

S101/1
GENERAL PAPER

Paper 1
2022
2 hours 40 minutes



MATIGO MOCK EXAMINATIONS
Uganda Advanced Certificate of Education

GENERAL PAPER

Paper 1

2 hours 40 minutes

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES:

The total time of 2 hours and 40 minutes includes ten minutes for you to study the questions before you begin your answering.

*Answer **two** questions which must be chosen as follows: **one** question from section **A** and **one** question from section **B**.*

Answers to each question must begin in a fresh answer booklet which should then be fastened together

*You are advised to divide your time equally between the **two** questions.*

***All** questions carry equal marks.*

*Any additional question (s) attempted will **not** be marked.*

Turn Over

SECTION A

*Answer **one** question from this section
Answers should be between **500** and **800** words in length.*

1. Account for the occurrence of human labour trafficking in Uganda and suggest remedies to this problem. (50 marks)
2. Examine the merits and demerits of co-education in Uganda. (50 marks)
3. Discuss the contribution of the mass media in the development of your community. (50 marks)
4. To what extent is the technological advancement a solution to Uganda's environmental problems? (50 marks)

SECTION B

*Answer **one** question from this section.*

5. Study the information provided below and answer the questions that follow:
The directors of generation Y have got four employees eligible for promotion. Controversy has arisen due to the failure of these directors to choose and promote these employees. A board meeting was convened to resolve this matter using the following criteria:
 - These employees should have the following qualities in their order of importance:
 - Amount of speech
 - Speed
 - Dominance
 - Intimacy
 - Competition
 - Performance/ Hard work
 - The employee with the best attributes will be ranked highest.
 - Voting will be done by a short message sent through social media from all stake holders.
 - The board's outcome is final.
 - Results will be released at the awards ceremony for only those invited

The following are the qualities observed from these employees.

Ella: Quiet, slow to reply, intimate, hard working and competitive.

He interacts once with Bella and once with Della and four times with Cella.

Bella: Talkative, competitive and hard working but emotional. He interacts twice with Della and five times with Cella.

Cella: Dominant, intrusive, competitive and compatible but too talkative.

He interacts six times with Della, five times with Bella and four times with Ella and the group as a whole.

Della: Talks at normal speed allowing for pauses, shy but intimate and competitive. He interacts twice with B and the rest of the group, thrice with Ella and seven times with Cella.

Questions:

a) Following the directors criteria rank the above employees in an ascending order of performance. (8 marks)

b) Using the interaction flow of these employees, show the employee who is:-
i. Most dominating.
ii. Least dominating (6 marks)

Show how you arrive at your answer.

c) If another participant Emella surfaced who gesticulates, articulately, is intimate, competitive and hard working. He interacts with the whole group once and twice with Della and thrice and thrice with Ella and Bella. How would he affect the placement in this organization? (4 marks)

d) At the Awards ceremony all those present were supposed to interact and shake hands with all those present and 66 handshakes were recorded. How many people attended this ceremony? (2 marks)

e) What is the significance of social media in your community? (10 marks)

f) How can people live in harmony? (10 marks)

SPGE (10 marks)

6. Read the passage very carefully and answer questions that follow:

“If it looks like a duck, walks like a duck, it’s a social construct of a duck”. Men and women look unlike, walk unlike, talk unlike. They differ in who is more **competitive**, single- minded and risk- taking; who is more likely to climb the Everest, drive too fast, become President of the United States, commit a murder, or win a Noble prize, in what triggers their sexual jealousy, exotic fantasies, status envy.

Differences such as these are universal, **transcending cultures**, class, societies, across the modern world, and in every known record back through time. Above all, there are differences that any student of evolutionary theory could predict and explain, and yet it has been said that so - called “gender” differences are just a social construct, a mere cultural artifact, as **arbitrary**, unwarranted and pointless as pink for girls and blue for boys (and, of course, vastly more invidious)- and therefore, when it comes to explaining male-female differences, an evolutionary understanding is irrelevant of marginal. I hope to show how a Darwinian analysis is fundamental and indispensable, and why to reject it is a mistake both scientifically and programmatically.

Let’s begin with the invention of formal sex, at least a billion year ago. For a sexual reproducing organism, reproductive investment divides into competing for mates and caring for off springs. Originally, the two sexes invested equally in these tasks.

However, this arrangement turns out to be unstable. Very soon, sex cells had diverged. The total investment of the two sexes remained equal. Nevertheless, some organisms produced sex cells that were small, numerous, and low in nutrients, each of which was cheap and mobile - sperm: sperm-bears had thus specialized somewhat in competing for off springs. Other organisms produced sex cells that were large, egg bearers had thus specialized somewhat in caring for off springs. Now once, that divergence has opened up, it becomes self- reinforcing: competing into caring.

