

Analysis of Political Cartoons

E.g. Q.N: Why was this cartoon published?

Common techniques:

- ❖ Analogy: Comparison between two unlike things that share some characteristics. This is usually done with complex issues that might be difficult for some people to understand.
- ❖ Irony: Authors use irony to show the difference between the ways things are and the way things should be. Cartoonists often use irony to express their opinion on issues.
- ❖ Symbolism: The use of simple objects/symbols to express larger ideas.
- ❖ Labelling: refers to a brief phrase, caption or sign used to describe an object, person or place.
- ❖ Exaggeration: Sometimes cartoonists overdo, or exaggerate, the physical characteristics of people or things in order to make a point

★Common for artists to use more than one of these!!

Structure:

1. 3A + M (action word, audience, anticipated outcome and message)
2. Evi. On msg. + Expl.
3. Context(what was happening at the time, what was audience thinking, feeling, doing)
4. Change in mindset
5. Link to audience carrying out anticipated outcome

Approve/Support

E.g. Q.N: Does cartoonist approve of the govt? / Is the cartoonist a supporter of the government?

Structure:

1. Ans. QN + reason (use portrayal & inference)
2. Evi. & Expl.
3. Portrayal + thus link back to reason

Inference with purpose

CANNOT LIFT FROM SOURCE FOR INF. (W/ OR W/O MSG, MESSAGE)

E.g of questions: why _____publish/make this statement?

What you need:

- 3A + M (action word, audience, anticipated outcome and message)
- Inference with evidence
- Context (what was happening at the time, what was audience thinking, feeling, doing)
- Cite anticipated outcome based on context

3A+M Do's and Don'ts	
Action word: use criticise/convince	Don't use show, say, tell
Audience: be specific!!!!: international community, sgreens, govt	Don't use public, everyone, people
Anticipated outcome: must be a change in behaviour after reading the source	Don't use: support, help, trust, feel, doubt
Message: what is the source trying to say?	

Structure:

Point 1. Action word 2. Audience 3. Anticipated Outcome 4. Message	<u>Thing</u> was published cause <u>author</u> wants <u>criticize/convince</u> <u>audience</u> that <u>message</u> so <u>audience</u> would <u>anticipated</u> <u>outcome</u>
Evi.	This is evident in "quote"
Exp. (What does Evi. Show?)	How does evidence support the message?
Context	What happening at that time (when source published)? What audience think/do/feel?
Link <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mindset change • Audience • Anticipated outcome 	Hence, after reading <u>source</u> , <u>audience</u> would realise <u>smth</u> and <u>change mindset</u> , Thus, <u>audience</u> will <u>anticipated</u> outcome.

Comparison

Example QNs:

No common criteria: How similar/diff. Are the sources?[1s1d]

In what way are sources similar/different? [2s2d]

Do sources agree with one another? (2 side, no need tone/purpose)

How far S.A> agree with S.B?(2 side, no need tone/purpose)

Yes given common criteria: study source a n b. How similar are they about issue?

Area of Comparison	Positive Adj.	Negative Adj.
Ways in which parties involved are portrayed as *[will revisit in portrayal]	Kind, Humane, Caring Defensive Capable Heroic	Cruel Aggressive Incapable Cowardly
Policies	Beneficial Effective Fair Popular Successful Practical/feasible	Non-beneficial Ineffective Bias/unfair Unpopular Unsuccessful Impractical
Groups/govt	Capable Reasonable Powerful	Incapable Unreasonable Weak
Manner in which a problem is settled	Justifiable Effective	Unjustifiable Ineffective

Structure of comparison:

1. Stand + comparison criterion (different in terms of what)
2. Specific points (what does each source suggest) *points **must be opposite**
3. Evi. + Expl. For each source.

