign workers, who usually fill such roles, are no longer available, and the policy only allows British workers to be employed. [3] - No, the cartoonist does not support the United Kingdom's immigration policy. The source shows that the immigration policy restricts the hiring of foreign workers in the care sector. In the cartoon, a sign reads "Nursing Home", but elderly residents are seen doing tasks such as cleaning windows, mowing the lawn, and pushing each other in wheelchairs. The caption states, "We employ only British workers. The elderly residents look after themselves while our staff work from home." This shows the negative consequences of the policy — there is a shortage of care workers, and the quality of care for the elderly has decreased as they are left to manage on their own. The cartoonist is highlighting how this immigration policy has led to serious problems in elderly care. [4]	3-4
L4	Response based on valid interpretation of source, critical tone/sarcasm. No, the cartoonist in Source C does not support the United Kingdom's immigration policy. The cartoon uses sarcasm to criticise the policy of employing only British workers. It shows a nursing home where elderly residents are seen cleaning windows, using a lawnmower, and pushing each other in wheelchairs, while the staff "work from home." The caption reads, "We employ only British workers. The elderly residents look after themselves while our staff work from home." This <u>exaggeration</u> highlights the negative consequence of a strict immigration policy — a shortage of care workers, leading to the elderly being left to care for themselves. Through this cartoon, the cartoonist is pointing out the impracticality and harm of restricting foreign workers in essential services like eldercare.	5

3). How useful is this source in the discussion on immigration? Explain your answer. [7]

Marker's Comment:		
L	DESCRIPTORS	M
L1	Response, based on provenance. Source D is useful because it is a data from a research organisation.	1
L2	Useful / Not useful, based on content. <i>2m – Unsupported</i> <i>3m – Supported</i> <u>Discussion may include the following:</u> - Varied range of public perception on immigration. - Complex public sentiment on immigration. - Accepts immigrants because they contribute to economy. - Sees immigrants as a threat when it comes to job competition. - Any others that can be supported with evidence Source D is useful in the discussion on immigration because it shows that there is <u>complexity of public sentiment on immigration</u>. From the source, it reflects that 51.1% agree that immigration "fills important job vacancies", while at the same time, 43.6% agree it "increases unemployment". This reflects a contradiction—people see immigrants as both helping and hurting the job market.	2-3
L3	Useful AND Not useful	4
L4	Useful: L2/3 + Cross-reference (MUST relate to 'reliability', otherwise is a ZERO) <i>5m – weak</i> <i>6m –strong</i> Source D is useful in the discussion on immigration because it shows that there is <u>complexity of public sentiment on immigration</u>. From the source, it reflects that 51.1% agree that immigration "fills important job vacancies", while at the same time, 43.6% agree it "increases unemployment". This reflects a contradiction—people see immigrants as both helping and hurting the job market. Source D is useful in the discussion on immigration because its sentiment is supported by the Background Information (BI). The BI shares that "people have mixed feelings about immigration. Debates continue over how much immigration is acceptable, how immigrants may dilute a country's national identity." This demonstrates that there is <u>complexity of public sentiment on immigration</u>. As such, Source D is supported by BI and that makes Source D reliable and useful.	5-6
L5	Not useful: L2/3 + Limitation of data due to critical analysis of provenance. <i>6m – weak</i> <i>7m –strong</i> L2 + Ultimately, Source D is not a useful source for discussion on immigration. The data in the chart shows public sentiment on immigration in Singapore, but it does not have information on the sample size <u>or</u> sample group. This raises concerns about its data representativeness. Sample size: The unknown sample size raises questions about whether the results accurately reflect the broader Singapore population's understanding of effects of immigrations on Singapore. Given this limitation, Source D <u>may not</u> provide a genuine and reliable representation about the public attitude toward immigration. OR Sample group: The unknown sample group raises questions about whether the results accurately reflect the broader public's understanding of effects of immigrations in Singapore. Given this limitation, Source D may not provide a genuine and reliable representation about the general Singaporean attitude toward immigration. Without knowing the background of the respondents – new citizens, citizens, PRs, etc... it is difficult to determine whether the results accurately reflect the broader public's views on immigration. New citizens and PRs may be more supportive of open immigration policy, while locals may be less supportive of it. So, when I do not know what is the sample group, it limits	6-7

	the value of the data. In light of these limitations, the chart <u>does not provide a genuinely reliable representation of public sentiment towards immigration in Singapore.</u> Note: Alternative segments can be business groups, government, elders, etc.	
--	---	--