Accordingly, the **divergence** widens generation down to evolutionary time, escalating even to such flagrant excesses as peacock versus penhen-he investing prodigiously in competition, she corresponding in child care.

In human beings the divergence is more modest. It, nevertheless, cleaves but species into two. Although the differences originate in productive strategies, they permeate our psychology, our priorities, emotions, hopes and desires.

Consider, for example sexual jealousy. Darwinian theory predicts that male jealousy will focus heavily on sexual infidelity (because of uncertainty of paternity) whereas female jealousy will focus more on emotional involvement (because that could signal loss of resources), and this is what has indeed been found. In one study, eighty – five (85) percent of women said that emotional infidelity would upset them more, whereas forty (40) percent only of men said it was **corroborated** using physiological measure of stress. This has been replicated in several cultures and or considers attitudes to virginity. Darwinians expect a sex difference, reflecting the difference in parental certainty. This was strikingly borne out of psychological differences (covering thirty – seven (37) cultures in six (6) continents)

Universally, men valued women's virginity more than women valued men's cultural differences make an impact. However, they merely shift the extent to which people value virginity for example, in Indonesia and Iran, but very in Finland and Sweden. Universally, too, women preferred husbands older than themselves; but there was not a single society in which men wanted older wives. This difference reflects women's evolved preference for men with status (because status could deliver resources for dependent off springs) and men's preference for women with high reproductive potential. For the same reason, women universally tended to value men's financial prospects (resources in modern guides) more than men valued women's; and men universally care more about women's physical attractiveness than vice versa.

Or take **homicide** rates as another example, they vary vastly from place to place and over time; compare, for example, Iceland and Miami early in the 20th century, where the rates were respectively less than one per million of the population a year and 1,1000 per million. But the sex difference is **invariant**; and it is massive. About sixty- five (65) percent or more of all murderers are men, mostly young men. This faithfully reflects the Darwinian expectation as to when male - male status competition will be most intense.

Now, turn to the Guinness Book of records and see how even the most recondite aspects of life reflect that same competitiveness – and lengths that males will dare all limits in order to win. Overwhelmingly, it is men that hold the records for “the most” or “The first” or “The greatest...,” however, apparently pointless the pursuit. Men are more obsessive collectors - most notoriously of trains spotted, but also of well, almost everything' they constitute the majority of serious collectors even of such traditionally “women's things”. Women own objects for sentimental reasons but men

tend to collect them for their status or utility. It's no surprise to discover that women are more likely to buy classical recordings to enjoy the music, men to complete the set; and, from gambling to ballooning to motor - racing, to Russian roulette to failing to apply sun block lotion, men are more ready to take risks!

Telling psychological sex, differences emerge as early in children's play. Boys opt for formal games, with a definite outcome that allows them to be declared the winner; they quarrel repeatedly over the rules, with apparent enjoyment, and are better than girls at competing with friends. Girls prefer unstructured play, without rules and goals or winners and losers; and they **waive formalities** in favour of consensus. Even among one-olds, girls are less willing to leave their mothers; boys are more independent, exploratory, and active. At just 20 months, girls choose dolls and kitchen toys whereas boys choose construction and transport toys – not, of course, through **innate preferences** for specific toys, but because of what the toys offer.

“So what's new?” I have heard critics cry. “Men preferring younger women? Darwinians have merely “discovered” what we all knew already.” However, we don't all know this already. Results such as these **fly in the face** of the social construction of gender.” Why such universality, such robustness? Why divergence at such an early age? Why do male-female differences show up even across huge cultural, economic, social, political, religious and historical divides? By contrast, evolutionary scientists have not only found these results they have also explained them. The theory of natural selection both predicts that such differences will exist and provides a scientific understanding of why they do.

Questions:

- a) Suggest a suitable title for the passage. (2 marks)
- b) “If it looks like a duck, walks like a duck, quacks like a duck, it's a social construct of a duck”. Explain what you understand by this statement in the context of the passage. (3 marks)
- c) In about 100 words summarize Darwin's analysis of the relationship between men and women. (15 marks)

d) Explain the meaning of the following words and phrases as used in the passage:

- | | |
|---------------------------|-----------|
| i) competitive | (2 marks) |
| ii) transcending cultures | (2 marks) |
| iii) arbitrary | (2 marks) |
| iv) divergence | (2 marks) |
| v) corroborated | (2 marks) |
| vi) homicide | (2 marks) |
| vii) invariant | (2 marks) |
| viii) waive formalities | (2 marks) |
| ix) innate preferences | (2 marks) |
| x) fly in the face | (2 marks) |

SPGE (10marks)

END