Table 5.1. Levels of disagreement. Extracts have been adapted from Levinson (2006).

Level of disagreement	Formula		
1	Where i as yet a matter, but where such evidence could in principle be forthcoming at some point	09-10? • Explanation for death of the dinosaurs • Is X likely to develop Huntington's disease? • Is xenotransplantation free from retroviral infection? • Has there been a global rise in temperature since the Industrial Revolution? • What are the best conditions for keeping a particular polar bear at the zoo? • Predicting the change in the size of a current when the configuration of a circuit is changed.	et are set out beforehand and ce is usually unambiguous and is consistent with the terms of the criteria. The likelihood of developing Huntington's can be confirmed by an unambiguous genetic test.
2	Where evidence relevant to settling a matter is conflicting, complex and difficult to assess.	• What is the acceptable risk of the transmission of disease as a result of the after effects of xenotransplantation? • Which shoe design will help a runner sprint fastest? • Which factors are responsible for the pollution of a local river? • Which is the best medicine for reducing the	Criteria can be agreed but it is difficult to assess whether evidence meets the criteria. Evidence is conflicting there are good sources of data which support opposing conclusions; it is complex when it is obtained through technically sophisticated processes or requires deep background specialist knowledge, and is is difficult to assess because it is not straightforward and linear and contains uneven variables. Acceptable risk may be estimated differently depending on cultural and economic factors. One medicine might be effective for a certain group of people while another might be better for other groups. The evidence might also be too complex to be understood by non-specialists.

		risk of heart disease? • Does the use of 'green' fuels reduce carbon dioxide emissions?	
8	Where the differing 'total experiences' of people in the course of their lives shapes their judgements in divergent ways	• Someone who has seen a sibling die from a genetic disease might be more likely to draw on that experience in supporting pre-implantation genetic diagnosis than someone who opposes this technique. • Someone who has suffered from flooding attributed to climate change brought about by carbon emissions differs in their interpretation of climate change from an oil company executive who might point out the complexity and unreliability of the climate change models used (see also category 2).	Where evidence is available parties incorporate the evidence into the worldviews which stem from their experiences.