4). How far does the account in Source E make you surprised by the statement in Source F? [7]

Marker's Comment:		
L	DESCRIPTORS	M
L1	Response, based on provenance / ATQ based on Source E instead The account in Source E does not make me surprised by the statement in Source F because both are talking about issues in Singapore.	1
L2	Response, based on Source F only. I am not surprised by Source F because it is expected of the President of Singapore to want the best for his country - to use immigration to mitigate ageing and manpower issues in Singapore. I am not surprised by Source F because it is natural for the President of Singapore to want to preserve the harmony of his country, that is why he said immigration needs to be paced.	2
L3	1-sided response, content from Sources E & F. <i>3m – Weak</i> <i>4m – Strong</i> Source E does not make me surprise about Source F because they agree with each other. <u>Both sources highlight the importance of integration for immigrants in Singapore.</u> Source E shows an example of this in action: Mr AitBachir, a foreign tech worker, recognises the risk of being “disconnected” and takes the initiative to stay connected with locals by working part-time as a food delivery rider. Source F explains the government’s belief that immigration must be managed carefully, and that integration is critical. If immigrants are not well integrated, the government would have to stop the inflow. OR Source E makes me surprise about Source F because they are talking about different management of immigration. Source E emphasises <u>personal / ground-level observation</u>, voluntary integration through social interaction. Source F, on the other hand, emphasises on <u>national-level observation</u> that integration has to be managed by the government. In Source E, Mr AitBachir shares that “through his part-time work, he values being able to foster interactions with communities around him, which include locals and the elderly living in the heartlands, as well as other food delivery riders.” This shows his personal ground-up initiative when it comes to interaction between immigrants and locals. However, for Source F, it is very clear that the government has to help to integrate immigrants and locals. The President of Singapore mentions that “critically, you’ve got to integrate people. And if you’re unable to integrate people well, you just have to stop (immigration policy).”	3-4
L4	2-sided response, content from Sources E & F. <i>4m – Weak</i> <i>5m – Strong</i> See above, 2-sided comparison.	4-5

L5	L3 + Response, based cross-referencing. Successful cross-referencing must have the same focus/topic E: _____ F: _____ 3rd: _____ <i>5m – Weak</i> <i>6m – Strong</i> Source E does not make me surprise about Source F because they agree with each other. <u>Both sources highlight the importance of integration for immigrants in Singapore.</u> Source E shows an example of this in action: Mr AitBachir, a foreign tech worker, recognises the risk of being “disconnected” and takes the initiative to stay connected with locals by working part-time as a food delivery rider. Source F explains the government’s belief that immigration must be managed carefully, and that integration is critical. If immigrants are not well integrated, the government would have to stop the inflow. Source E does not make me surprise about Source F because <u>Source F is supported by Source B. Source B also shares the sentiment that it is important for immigrants to integrate in the host country in UK.</u> Form Source B, it states that “our current government will control our borders ... and how people should be able to integrate in local communities.” The UK government wants to be in control because it is crucial for immigrants and locals to accept each other and have social cohesion.	5-6
L6	Response, based on expectedness of provenance. METHOD A: <i>Expected of Sources E & F, due to provenance.</i> • <u>Role of President to protect Singapore’s interest and social cohesion.</u> • <u>Role of PR who has called Singapore home, in demonstrating genuine commitment to bonding.</u> • <u>Consider intention of PR, to demonstrate his commitment for future application of citizenship in Singapore.</u> Source E does not make me surprised about Source F. The perspectives in both sources are expected given their provenance and positions in highlighting the importance of integration. Source F, a speech by President Tharman {author}, reflects the government’s role in safeguarding national interests. His message reflects the <u>government’s responsibility to ensure that immigration does not erode social cohesion</u>. It is expected that he emphasises a measured immigration policy, where integration is crucial to preserve the Singaporean ethos. Source E, a local news article, features Yann AitBachir {author}, a high-earning French national who has made Singapore his home. Despite his status, he chooses to do part-time food delivery to stay connected with the local community, showing a <u>personal commitment to integration</u>.	6-7

