

Source based questions format

Inference

Source A shows that (what does it show). In source A it states,“(Evidence)”.This means that (explanation). Therefore, Source A shows that (what does it show).

Comparison

Source A and source B are similar in that/in terms of (similarity). In source A it states,“(evidence)”,which shows that (explanation). In source B, it states that,“(evidence)”,which shows that (explanation). Therefore, Source A and source B are similar in that/in terms of (similarity).

Source A and source B are different in that/in terms of (difference). In source A it states,“(evidence)”,which shows that (explanation). In source B, it states that,“(evidence)”,which shows that (explanation). Therefore, Source A and source B are different in that/in terms of (difference).

Purpose

The purpose of source A is to (command word) the (audience) that (purpose). This is evident in the source,” (evidence)”, which shows that (explanation). Source A also wants (the audience) to (do something/ impact). Thus, the purpose of source A is to (command word) the (audience) that (purpose) and wants (the audience) to (do something/ impact).

Message

Source A aims to (command word) the (audience) that (purpose). This is evident in the source,” (evidence)”, which shows that (explanation). Thus, source A aims to (command word) the (audience) that (purpose).

Supporter-opponent

Supporter

Source A is a supporter of (the issue) as it shows that (what does it show). In source A it states,”(Evidence)”.This means that (explanation). Therefore, Source A is a supporter of (the issue) as it shows that (what does it show).

In addition, the purpose of source A is to (command word) the (audience) that (purpose). This is evident in the source,” (evidence)”, which shows that (explanation). Source A also wants (the audience) to (do something/ impact). Thus, the purpose of source A is to (command word) the (audience) that (purpose) and wants (the audience) to (do something/ impact). Therefore, Source A is a supporter of (the issue).

Opponent

Source A is an opponent of (the issue) as it shows that (what does it show). In source A it states,”(Evidence)”.This means that (explanation). Therefore, Source A is an opponent of (the issue) as it shows that (what does it show).

In addition, the purpose of source A is to (command word) the (audience) that (purpose). This is evident in the source,” (evidence)”, which shows that (explanation). Source A also wants (the audience) to (do something/ impact). Thus, the purpose of source A is to (command word) the (audience) that (purpose) and wants (the audience) to (do something/ impact). Therefore, Source A is an opponent of (the issue).

Reliability

Source A is reliable in showing that (what does it show). In source A it states,"(Evidence)".This means that (explanation). Therefore, Source A is reliable.

When I cross refer Source A to the background information/ Source B/C/D/E/F..., source A is reliable/unreliable. In the background information/ Source B/C/D/E/F..., it states," (evidence)", which shows that (explanation). Since the background information/ Source C/D/E/F... corroborates with/challenges source A, source A is reliable/unreliable in telling me that (issue).

Provenance

- Bias as it is a comment/speech made by a person (from organization) and the content supports the organization
- Bias as it is a comment/speech made by a person (against the organization) and the content is not supportive/against the organization
- Neutral as it is a comment/speech made by a person (from the organization) and the content is not supportive/against the organization which has enhanced reliability
- Neutral as it is a comment/speech made by a person (from organization) and the content supports the organization, but the person admits the mistakes or inefficiency of the organisation (shows both positive and negative aspects of the organisation)
- Neutral as the comment/speech is made by somebody who is not related to the organisation or is independent of the organisation

Tone

- Bias as tone is too extreme
- Bias as the tone is one sided
- Bias as the tone is exaggerating

Since source A is bias/neutral, source A is unreliable/reliable, and therefore, source A is not reliable/reliable in telling me that (issue).

Therefore the source is unreliable/reliable.

Usefulness

Source A is useful in showing that (what does it show). In source A it states,"(Evidence)".This means that (explanation). Therefore, Source A is useful.

When I cross refer Source A to the background information/ Source B/C/D/E/F..., source A is reliable/unreliable. In the background information/ Source B/C/D/E/F..., it states," (evidence)", which shows that (explanation). Since the background information/ Source C/D/E/F... corroborates with/challenges source A, source A is reliable/unreliable in telling me that (issue), and thus source A is useful.

Provenance

- Bias as it is a comment/speech made by a person (from organization) and the content supports the organization

- Bias as it is a comment/speech made by a person (against the organization) and the content is not supportive/against the organization
- Bias as source A is an extract/cartoon from communist state and thus media would be controlled by the government and only good things would be said about the government.
- Neutral as it is a comment/speech made by a person (from the organization) and the content is not supportive/against the organization which has enhanced reliability
- Neutral as it is a comment/speech made by a person (from organization) and the content supports the organization, but the person admits the mistakes or inefficiency of the organisation (shows both positive and negative aspects of the organisation)
- Neutral as the comment/speech is made by somebody who is not related to the organisation or is independent of the organisation

Tone

- Bias as tone is too extreme
- Bias as the tone is one sided
- Bias as the tone is exaggerating

Since source A is bias/neutral, source A is unreliable/reliable, and therefore, source A is not useful/useful in telling me that (issue).