*Can also compare in terms of purpose (follow inference w purpose format) or tone (use of critical/supportive words to portray thing in bad/good light *link to portrayal*)*

Evaluation

The "study all sources" question

Steps	Descriptor	Suggested Techniques
1. Analyse assertion	Focus word? Further impacts/rationale? E.g. necessary/unnecessary beneficial/detrimenta leffective/ineffectiv e	Highlight focus word. Ask: what must source say to support/refute assertion?
2. Identify & annotate sources	Differentiate supporting/refuting sources	Use ticks n crosses, annotate inference and underline evidence.
3. Analyse sources' content	At least 3 (but do 4 instead) sources, represent both sides of assertion. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stand + reason • Evi. + Expl. • Expl. Further rationale/impacts • Link back to stand 	Use basic inference strategy (P, E, E, Further rationale/impact) E.g. source supports/opposes assertion as source says/according to the source, ...
4. Critical	Analyse reliability	Does the source have

analysis of source (bonus +2)	of source Can use CK (CR to BI, "from what I know..." to make a final stand) Or Balanced Conclusion (both sides are valid and reasonable)	any hidden purpose that makes you think it is not credible? Is there anything in the source content that makes you doubt it? such as exaggeration, sweeping statements.etc. Does the source present a balanced viewpoint that enhances its reliability?
-------------------------------	---	--

Structure: I agree/disagree with assertion as [source msg], evi. Expl. then x4.

Proving a Claim

E.g. Qn: Does source A prove that [claim]?

Tips:

- NEVER change the claim
- No need infer if reasons can be clearly derived from source
- Can cross-refer to BI
- Reasons in main source & CR source must be the same
- There is a correct way to conclude CR

Structure[if given [claim] in qn: source proves/disproves [claim] because[reason]→ evi. + Expl. →link back to reason & claim→ CR to another source/BI that supports source → evi. + Expl. →link back to reason & claim

Two Sources Proving

E.g. Qn: Does source A prove source B wrong/right?

Many many possibilities...

Prove→ if reliable yes prove, if unreliable no prove

Wrong→both sources diff msg. Right→ both sources same msg.

Comparison strat[pass the qn] structure: Ans. qn + state both sources' messages [if same can combine (both sources say...)], A

evi. + expl. → B evi. + expl. → since A contradicts/support B,
[repeat your stance]

Reliability start [more complete] structure: Ans. qn + state both
sources msgs→ provenance analysis→ evi + expl. 1st source msg→
any reliability analysis [C/M, 1sided, portrayal, exaggeration
etc.] → CR

S.D proves S.E correct (show connection between 2/3 sources in
question)

→ agree (rationale)

→ point

CR to S.F, S.F supports S.D. reliable in proving F correct.

If Unreliable. Cannot prove correct.

Reliability (Multi-part)

General structure:

1. Stand + msg
2. Provenance
3. Evi, support + expl. Msg
4. C/M and/or 1sided
5. ★C.R

Complete ans: have both C/M **and** 1sided

Context/Motive

Context→ what happening at the time

Influences:

- ★ what author/audience thinking doing feeling
- ★ Determines how the present the issue
- ★ Influences motive and intended outcomes

Take note of date of publishing, who the author is. (Provenance)

From Provenance determine bias (towards/against) and what event
may have occurred to make author biased

Structure:

1. Stand + msg
2. Provenance + link to bias
3. Evi. From msg + expl. Of msg [rmbr link back to msg]
4. Context (at that point in time...
5. Motive (same thing as purpose: change in mindset, and what
audience will do now)
6. Link motive to unreliability
7. 2nd para: CR (like proving a claim)

One-sided

Source is unreliable when is one sided→ author purposely only show one POV while ignoring other POVs.

Why do this: benefit to gain/ulterior motive

How check for one-sidedness:

1. What is source message?
2. What do you know that can prove one-sidedness?
 - ★ Intentionally excluded POV?
 - ★ BG info got clues?
 - ★ Other sources got clues?
 - ★ CK clues?
 - ★ author/provenance? [political bias etc]
3. How does this make source unreliable?
4. Any other red flags during source analysis?

Structure:

1. Stand + msg
2. Provenance + link to bias
3. Evi. From msg + expl. Of msg [rmbr link back to msg]
4. Why is the source one-sided? [provide evi. From BI/CK/other sources]
5. Analyse provenance, determine if aforementioned evi. Would be widely known, and thus did source intentionally no include that evi. ?
6. Link to unreliability

Unreliable [E/SS] ❀

Source unreliable cause exaggeration (make smth sound worse/better than it actually is) or sweeping statements (vague statement that does not consider all facts/not backed by evi.)

