

Global politics: sources and competing perspectives

Supported preparation only; actual school choices and assessed work remain separate

Power and legitimacy: method

Power and legitimacy: method

Power concerns capacity to shape action, resources and agendas. Legitimacy concerns accepted justification for authority; it differs from popularity or formal power alone.

Evaluate a source for a question through origin, purpose, content and evidence, not an automatic interested= false rule.

Power, legitimacy and source analysis: source representation

Original source / task evidence

Original source A, a committee notice: "Only funded proposals enter the meeting agenda." Source B, a user statement: "Our access concern was never discussed." Explain agreement and a useful check.

Separate what is stated from the interpretation.
Power and legitimacy

Original fictional task source; not an authentic selected work.

Power and legitimacy: worked case

Power and legitimacy: worked case

Original source A, a committee notice: "Only funded proposals enter the meeting agenda." Source B, a user statement: "Our access concern was never discussed." Explain agreement and a useful check.

Identify the evidence before reading the model.

Power and legitimacy: reasoning

Power and legitimacy: reasoning

Both can support a constraint on agenda access, although B concerns one person's experience. The notice shows the stated rule; neither alone establishes every practical decision.

Inspect agendas, funding criteria and excluded stakeholders' accounts.

Power and legitimacy: your transfer

Power and legitimacy: your transfer

Everyone may speak, but one funder sets the agenda. Explain the different forms of influence.

Pause and give an individual answer with reasons.

Power and legitimacy: transfer review

Power and legitimacy: transfer review

Formal participation permits speech while agenda control determines which issues reach a decision. Compare actual proposals considered, funding conditions and responses to excluded concerns.

Equal formal rights do not establish equal practical influence or accepted legitimacy.

Rights, development and durable arrangements: method

Rights, development and durable arrangements: method

Connect concepts through mechanisms. Access rules can affect rights and fair treatment; resource distribution affects development and future sustainability.

A durable agreement needs acceptable terms, implementation and credible review.

Rights, development, sustainability and peace: source representation

Original source / task evidence

Task: two fictional organizations share a water supply. One proposes fixed priority; the other proposes need-based allocation reviewed jointly.

Separate what is stated from the interpretation.
Rights, development and durable arrangements

Original fictional task source; not an authentic selected work.

Rights, development and durable arrangements: worked case

Rights, development and durable arrangements: worked case

Task: two fictional organizations share a water supply. One proposes fixed priority; the other proposes need-based allocation reviewed jointly. Evaluate both without assuming consultation alone ensures fairness.

Identify the evidence before reading the model.

Rights, development and durable arrangements: reasoning

Rights, development and durable arrangements: reasoning

Fixed priority may be predictable but can entrench disadvantage. Joint review can incorporate changing needs but requires information, authority and dispute resolution.

Compare enforceability, available water, unequal capacities and those absent from negotiation.

Rights, development and durable arrangements: your transfer

Rights, development and durable arrangements: your transfer

A dry period makes the previous water allocation infeasible. How should the agreement be evaluated?

Pause and give an individual answer with reasons.

Rights, development and durable arrangements: transfer review

Rights, development and durable arrangements: transfer review

Compare changed availability, essential needs, unequal vulnerability and implementation capacity. Review allocations through agreed dispute and monitoring procedures.

Predictability matters, but keeping an infeasible or unfair rule can undermine durability and acceptance.

Engagement preparation and reflection: method

Engagement preparation and reflection: method

A focused political issue identifies a contested allocation or relationship, actors and setting. Engagement informs inquiry but needs research and other perspectives.

Keep consent, safe school approval and genuine evidence separate from classroom rehearsal.

Engagement and reflective research: source representation

Original source / task evidence

Task: a pupil attends a fictional consultation, hears staff only and concludes all users support a rule. Rewrite the reflection.

Separate what is stated from the interpretation.
Engagement preparation and reflection

Original fictional task source; not an authentic selected work.

Engagement preparation and reflection: worked case

Engagement preparation and reflection: worked case

Task: a pupil attends a fictional consultation, hears staff only and concludes all users support a rule. Rewrite the reflection.

Identify the evidence before reading the model.

Engagement preparation and reflection: reasoning

Engagement preparation and reflection: reasoning

Staff accounts clarify institutional aims but do not establish users' experiences. The pupil's invited role affected access.

Compare documents and approved voluntary accounts from affected groups, explain missing voices and limit the conclusion.

Engagement preparation and reflection: your transfer

Engagement preparation and reflection: your transfer

A user challenges the pupil's staff-only account. What should critical reflection do?

Pause and give an individual answer with reasons.

Engagement preparation and reflection: transfer review

Engagement preparation and reflection: transfer review

Check the account's context and evidence, identify the original access limitation and revise the question or conclusion where justified. Compare rather than merely append perspectives.

An unexpected account is not automatically representative, but can expose a material missing experience.

HL stimulus synthesis: method

HL stimulus synthesis: method

Use the current 2026 stimulus model. Compare mechanisms, institutions, scale and constraints across researched cases; a generic memorized example cannot substitute for stimulus evidence.

Keep the interpretation within the supplied evidence.

Global challenges and case synthesis: source representation

Original source / task evidence

Task: a local body has an allocation mandate but no inspection staff; a wider body has staff but cannot compel cooperation. Compare institutional capacity.

Separate what is stated from the interpretation.
HL stimulus synthesis

Original fictional task source; not an authentic selected work.

HL stimulus synthesis: worked case

HL stimulus synthesis: worked case

Task: a local body has an allocation mandate but no inspection staff; a wider body has staff but cannot compel cooperation. Compare institutional capacity.

Identify the evidence before reading the model.

HL stimulus synthesis: reasoning

HL stimulus synthesis: reasoning

Formal authority and implementation capacity differ. Local enforcement may fail for lack of resources; wider monitoring may fail without agreement.

A joint response might combine capacities, subject to legitimacy, information and funding.

HL stimulus synthesis: your transfer

HL stimulus synthesis: your transfer

New evidence shows the wider body can fund local inspectors. How does this change the institutional comparison?

Pause and give an individual answer with reasons.

HL stimulus synthesis: transfer review

HL stimulus synthesis: transfer review

Funding could connect local mandate with implementation resources, improving feasibility. Cooperation, accountability, information and sustained financing still need review.

Explain the specific mechanism changed rather than assuming the institution now guarantees success.

Check yourself

Independent retrieval

An institution gains compliance after both incentives and consultation change.

Distinguish evidence of power from evidence of legitimacy.

Write your reasoning before comparing it with the methods and limits taught in this lesson.