5). 'Immigrants bring benefits.' Using sources in this case study, explain how far you would agree with this statement. [10]

Marker's Comment:																										
L	DESCRIPTORS	MARK																								
L1	Writes about statement, no valid source use/specific knowledge.	1																								
L2	Yes / No Supported by valid source use. 1 source: 2 marks 2 sources: 3-4 marks	2-4																								
L3	Yes AND No with valid source use. 1 Agree 1 Disagree: 5 marks 1 Agree 2 Disagree OR 2 Agree 1 Disagree: 6 marks 2 Agree 2 Disagree: 7-8 marks 2 Agree 3 Disagree OR 3 Agree 2 Disagree: 8 marks Unbalanced (1/3 or 1/4): Maximum 6 marks Possible Considerations: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">'Immigrants bring benefits.'</th></tr> <tr> <th></th><th>Agree - Benefits</th><th>Disagree – Harm</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Source A</td><td>✓</td><td>✓</td></tr> <tr> <td>Source B</td><td></td><td>✓</td></tr> <tr> <td>Source C</td><td>✓ [only]</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>Source D</td><td>✓</td><td>✓</td></tr> <tr> <td>Source E</td><td>✓</td><td>✓</td></tr> <tr> <td>Source F</td><td>✓</td><td>✓</td></tr> </tbody> </table> Yes, I agree. Source A shows an immigrant in Canada explains how he/she “brings creativity, technical expertise, and fresh perspectives.” Author also shares that he/she “pays taxes, support local businesses, and add value through diversity.” This shows that <u>immigrants support the economy and enrich the workplace; all these help drive innovation and growth in Canada's economy.</u> No, I disagree. Source B shows how the UK government notes that past uncontrolled immigration led to “serious consequences for the working of our economy, public services, the housing market and community cohesion. This demonstrates that immigration can have harmful effects because when community cohesion is hurt, <u>it will lead to tension between immigrants and locals. Such tension may destabilise the country.</u> Yes, I agree. Source C criticises the tightening of UK immigration policy, which restricts foreigners from coming into the country. It shows a nursing home where “only British workers” are employed. However, when British workers are working from home, the elderly residents have to care for themselves. This implies that the lack of migrant workers leads to a shortage of essential labour, especially in sectors like elderly care. <u>Without immigrants, care services like elderly care suffer. Hence, immigrants are essential because they can bring benefits such as supporting the care sector and looking after the patients or elderly.</u> No, I disagree. Source D shows that 43.6% of the respondents agree that immigrants increase unemployment in Singapore. This suggests that the locals in Singapore do view immigrants as a form of threat, competing with them for jobs. <u>When there is such negative sentiment in the society, it may lead to tension between the locals and the immigrants, resulting in disharmony of the society.</u>	'Immigrants bring benefits.'				Agree - Benefits	Disagree – Harm	Source A	✓	✓	Source B		✓	Source C	✓ [only]		Source D	✓	✓	Source E	✓	✓	Source F	✓	✓	5-8
'Immigrants bring benefits.'																										
	Agree - Benefits	Disagree – Harm																								
Source A	✓	✓																								
Source B		✓																								
Source C	✓ [only]																									
Source D	✓	✓																								
Source E	✓	✓																								
Source F	✓	✓																								