Structure:

exaggeration/sweeping statement evi. → expl. Why e/ss → inaccurate rep. Of event/person→ may only see and intentionally highlight pos./neg. Aspects→ lack objectivity→ present skewed POV, may be biased against/towards [party or person]--> may not be credible/reliable in giving info about [party/action/issue]

Portayal ❀

Source unreliable cause it portrays a party/issue positively/negatively.

Why do this? Refer to context, usually got something going on at that time, author portray parties/actions in positive/negative manner help author achieve motive/gain benefit. [closely linked with tone]

Words to use to desc. Attitude:
sympathetic/concerned/critical/apathetic

Too positive/negative portrayal: supportive/unsupportiveness

Too critical/ too much praise: supportive/unsupportiveness

Highly supportive/unsupportive→ may only see and intentionally highlight pos./neg. Aspects→ lack objectivity→ present skewed POV, may be biased against/towards [party or person]--> may not be credible/reliable in giving info about [party/action/issue]

Reliable POV

Criteria for reliable source	How explain
Eye-witness/1st hand acc.	seen/experience event etc. → credible in giving more accurate acc. Of event/person→ may be reliable
Hist. trends/data	Hist. trends hint at higher likelihood of such a phenomenon occur again→ educated[not baseless] assumption→ could be q accurate in predicting what would happen → may be credible→ may be reliable

Statistical data [needs to be proven]	<p>Survey: rep. Ppl. opinion on an issue → could be accurate rep. Of event/person → may be credible → may be reliable</p> <p>Statistics → based on collected data [evi. Based] → shows degree of credibility →, may be reliable</p> <p>If data easy verify [records/info. Out there] → not easy lie abt → chances of author being credible higher → may be reliable</p>
Logical conclusion	<p>Using clues from context or even general knowledge/common sense</p> <p>Whatever is being said is sensible/logical → may be credible → may be reliable</p>
Expert Opinion [must supplement w/ one more]	<p>Expert in a certain area → good knowledge of what is happening / the person → so whatever is said may be credible → may be reliable</p>
Credible source/org.	<p>Need to maintain their credibility (lose reputation / business) → ensure whatever is reported is as accurate as possible → may be credible → may be reliable</p>
Objective	<p>This person may be expected to side with Person A. But he does not.</p> <p>Does not try to hide the truth Lack of bias (objective) despite the political stand → may be credible → may be reliable</p>

Structure:

Ans first sentence + msg → provenance [why prov. Credible] → evi. +
 Expl. → explain reliable strategy (why source reliable, rmbr
 link back to qn) → CR

2 Source Reliability (differ)

E.g. Q.n : both sources differ in (smth smth), does that mean one of them is wrong/more believable than the other?

Structure:

- ★ Starter (address both sources, state stands & msgs for each source)e.g.: Source A is reliable in saying (____) while source B is unreliable in saying (____)
- ★ Choose 1 source, do reliability ans: Provenance (biased towards/against), evi. + expl., unreliable/reliable technique
- ★ **OR do evi. + expl. For one source, CR for that source [get 4-5 instead of 6]**

Surprise

E.g. Q.n : Are you surprised about what this source says?

Surprised (when unexpected)	Not surprised (when expected)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information goes against logic and common sense Information goes against what you already know Information goes against other sources of information Contradictions in information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information is in line with logic and common sense Information is in line with what you already know Information coincides with other sources Information is reliable

--	--

Structure:

1. Starter/stand (ans. Qn), back it up w CR (I am not surprised/surprised by what source says about [msg] because CR source says that [CR source msg])
2. Evi + expl. Given source
3. Evi. + Expl. CR
4. Concluding statement (Since CR supports/contradicts source, information in source expected/unexpected. Therefore, I am not surprised/surprised by what source says abt [msg])

L3: CR/CK

L4: Content on reliability (if any)

L5: L4 + CR (if any)

- CR source no need reliable, CR source can be published later than main source IF talking abt past [e.g. talking about tragedy], as long as info from CR source readily available at time of main source publishing.

Diff. Ways to Structure your answer, diff. Expectations

Content	Reliability
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Identify the main topic of the question (there could be different topics based on your level of focus). ✓ Look for evidence that proves or disproves this claim. ✓ Formulate a statement in your own words. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify the main topic of the question (<i>there could be different topics based on your level of focus</i>). 2. Look for evidence that proves or disproves this claim. 3. Formulate a statement in your own words.

