History

SBQ

1. Basic Inference

SEE format
- Statement, evidence, elaboration
- Consider everything then make a stand, do not jump to conclusions
- L4 for CK
- "Never take cartoons too seriously" - there may be more than meets the eye
- Don't fixate on a few words/details, understand the full meaning
- *Source A tells me that (inference in own words). This can be seen from Source A that (evidence). This suggests that (evidence).*

2. Inference-Purpose

Question Types
- "Why did the author say this?" / "What is the purpose of this source?" / "Why was this published?" / "What was the intention of…"

Elements
- Message + evidence
- Active Verb
- Target Audience
- Desired Impact (link to message)
  - Identify the tone (bias, exaggeration of emotion) and aims of the source
- CK (link to target and provenance)
- *The message of the source is to (inference: mention active verb, TA and DI). From Source X, it states that (evidence). This suggests that (explanation: link to DI + evidence). This is supported by (CK). Therefore, (explanation: link back to DI).*

3. Comparison

Question Types
- How different/similar… describe **BOTH** similarities and differences
  - Focus on what the question asks for first then talk about other side
- How are source X and Y similar/different? Describe **ONE** only (ie the one asked in the qn)
- In terms of tone, content, purpose

Elements
- Basis of Comparison (state in own words)
  - Needs to show some form of stance
- [CONTENT] Establish BOC -> explain sources in own words -> comparison -> evidence
- [TONE] Establish BOC -> describe tone (emotions displayed) -> explain sources in own words -> evidence -> comparison
- [PURPOSE] Establish BOC -> explain sources in own words <u>in inference purpose format</u> (that means TA, DI etc) -> comparison -> evidence
- C: can be similar and different
- T: usually only similar *(not confirmed)
- P: usually similar or diff

4. Utility

Question Types
- "How useful is this source?" / "Can Source Y help you to understand….?" / "Is the source of any use….?" *no it is useless and deserves to die~*

Elements
- Useful or not + why
- What the source is about
- Cross refer / CK to support usefulness
- Limitations: what
- Cross refer / CK to show limitations
- Check purpose for hidden motive
- Provenance and how it could affect the perspective on the issue
- *Feels like there's more to this but okurr*
- *Source X is useful as it shows (...). It states that (evidence). This is supported by Source Y which states that (...). However, Source X has its limitations in the portrayal of (...). Although Source X shows (...) , it did not show (...) as seen in Source Y, which stated that (... + evidence). Furthermore, (CK). Therefore…*

5. Reliability

Question Types
- "Do you believe this source?" / "Is this source reliable?" / "Do you trust what the author has claimed?"

Elements
- Message + evidence
- Cross ref: other sources (+ evidence) and CK
  - Usually contradict = unreliable, support = reliable
- Consider: provenance, purpose (for hidden motive - if there is, explain + evidence)
  - If got purpose, then must include Inference P elements
- End: link back to message and reliability

- message + explanation + evidence -> *Cross-refer to check reliability + explain + evidence -> Purpose (if needed)
  - *Eg Source X is unreliable as Source Y (message + evidence). Therefore,(link back to message)*

SEQ Tips
- Provide context for points (ie reasoning behind them, eg instead of just stating that there was concern over communism, also mention WHY there was concern over communism)
- Support points with evidence and details
  - examples, statistics, trends
  - *** include at least 2-3 events of significance***
- Think of terms of cause/effect
- Have a clear and BALANCED argument
- Show what takes place, how its significant, how it affects the qn: don't just dump facts, you need to **explain them**
- Pay close attention to the context of the question, such as time periods (eg Hitler during his time as *chancellor*…)
  - Consider time frame carefully – especially when considering which aspects to focus on
  - Explain the impact/significance of these events -> what they showed/illustrated about the issue in the question/ how did they drive it deeper/ further
- Explain how factor leads to issue
- PEEL may help
- Try to have conclusion

1. Agree/Disagree
Format
- Intro -> agree side -> disagree side -> conclusion

2. Given Factor/Other Factor
Format
- Intro -> GF -> OF1 -> OF2 -> conclusion

Others
- Always answer every question
- 150 min
  - 2-3 min skimming
  - 10min must check
  - SBQ: recommended 70-80min (14 min/qn)
  - SEQ: recommended 60-70min (5 min planning + 30-40min per qn)
  - When tired plan another qn or finish up previous parts

Appendix

Comparison Templates

Template:

1. <u>Comparison based on similar content</u>
- Both sources are similar in showing that(point of comparison). Source X shows that '(Evidence)'. Similarly, Source Y shows that '(Evidence)'. Both sources imply that(explanation).

2. <u>Comparison based on different content</u>
- Both sources are different in showing that ____ (Introduction Statement). Source X shows that '_____' (Evidence). This suggests that ____ (explanation: relate to evidence to support inference).

3. <u>Comparison based on similar tone</u>
- Both sources are similar in tone. Both sources are written in___ (adjective to indicate tone). This can be seen from Source X that '_____' (Evidence from source) and similarly, in Source Y, '_____' (Evidence from source).

4. <u>Comparison based on different tone</u>
- Both sources are different in their tone. Source X's tone is(adjective to indicate tone). This can be supported by Source X that '_____' (Evidence from source). However, Source Y's tone is ____ (adjective to indicate tone). This can be supported by Source Y that '_____' (evidence from source).

5. <u>Comparison based on similar purpose</u>
- Both sources are similar in their purpose. Both sources try to (active verb to indicate purpose)(target audience)(purpose)(outcome).

6. <u>Comparison based on different purposes</u>
- Both sources are different in their purpose. Source X wants to (active verb to indicate purpose)(target audience)(purpose)(outcome). However, Source Y wants to (active verb to indicate purpose)(target audience)(outcome)

Utility

1. State if the source is useful for the issue presented in question + evidence and explanation
2. Cross-refer appropriately to other sources/CK to support the usefulness + evidence and explanation and link to the source usefulness.
3. State the limitations / gaps of the source and how OTHER RELIABLE SOURCES/CK provide the missing info (evidence+explanation+compare the 2 sources) and if this will affect the reliability as a whole

---

4. Check purpose for hidden motive
- state provenance and how it TA, Message, DI
- CK (evidence)
- So how does this affect usefulness in totality?

5. Link and conclude.

Assertion

Question type
- How far do the sources support the assertion/claim that …

Process
- Understand assertion in the question
- Make inferences from source in relation to assertion
- CK: evaluate validity of source
- Cross refer: reinforce/contradict source + evaluate validity of source
- Provenance: determine reliability/credibility + infer possible intent behind source
- Assess overall validity of source in supporting assertion

Format
- [INTRO]
  - The assertion argues that…
  - Sources supporting the assertion show that… (which)
  - Sources against the assertion show that… (which)
- [MAIN BODY]
  - Source A supports/challenges the assertion/view that …
  - Source A shows that (inference about assertion + evidence)
  - This is (in)accurate as CK…
  - Source A is reinforced/contradicted by source …
  - Source A is (un)reliable … (assess context of purpose)
  - Hence, Source A…
- [CONCLUSION]
  - Weighing the assessment of each source
  - Explain why evidences to support/challenge is better/preferred
  - OR reconcile/explain problems of the sources to show that neither support/challenge is preferred

Others
- Frame the ans in consideration of the qn
- Other than considering inference, consider evaluation by other means