	No, I disagree. Source E is an account of a PR in Singapore. He shares that it “made him concerned that he would become rather “disconnected” from local communities here” because of his expat and higher socio-economic status (SES) background. This means that there is a tendency for immigrants from more privileged backgrounds to remain socially distant from locals, especially if they do not make the effort to integrate. As a result, <u>immigrants may not always bring benefits if they are unable—or unwilling—to connect meaningfully with the local population, which can weaken social cohesion when they fail to integrate.</u> Yes, I agree. Source F shares that Singapore is an ageing society, and to address labour shortages, the country has to “rely on immigration”. This suggests that the survival of Singapore, a resource-scarce nation with a shrinking workforce, depends on the contribution of immigrants. They help fill critical roles in sectors like healthcare, construction, and eldercare, which are essential to the functioning of society. Therefore, <u>immigrants bring benefits by supporting Singapore’s economic needs and ensuring that essential services continue running smoothly despite demographic challenges.</u>	
Bonus	To score additional 2 marks, candidates will need to either: 1) Analyse at least one source in relation to its reliability, utility or sufficiency L2 (Source A agrees with the statement) + However, the immigrant’s account may not be fully reliable because they have a motive to defend themselves and other immigrants against negative public opinions. In the source, the Brazilian designer talks about facing discrimination in Canada and wants to change how locals view immigrants. They are likely trying to show that immigrants work hard, contribute to society, and do not take away jobs or harm the culture. Because of this, the speaker may be selective in his/her portrayal on the positive side of immigration and leave out major problems it may bring. This means the source might be biased, as the speaker is using it to gain sympathy and challenge negative stereotypes, not to give a balanced view. As such, Source A is an unreliable source. 2) By giving a balanced conclusion/resolution L3 (must at least successfully address 2 or more contrasting sources) + Source B suggests that immigrants bring more of a <u>threat</u>, yet Source F suggests that immigrants bring more of a <u>benefit</u>. Both are statements by the respective government officials (B: UK and F: Singapore) and both views are valid and justified when understood in the context of their respective countries’ needs and challenges. Source B, from the United Kingdom, presents a critical view of past immigration policies, emphasising the need for tighter control. It highlights how the previous government’s lax approach led to negative consequences such as strain on public services and rising unemployment among local workers. In response, the current government seeks to regain control over who enters the country, who can work or access services, etc. <u>This stance is justified as it reflects a national effort to address past policy failures and restore public confidence in the immigration system.</u> In contrast, Source F, from Singapore, acknowledges the necessity of immigration, particularly in light of an ageing population and shrinking workforce. President Tharman explains that immigration is vital for Singapore’s continued economic growth but must be carefully managed and coupled with strong integration efforts. The emphasis on maintaining a “Singaporean ethos” shows that while Singapore welcomes immigrants for their contributions, it remains mindful of preserving national identity and social cohesion. <u>This position is also valid, as it reflects a pragmatic and forward-looking strategy tailored to Singapore’s economic realities / national interest.</u> 3) Provide contextual knowledge L2 (Source C agrees with the statement) + According to Singapore Nursing Board’s 2019 report, about 7,600 (or 18%) of our nursing workforce are Filipino. This shows that immigrants play a crucial role in supporting Singapore’s healthcare system. With an ageing population and increasing healthcare demands, foreign nurses help fill the manpower gap that locals alone cannot meet. Without these migrant	

	healthcare workers, Singapore would struggle to maintain the quality and accessibility of its healthcare services. Therefore, immigrants bring clear and essential benefits to our healthcare sector.	
--	---	--

6) In your opinion, what do you think Singapore can do to promote inter-generational bonding between the young and old? Explain your answers with two strategies. [7]

Marker's Comment:		
LEVEL	DESCRIPTOR	MARKS
L1	Describes the Topic E.g. The world's population is ageing. Virtually every country in the world is experiencing growth in the number and proportion of older persons in their population. Hence, it is crucial to integrate youth and elderly in Singapore.	1
L2	Identifies/Describes reason(s) <i>Award 2 marks for identifying one impact and 3 marks for identifying two impacts. Award 3 marks for describing one impact and 4 marks for describing two impacts.</i> E.g. One strategy Singapore can adopt is to implement regular youth volunteer programmes in eldercare homes. These provide structured opportunities for youths and seniors to interact through shared activities such as games, storytelling, and light exercises, fostering empathy and mutual respect. E.g. One strategy Singapore can adopt is to create more dedicated inter-generational community spaces that bring youths and the elderly together regularly. An example is the Joo Chiat Social Club, an intergenerational facility along Joo Chiat Road. It combines assisted living for seniors with an activity hub where children and youths, including volunteers' kids, visit weekly for workshops such as woodworking, baking, exercise, and crafts.	2-4
L3	Explain the reason(s) <i>Award 5-6 marks for explaining one reason. Award 6-7 marks for explaining two reasons.</i> E.g. One strategy Singapore can adopt is to implement regular youth volunteer programmes in eldercare homes. These provide structured opportunities for youths and seniors to interact through shared activities such as games, storytelling, and light exercises, fostering empathy and mutual respect. For example, many schools in Singapore organise Values in Action (VIA) projects where students visit eldercare centres to engage seniors through conversations, performances, and interactive activities. These sessions are part of the curriculum to instil values of care and social responsibility in students. <u>This helps youths better understand the needs of the elderly, while seniors feel valued and less isolated. Such sustained interaction strengthens intergenerational ties and promotes social harmony in Singapore.</u> E.g. One strategy Singapore can adopt is to create more dedicated inter-generational community spaces that bring youths and the elderly together regularly. These spaces support shared activities such as crafting, cooking, and storytelling, which help foster mutual respect, empathy, and deeper understanding. Through regular interaction, age-based stereotypes are broken down and emotional bonds are formed. An example is the Joo Chiat Social Club, an intergenerational facility along Joo Chiat Road. It combines assisted living for seniors with an activity hub where children and youths, including volunteers' kids, visit weekly for workshops such as woodworking, baking, exercise, and crafts. This example shows how shared spaces and structured programmes can promote organic bonding. <u>Seniors feel more engaged and energised, while younger participants learn empathy and patience—strengthening intergenerational relationships and social harmony in Singapore.</u>	5-7