<p>✓ Write out your answer using the format given (SEE).</p>	<p>4. Write out your answer using the format given.</p> <p>5. Look for a source that you could cross- refer [CR] with.</p> <p>6. Extract the main point from the CR source that matches your point.</p> <p>7. Write out your answer using the SEE format as well.</p>
<p>Cross-reference</p> <p>1. Identify the main topic of the question (there could be different topics based on your level of focus).</p> <p>2. Look for evidence that proves or disproves this claim.</p> <p>3. Formulate a statement in your own words and quote evidence.</p> <p>4. Look for a source that you could cross- refer [CR] with.</p> <p>5. Extract the main point from the CR source that matches your point.</p> <p>6. Write out your answer using the SEE format as well.</p>	<p>Contextual Knowledge</p> <p>1. Identify the main topic of the question (there could be different topics based on your level of focus).</p> <p>2. Look for evidence that proves or disproves this claim.</p> <p>3. Formulate a statement in your own words and quote evidence.</p> <p>4. Formulate your answer for CK.</p>

2-Source Surprise

E.g. Q.n: Does source A make you surprised about source B (B is base source)?

If similarities→ unsurprised

If no similarities→ surprised

Structure:

starter/stand → msg of both sources → evi. + expl. Both sources → [mention provenance for higher marks] → link back to question.

Hard 2 explain, i put word form: e.g. QN is: does source C make you surprised about what source B is saying?

Comparison method [secure 4/5m out of 7m]: source C does not make/makes me surprised over source B as source C states [msg. SC] while source B states [msg. SB]. evi + expl both sources, ... Since source C contradicts/support source B, info. unexpected/expected, does not make/make me surprised about source B. CR to third source, no matter which source it agrees with, it needs to be linked back to both the base source and the given source.

Surprise How + Why [higher marks]: example ans. : source C does not make me surprised about source B even though they contradict each other on the surface. [state both sources' msgs]. This is because source B unreliable, comes from president, would be biased. [use. Reliability analysis, evi + expl.] link back to stand + reason, explain if got benefit to gain by giving biased POV. I had expected the President to push the blame onto the inspector, who could be innocent. Thus is also supported by inspector himself in source C. Thus, source C does not make me surprised about source B.

If you want change stand, can base first para on evidence in source, then second para is provenance. (Who is the source by, why would it be unsurprising/surprising) Need let marker know what you say in 2nd para is based on 1st para.

Utility

E.g. Q.N: Utility

NOT USEFUL: unreliable/ has gaps in information

USEFUL: Tells me smth/ is reliable

→ just do CR to prove reliability

Structure:

1) Stand (useful? Not useful? → all sources are useful in telling us smth) + Message	EG: Is source B useful as evidence about racial harmony in SG? - Useful + msg
--	--

	- Not useful + msg
<p>2) Explain reliability (reliable/ unreliable)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provenance • Evi + Exp msg <p>Reliable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source Analysis [data, 1st hand account, expert opinion, objectivity, trends, credible org etc etc] <p>Unreliable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CM, Source Analysis [exaggeration/ SS, One sided] 	<p>Useful: Explain reliability</p> <p>Not useful: Explain unreliability</p>
<p>3) CR →take note of the date of the source</p> <p>If CR source was published after the og source→cannot be used to CR</p> <p>CR source must be before or during/ info is available when og source was published</p>	<p>My stand can be supported by...</p>

Summary

Question types which require cross-reference: **** ensure to state msg from source FOR ALL QN TYPES in your STAND**

1. **Proving a claim** (Stand + reason→Evi + Exp reason →CR [matching reason as primary source] to another source) →no need to prove reliability
2. **Utility** (Stand: Useful/ not useful in saying **msg (from source)**→Evi + Exp msg →prove reliability →CR to another source)
3. **Reliability, 2 sources reliability** →**Stand + prove reliability of ONE source**→CR
4. **2 Sources proving** (Stand →prove reliability of primary source→CR)
5. **Surprise** (Stand→evi + exp msg of primary source & CR source) →direct CR in stance
6. **2 sources surprise** (Stand (same msg→not surprised, diff msg surprised →evi + exp both msg→CR to diff sources)