Therefore, source A is not useful/useful in telling me that (issue) as it is unreliable/reliable.

Prove

Source A proves that (issue). In source A it states," (Evidence)". This means that (explanation). Therefore, Source A proves that (issue).

When I cross refer Source A to the background information/ Source B/C/D/E/F..., source A is reliable/unreliable. In the background information/ Source B/C/D/E/F..., it states," (evidence)", which shows that (explanation). Since the background information/ Source C/D/E/F... corroborates with/challenges source A, source A is reliable/unreliable in telling me that (issue), and thus Source A proves/does not prove that (issue).

Provenance (quote evidence from text/cartoon)

- Bias as it is a comment/speech made by a person (from organization) and the content supports the organization
- Bias as it is a comment/speech made by a person (against the organization) and the content is not supportive/against the organization
- Bias as source A is an extract/cartoon from communist state and thus media would be controlled by the government and only good things would be said about the government.
- Neutral as it is a comment/speech made by a person (from the organization) and the content is not supportive/against the organization which has enhanced reliability

- Neutral as it is a comment/speech made by a person (from organization) and the content supports the organization, but the person admits the mistakes or inefficiency of the organisation (shows both positive and negative aspects of the organisation)
- Neutral as the comment/speech is made by somebody who is not related to the organisation or is independent of the organisation

Tone

- Bias as tone is too extreme
- Bias as the tone is one sided
- Bias as the tone is exaggerating

Since source A is bias/neutral, source A is unreliable/reliable, and therefore, source A proves that/ does not prove that (issue).

Therefore, source A proves that (issue) as the source is reliable.

Surprise

I am surprised/not surprised that source says that (issue) as I did not expect/expected the author to say that (issue) since the author

- Is from the organisation and is expected to support the organization and the content supports the organization (Not surprised)
- Is against the organization and is expected to not support the organization and the content is not supportive/against the organization (not surprised)
- Is from the organization and is expected to support the organization yet the content does not support/is against the organization (surprised)
- Is against the organisation and is expected to not support the organization yet the content supports the organization (surprised)

Source A shows that (issue).In source A it states," (Evidence)".This means that (explanation). Therefore, Source A is useful.

When I cross refer Source A to the background information/ Source B/C/D/E/F..., source A is reliable/unreliable. In the background information/ Source B/C/D/E/F..., it states," (evidence)", which shows that (explanation). Since the background information/ Source C/D/E/F... corroborates with/challenges source A, source A is therefore reliable/unreliable and I am therefore

- Not surprised (corroborates)
- Surprised (challenges)

Provenance

- Bias as it is a comment/speech made by a person (from organization) and the content supports the organization
- Bias as it is a comment/speech made by a person (against the organization) and the content is not supportive/against the organization

- Bias as source A is an extract/cartoon from communist state and thus media would be controlled by the government and only good things would be said about the government.
- Neutral as it is a comment/speech made by a person (from the organization) and the content is not supportive/against the organization which has enhanced reliability
- Neutral as it is a comment/speech made by a person (from organization) and the content supports the organization, but the person admits the mistakes or inefficiency of the organisation (shows both positive and negative aspects of the organisation)
- Neutral as the comment/speech is made by somebody who is not related to the organisation or is independent of the organisation

Tone

- Bias as tone is too extreme
- Bias as the tone is too exaggerated
- Bias as the tone is one sided

Source A is therefore reliable/unreliable and I am therefore

- Not surprised (reliable)
- Surprised (unreliable)

Therefore, I am surprised/not surprised that the author said that (issue).

2 source agree/disagree

Source A agree with source B in terms of (similarity). In source A it states, “(evidence)”, which shows that (explanation). In source B, it states that, “(evidence)”, which shows that (explanation). Therefore, Source A agree with source B in terms of (similarity).

Source A disagree with source B in terms of (difference). In source A it states, “(evidence)”, which shows that (explanation). In source B, it states that, “(evidence)”, which shows that (explanation). Therefore, Source A disagree with source B in terms of (difference).

Checking reliability of tool:

Provenance OR Cross refer

Source A/B is reliable/unreliable and therefore can/cannot be used to agree/disagree with source B/A.

Using provenance to assess relationship:

- Both work for the same organisation/Both are allies-both supports the organisation and the content would therefore agree with each other.
- Both work for opposing organisations/Both are enemies-their own stand are threatened due to opposing views, and therefore disagree with each other.

Therefore, source A can/cannot be used to prove source B.

Study all sources.

