

## SS SBQ SKILLS

## 1. Inference (Message of the source)

NO VAMQ:

There's no  
'why'!

- "shows", "tells", "says", "learns", "message"

- "What is the message of this source?", "What is the cartoonist's message?"

- ① Inference

→ The message of the source is that \_\_\_\_\_.

- ② Evidence

→ This is evident from "\_\_\_\_\_".

- ③ Explanation

→ This suggests that \_\_\_\_\_.

- Look at the Inquiry question for a hint!

## 2. Purpose ⇒ No need to do x-ref.

- "Why did \_\_\_\_\_?", "Intention"

→ "Why was this cartoon published?", "Why did the author make this social media post?"

- ① Purpose

→ The purpose of the source is to \_\_\_\_\_ (This cartoon was published to \_\_\_\_\_)

- ② Verb

→ convince/persuade/encourage/criticise/warn x show/tell

- ③ Audience

→ Singaporeans/worried parents/the government/aspiring entrepreneurs etc. x public/people

- ④ Message

→ ... that \_\_\_\_\_

- ⑤ Outcome

→ ... so that \_\_\_\_\_ (common answer is "support")

- ⑥ Evidence

→ This is evident from "\_\_\_\_\_".

- ⑦ Explanation

→ This suggests that \_\_\_\_\_.

VAMQ

## X NO x-ref 3. Comparison

to other  
sources?

- "How similar/different are Sources A and B?"

→ BOTH similarity and difference (1 each)

- "How are they similar/different?"

→ ONLY similarity/difference (2)

- "Do you think the writer in source A would agree with the cartoonist in source B?"

- Common criteria: Provenance, Source content, Tone, Purpose, Perspective

- "How far does the author in source A agree with the author in source B?"

- "How do the sources agree on..."



For the "How far will source A agree with source B" ("Agree" type of question)  
 - Both sources will agree with each other as they both "common criteria"

No: .....

Date: .....

Subject: .....

### - ① Similarity

→ Sources A and B are similar in "common criteria"

### - ② Evidence

→ This is evident from A "\_\_\_\_" and from B "\_\_\_\_"

### - ③ Explanation

→ Both sources feel that \_\_\_\_.

### - ④ Difference

→ However, they are different in "common criteria" or Both sources disagree on "common criteria"

### - ⑤ Evidence + Explanation

→ This is evident from A "\_\_\_\_". This suggests that \_\_\_\_.

→ This is contradicted in B, which says "\_\_\_\_". This suggests that \_\_\_\_.

### - ⑥ Similarity/Difference in Tone/Purpose

→ Both sources are different in tone. Source A has a (Tone descriptor) tone as seen in the words used like "\_\_\_\_", "\_\_\_\_" and "\_\_\_\_". In contrast, B portrays a (Tone descriptor) tone, with the use of words like "\_\_\_\_", "\_\_\_\_" and "\_\_\_\_".

→ Tone descriptors: persuasively encouraging/self-assuring/exaggerated/solemn/confident/self-righteous/complacent/condescending/convincing/positive/optimistic/pessimistic/balanced/objective/emotional/critical.

→ Both sources have similar purposes as they both \_\_\_\_\_. They both want to (verb) (Audience) that (Message) so that (Outcome).

→ Both sources are different in purpose. The purpose of A is (VAMO). This is different from B, where the (e.g. minister) wants to (VAMO).

TONE

PURPOSE

## 4. Reliability

- "How reliable is the source as evidence of \_\_\_\_?", "Does/How far does the source prove \_\_\_\_?",

"Do/can you trust/believe the source?", "How far can you accept the source as evidence of \_\_\_\_?"

### - ① Reliable

→ The source is reliable as evidence of \_\_\_\_.

x-ref:

• As source B supports source

### - ② Evidence

→ This is evident from "\_\_\_\_".

A, source A is reliable and

hence further proves that...

### - ③ Explanation

→ This suggests that \_\_\_\_.

• As source B refutes source

A, source A is unreliable

and hence does not prove

### - ④ x-ref

→ This is further supported by source \_\_\_, which says that "\_\_\_\_". that...

### - ⑤ Unreliable

→ However, the source is unreliable even though it says "\_\_\_\_". source \_\_\_ refutes it as it says "\_\_\_\_".

• If given 2

sources,

x-ref

between

given sources.

• If given 1 source,

x-ref to an external source.



