Global Perspectives

**Possible Strengths and Weakness, of the evidence:**

(How well does X support his view with argument and evidence) *(Note: Find reasonable evidence that you can see a particular strength or weakness in the source):*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount/range of Evidence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of factual evidence is used, and comprises of several different types: statistical and behavioural</td>
<td>• There is very little clear, specific statistical/numerical evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several different types of evidence are used – opinion, fact, statistics, values</td>
<td>• The facts are weak as they are based on statistics/examples which may not continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The facts are weak as they are based on examples which may not be typical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance of the Evidence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the factual evidence is generally relevant; used forcefully in a strongly worded argument</td>
<td>• The evidence is not easy to verify/check from the information provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• research evidence is cited</td>
<td>• Too much reliance on anecdotal evidence/facts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence may be out of date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Examples may not apply to other places/countries/cultures etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Personal testimony/anecdote/values may not apply to other places/countries etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ambiguity/Clarity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The evidence is related clearly and explicitly to the argument</td>
<td>• Evidence is not cited – the dates and sources are not clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• method of research is alleged/unclear</td>
<td>• Accuracy of the examples is not clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Level of expertise of the author is not clear – may have poor knowledge claims in practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Clearly reasoned, credible and structured evaluation; usually two (or more) developed points clearly linked to the issue, usually with some other undeveloped points; or a wide range (three or more) of undeveloped points.

- A convincing overall assessment or conclusion is reached.
Testing a claim (Types of Information, Sources, and Methods)

Types of Information | Sources | Methods
--- | --- | ---
*Compare statistics/information on internet usage and privacy* – for individual
| Countries and globally; trends
| Interview or questionnaire data from local people
| Interview or questionnaire data from professionals in internet security – e.g. police/security businesses/ government security
| expert testimony
| material from international NGOs and pressure groups

| National and local governments and their departments, reputed officers from the department
| International organisations e.g. United Nations; UNESCO; UNICEF; WHO; UNSC etc.
| Experts on the relevant topic (Ex. a professor from a relevant department of university)
| Research reports
| Pressure groups, charities and non-government organisations
| Media and worldwide web

• Review of secondary sources/literature/research/documents
| Interviews
| Interview relevant experts
| Internet search
| Questionnaires
| Surveys
| Case studies
| Other relevant response

- Clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation of ways to find out if it is likely to happen. The response is likely to contain two (or more) developed points, and may contain some undeveloped points.

- The response is clearly and explicitly related to the statement.

**Types of Statements:**

- **Value Judgment:** A value judgement is generally defined as a view or belief about what is important; reference to ethics and morals.

- **Prediction:** A prediction is a claim about something that is likely to happen in the future.

- **Opinion:** An opinion is a point of view, belief, judgement or something that someone thinks but which cannot be verified or proven to be true.; a personal belief.

- **Fact:** Something that can be proven, or is already proven.

**Whose reasoning works better?**

You should aim to give: Clear, credible and well supported points about which reasoning works better. Coherent, structured evaluation of both arguments with clear comparison. The response is likely to contain three (or more) developed evaluative points, and may include some undeveloped points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of the argument</th>
<th>Quality of the evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| o clarity
| o tone – emotive; exaggerated; precise
| o language
| o balance
| o use of arguments/counterarguments
| o relevance
| o sufficiency – sample
| o source – media; radio
| o date – how recent
| o factual, opinion, value, anecdote
| o testimony – from experience and expert

**Knowledge claims**

| Ability to see |
**The last Evaluative 18 marker long-answer question:**

- State the decision – why
- Impact of decision on local, national and global scale
- Time consumed to put it to action
- Finances – feasibility
- Comparative analysis of developing and developed nations
- Socio-cultural impacts: the effects of cultural differences and beliefs
- Will it create any ethical/cultural conflicts? If yes, then how will the government be able to tackle it.
- Other perspectives and rebutting – vested interest/ biases
- reference to scale of impact on individual/group/governmental behaviour/actions
- barriers to change
- the power of collective action
- the difficulties of changing individual behaviour
- the influence of individuals and groups acting locally
- the role of vested interests and power differences
- difficulties in coordinating globally and across different countries with independence
- cost and access to resources to implement change
- governmental responses and action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of bias</th>
<th>Acceptability of their values to others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o gender</td>
<td>o how likely other people are to agree with their perspective/view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o political</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o personal values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likelihood of solutions working and consequences of their ideas