How far does the sources support this judgement?

Source A shows that (what does it show). In source A it states," (Evidence)".This means that (explanation). Therefore, Source A shows that (what does it show).

Source B shows that (what does it show). In source B it states," (Evidence)".This means that (explanation). Therefore, Source B shows that (what does it show).

Source C shows that (what does it show). In source C it states," (Evidence)".This means that (explanation). Therefore, Source C shows that (what does it show).

Source D shows that (what does it show). In source D it states," (Evidence)".This means that (explanation). Therefore, Source D shows that (what does it show).

Source E shows that (what does it show). In source E it states," (Evidence)".This means that (explanation). Therefore, Source E shows that (what does it show).

Provenance (assess reliability of one of the sources)

- Bias as it is a comment/speech made by a person (from organization) and the content supports the organization
- Bias as it is a comment/speech made by a person (against the organization) and the content is not supportive/against the organization
- Bias as source A is an extract/cartoon from communist state and thus media would be controlled by the government and only good things would be said about the government.
- Neutral as it is a comment/speech made by a person (from the organization) and the content is not supportive/against the organization which has enhanced reliability
- Neutral as it is a comment/speech made by a person (from organization) and the content supports the organization, but the person admits the mistakes or inefficiency of the organisation (shows both positive and negative aspects of the organisation)
- Neutral as the comment/speech is made by somebody who is not related to the organisation or is independent of the organisation

Since one of the source that support the judgement is unreliable, the judgement is not supported by the sources.

Source A and B differ in terms of their views. Does this mean that one of them is wrong?

For own reference:

By opposing parties- One of them must be wrong.

By experts and non-expert- non-expert is more likely to be wrong.

Cross- reference:

When I cross refer Source A and B to the background information/ Source C/D/E/F..., source A is reliable/unreliable and source B is reliable/unreliable. In the background information/ Source C/D/E/F..., it states," (evidence)", which shows that (explanation). Since the background information/ Source C/D/E/F... corroborates with/challenges source A and corroborates with/challenges source B, source A is therefore reliable/unreliable and source B is therefore reliable/unreliable.

Thus Source (X-the source that is unreliable) is wrong and Source (Y-the source that is reliable) is correct.

Provenance for both sources:

Provenance (assess reliability of both sources)

- Bias as it is a comment/speech made by a person (from organization) and the content supports the organization
- Bias as it is a comment/speech made by a person (against the organization) and the content is not supportive/against the organization
- Bias as source A is an extract/cartoon from communist state and thus media would be controlled by the government and only good things would be said about the government.
- Neutral as it is a comment/speech made by a person (from the organization) and the content is not supportive/against the organization which has enhanced reliability
- Neutral as it is a comment/speech made by a person (from organization) and the content supports the organization, but the person admits the mistakes or inefficiency of the organisation (shows both positive and negative aspects of the organisation)
- Neutral as the comment/speech is made by somebody who is not related to the organisation or is independent of the organisation.

Thus, source (X-the bias source) is wrong and source (Y- the neutral source) is correct.

Therefore, source (X-unreliable, bias/ unreliable, neutral) is wrong and source (Y-reliable, neutral/reliable, bias) is correct.

This source is by a third party that is not directly involved in the dispute. Does this mean that the source is useless?

Source A is useless/ not useless in showing that (what does it show). In source A it states,"(Evidence)". This means that (explanation). Therefore, Source A is useless/ not useless.

When I cross refer Source A to the background information/ Source B/C/D/E/F..., source A is reliable/unreliable. In the background information/ Source B/C/D/E/F..., it states," (evidence)", which shows that (explanation). Since the background information/ Source C/D/E/F... corroborates with/challenges source A, source A is reliable/unreliable and therefore not useless/useless in showing that (issue).

Provenance

- Bias as it is a comment/speech made by a person (from organization) and the content supports the organization
- Bias as it is a comment/speech made by a person (against the organization) and the content is not supportive/against the organization
- Bias as source A is an extract/cartoon from communist state and thus media would be controlled by the government and only good things would be said about the government.
- Neutral as it is a comment/speech made by a person (from the organization) and the content is not supportive/against the organization which has enhanced reliability

- Neutral as it is a comment/speech made by a person (from organization) and the content supports the organization, but the person admits the mistakes or inefficiency of the organisation (shows both positive and negative aspects of the organisation)
- Neutral as the comment/speech is made by somebody who is not related to the organisation or is independent of the organisation

Tone

- Bias as tone is too extreme
- Bias as the tone is one sided
- Bias as the tone is exaggerating

Since source A is bias/neutral, source A is unreliable/reliable, and therefore, source A is useless/not useless in telling me that (issue).

Therefore, source A is useless/not useless in telling me that (issue) as it is unreliable/reliable.