

A-LEVEL SOURCE VALIDATION GUIDE

When crafting your A-level source validations, there are a few things you should keep in mind to make sure you are being purposeful and effective in your writing. Don't worry, you're not the first students to go through this course. Below are a few tips that will help you on your transition from AS to A-level Global Perspectives.

AS-LEVEL v. A-LEVEL VALIDATIONS

AS source validations won't cut it this year. Here are some characteristics that define A-level validations:

a. Length

Validations this year should equal a small paragraph to ensure well-rounded research.

b. Quality

Pick out information about the source that goes deeper than their college education (reminder: your A-level sources MUST be authored by REAL people).

c. Judgement

The biggest challenge this year is making a high-level judgement (after your high-level source analysis) on each source at the end of your validations.

1. DECIDE WHAT YOU WANT TO VALIDATE

As you're writing your validations, you have to decide what aspect of the quote you want to talk about. All of the following are sufficient in proving your source is legitimate:

- ✓ **The author of the source material you are using**
- ✓ **The expert being interviewed by the author**
- ✓ **The study/experiment/subject that is the focus of the quote**

2. FIND THE PROS

In order to have outstanding source analysis, you need to choose the aspects of a source that make their resume really impressive. While it's important that the source's author went to college, there should be many other credentials available that prove it's an adequate source, such as prior work experience, their status among peers or any awards given to them.

3. FIND THE CONS

While you're researching the pros it's essential to discuss the negative aspects of each source you use. This ensures an well-rounded approach. Below are some cons that you can analyze

- Ties to outside organizations or sponsors
- Questionable experience or experience in an area unrelated to the topic
- Outdated information

4. COMBINE

You can format your validations by describing the pros first and the cons second or vice versa, but it is essential to remember that you are trying to prove that your source is appropriate for your paper. Ending your validations with the negatives does not help. Always end the validations on a high note, emphasizing that the pros overshadow any liabilities that the source may have.

5. ANALYZE

This is the bulk of your validation. Take the information you have gathered about your source and talk about how this shows that they are a steadfast or faulty source. Below are some questions that you should ask yourself to guide you towards your analysis:

- * Does the author/organization have anything to gain from publishing information that supports their cause?
- * Does the author's area of expertise differ from the subject? (e.g. a journalist who generally writes about sports shouldn't be writing an article on climate change)
- * Is there a target audience that may influence the information the source publishes?

6. MAKE A JUDGEMENT

Making a judgement at the end is the defining characteristic of an A-level source validation. Taking the information and analysis you have gathered about each source, firmly establish that your source is more than sufficient for use in your paper.

SAMPLE A-LEVEL VALIDATION W/QUOTE

This is supported by research conducted at Rice University by Peter Weyand of Southern Methodist University and Matthew Bundle of the University of Montana. According to Bundle,

The more mass you have closer to the axis—in this case, your hips—the easier it is to stop the rotation and then turn it around... Whereas if you had that same amount of mass located a long way from the axis—in your lower legs and feet—it becomes much more difficult to stop it and get it going in the opposite direction. (Greenemeier, 2016)

Matthew Bundle was one of the leading researchers who argued against South African Paralympian Oscar Pistorius' bid to run in the Olympics, having determined that Pistorius had an unfair advantage over able-bodied competitors (Moy, 2011). This means that Bundle has a reputation to uphold within this field, which may cause him to withhold information supporting the opposition. Alternatively, Bundle is a Harvard-educated scientist and lecturer specializing in human-performance studies specific to prosthetic advancement (Moy, 2011). When looking at Bundle's history within the disability sport world, it is observed that his high-profile status demonstrates a need for him to report the truthful results of his work. This negates his allegiance with the opposing side, as his research needs to be authentic.

The little things add up. It's important to have smooth transitions. I introduced Bundle at the beginning of the quote because I felt like it allowed me to pack more into the validation. Some more options include:

"[Source] is/has [insert cons]..."

"[Source] is/has [insert pros]..."

"Regardless (of the cons)..."

"Alternatively, [source] is weakened by [insert cons]..."

"Ultimately, [insert judgement]"

Note: the author of the source is Greenemeier but I validated Bundle, who was the expert being quoted in the article.

DONT FORGET TO CITE YOUR VALIDATIONS!