- Higher analysis: Bias testing
- slant (one-sided arguments)
  - overgeneralisation (complex issues simplified until wrong)
  - Loaded language (tone - very +ve/-ve)

Subject: \_\_\_\_\_

- Association (author's identity, role, background)
- opinion presented as Fact (personal opinion described until it seems like a definitive fact)

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## - ⑥ Reliability based on Tone/Purpose/Provenance explained

→ The tone of the source is (Tone descriptor). He uses words like "\_\_\_\_" which makes the source unreliable due to his bias/underlying bias.

→ The source is unreliable as there is a purpose. The (e.g. minister) is trying to (VAMO).

## 5. Utility

- "How useful is the source as evidence of \_\_\_\_?", "which source is more useful in showing \_\_\_\_?"

### - ① Useful

→ source \_\_\_\_ is useful as it tells me \_\_\_\_.

### - ② Evidence

→ This is evident from "\_\_\_\_".

### - ③ Explanation

→ This suggests that \_\_\_\_.

### - ④ x-ref (to a reliable source for support on utility)

→ This is further supported by source \_\_\_\_, which says that "\_\_\_\_". This suggests that \_\_\_\_.

← Since source \_\_\_\_ is supported by source \_\_\_\_, the source is reliable and useful.

comes after  
the x-ref  
source.

### - ⑤ Not useful (limited)

→ However, source \_\_\_\_ is not useful as it did not/failed to tell me that/omitted information/omitted the fact that \_\_\_\_.

### - ⑥ Evidence

→ This is evident from source \_\_\_\_, which says that "\_\_\_\_".

### - ⑦ Explanation

→ This suggests that \_\_\_\_.

### - ⑧ Overall Evaluation based on Purpose/Provenance explained

→ Overall, the source is useful/not useful because \_\_\_\_.

↳ Biased? Balanced? Is there an agenda? [Explain Provenance]

→ Explain purpose: VAMO.

## 6. Surprise

- "Are you surprised by \_\_\_\_?" - "How surprised are you by source \_\_\_\_?"

- ① Surprised/Not surprised - "Did you expect the author in source \_\_\_\_ to make such a statement?"

### - ② Evidence

→ This is evident from "\_\_\_\_".

### - ③ Explanation

→ This suggests that \_\_\_\_.

### - ④ x-ref

→ surprised: contradict

→ Not surprised: support



Subject:.....

- ⑤ Surprised/not surprised based on context of source (purpose, provenance, context)

SS - 7. Hybrid

Stand - Inference + Reliability

History - → "Are you surprised by this source?"

both sides - comparison + Inference + Reliability

→ "Does source \_ make you surprised by the views expressed in source \_?"

→ "Does source \_ make source \_ surprising?"

\* → "Having read source \_, are you surprised by source \_?"

→ "Does source \_ prove that source \_ is wrong?"

- comparison + Inference + Reliability/Utility

→ "Which source is more reliable/useful as evidence as \_?"

\* - ① Surprised/Not surprised

→ Having read source \_, I am surprised/not surprised by source \_ because they are similar/different in \_\_\_\_.

- ② Evidence + Explanation

→ surprised: This is evident from source \_ " \_\_\_\_ ". This suggests that \_\_\_\_\_. However, in source \_, it says that " \_\_\_\_ ". This suggests that \_\_\_\_.

→ Not surprised: This is evident from \_ " \_\_\_\_ " and \_ " \_\_\_\_ ". They both suggest that \_\_\_\_.

- ③ x-ref (Any source/BI)

→ surprised: supports \_/\_. ⇒ EITHER

→ Not surprised: supports \_ + \_ . ⇒ BOTH

- ④ Evaluate purpose & provenance

→ surprised: similar (both sources can have similar provenances but different content!)

→ Not surprised: different

→ VAMO

8. Assertion

- 2 agree, 2 disagree

- ① stand

→ I agree/disagree that \_\_\_\_.

- ② Agree

→ sources \_ and \_ agree with the statement.

→ source \_ agrees with the statement. This is evident from " \_\_\_\_ ". This suggests that \_\_\_\_.

→ source \_ "

### -③ Disagree

→ However, sources \_ and \_ disagree with the statement.

→ Source \_ disagrees with the statement. This is evident from " \_ ". This suggests that \_.

→ Source \_ "

### -④ Last 2 bonus marks

→ #1: Through analysing at least one source in relation to its reliability/utility/sufficiency.

→ #2: By sharing an example(s) from contextual knowledge.

→ #3: By giving a balanced conclusion/resolution.

## SS SRQ SKILLS

(a) [7m]

- Identify + describe 2 strategies/reasons/messages

→ Evidence: textbook, contextual knowledge

- Explain each strategy

(b) [8m]

- Para 1: Factor #1 } describe + explain each factor in detail (PEEL)

- Para 2: Factor #2 }

- Para 3: Weigh the factors → take a stand