7) How far do you agree that assimilation policy is more effective than integration policy in managing socio-cultural diversity in society? Explain your answer. [8]

Marker's Comment:		
LEVEL	DESCRIPTOR	MARKS
L1	Writes about the topic without addressing the question. A policy managing socio-cultural diversity promotes inclusion, mutual respect, and harmony among different racial, religious, and cultural groups in society.	1-2
L2	Describes the effect(s) <i>Award 3 marks for describing one factor.</i> <i>Award 4 marks for describing both factors.</i> E.g. Negative impact is more significant in a diverse society. Interactions between locals and immigrants bring cultural challenges in a diverse Singapore society. Singapore is a very diverse society because we have people from different nationality, race and ethnicity, religion and socio-economic status. Thus, prejudice and misconceptions of others can pose a threat to social harmony in Singapore. E.g. Positive impact is more significant in a diverse society. Interactions between locals and immigrants bring cultural opportunities in a diverse Singapore society. Cultural exchanges can create distinct experiences because of diversity in nationality, race and ethnicity, religion and socio-economic status. Our diverse society provides people with many opportunities to interact and learn from those who hail from different countries and cultures.	3-4
L3	Explains the effort(s) Student must at least implicitly address 'diversity' in his 'Elaboration', before they can be considered for L3. <i>Award 5-6 marks for explaining one factor.</i> <i>Award 6-7 marks for explaining two factors.</i> E.g. Assimilation is one way to manage socio-cultural diversity. It means encouraging everyone to adopt a single national identity, so people feel united as one. In France, assimilation is based on the idea of secularism, where the government stays neutral about religion. All religions are treated equally and are kept separate from government matters. France uses education, jobs, and the citizenship process to help immigrants fit in. For example, immigrant children attend special classes to improve their French, so they can join local schools. In school, religion is not discussed, except in subjects like History or Literature. New immigrants who want to become citizens must also take a four-day course to learn about French values and daily life. <u>This helps reduce misunderstandings between different cultural groups, as everyone learns to speak the same language and understand French culture. As a result, people feel more connected, and there is less chance of conflict. So, assimilation helps create unity by getting everyone to adopt a common way of life.</u> E.g. Integration is another way to manage diversity. Instead of making everyone the same, it encourages people to keep their own cultures while still being part of a shared national identity. In Singapore, we believe that different cultures and backgrounds can work together to form a strong Singaporean identity. One example a common shared experience where all male Singapore Citizens and Permanent Residents must serve National Service (NS) after turning 18. NS brings together young men from different races and religions to train and live together. <u>This builds strong bonds and a shared identity. Integration gives people a chance to mix and learn from one another. It helps reduce stereotypes, builds mutual respect, and ensures that no group feels left out. That's why integration promotes harmony in a diverse society like Singapore.</u>	5-7
L4	Both aspects in L3 + Weighing of effects. I believe integration is more effective than assimilation in managing diversity. Integration helps people feel proud of both their cultural background and their national identity. It includes everyone, encourages respect, and brings people together without forcing them to give up their culture. Assimilation, on the other hand, can make minority groups feel like they have to lose their identity, which may lead to unhappiness and social tension. In the long run, integration supports a more open and united society.	8