

Agreement

Comparison with a human dimension.

- Infer with author's attitude

They would disagree as both authors in the sources have different stances on the effects of cultural globalisation.

The author of B is **critical** (author's stance on the issue) of and shows the disadvantages of globalisation as he titled his cartoon as "problems of globalisation".

In the cartoon, he is highly sarcastic when he shows the problems of how the three tourists were not experiencing the authentic cultures of the places they visited namely: Paris, London and Rome as they were more into purchasing American products such as Nike, Disney and McDonalds, Gap which they could get anywhere.

This implies that globalisation causes places of interest to lose their distinctive traits, uniqueness and cultural identity.

On the other hand, Source C, supports globalisation as it shows the benefits of globalisation.

He applauds the availability of the common consumer goods. "It is a good thing. Even if it means the loss of cultural diversity. It increases our sense of togetherness via sense of shared culture."f This implies that author's approval of globalisation despite recognising the fact that there will be problems of uniformity and the loss of distinctive traits. The author believes the common experiences will bring about togetherness. This is in contrast to author B's stance, thus not in agreement.

Possible Lorms

- L1: Agree/Disagree based on Prov
- L2: Agree/Disagree based on Topic
- L3: Agree OR/AND Disagree (Surface S/D using Content)
- L4: Disagree in L3+ Evaluation of Sarcastic Tone in Source B

Must Do: Agreement + Disagreement

Depth of Analysis

e.g. Tone / Attitude / Stances / Bias / Hidden Purpose / Inclination / Due to Provenance

Utility

How useful is Source E as evidence about Pokemon Go?

- L3: Utility in Content: PEE for Source A
- L4: Useful/Not Useful based on Cross Reference to check on Content
 - PEE + Logic of Cross Reference for Source B

- Useful then not useful Both sides CR -> breadth of analysis L5/6-7

3 Step Process in CR

1. What to check on
2. What to check against
3. Logic for doing CR

Source E is useful as it is reliable. Source E tells me Pokemon Go has caused many people to venture out to different areas in their pursuit of the Pokemons. This is evident in Source E, "We don't know that it's attracting people who wouldn't have otherwise come, but it's a fair assumption that some passing players will pop in to play." This implies that Pokemon Go allows many players to explore places that they have not explored before. This is supported by Source D, which tells me that Pokemon Go has caused many people to venture out to different areas in their pursuit of the Pokemon. This is evident in Source D, "

Source E is not useful as it is not reliable. Source E tells me Pokemon Go is perceived to be beneficial and is welcomed by the properties.

This is evident from the source "At the very least, it flags up to players nearby that the Museum exists. It's free advertising with a huge audience." This implies that some properties recognised the merits of Pokemon Go and welcomed Pokemon Go as a platform to attract visitors. This is contradicted by Source D, which tells me Pokemon Go is perceived to be detrimental and is not welcomed by the properties. This is evident in the source "religious leaders here are worried that the game might provoke many to enter places of worship, disturbing prayer and creating law and order problems."

This implies that some properties view Pokemon Go as causing disrupting the physical space and also orderliness of the space.

This contradiction makes Source E unreliable, hence, not useful.