Social Studies Source Based Question (SBQ) format!

Question 1 - inference:

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

Purpose:

The purpose of source ... is to / Source ... was published to (command word: persuade / convince) the (audience) that (purpose). This is evident in the source which shows/states, "(evidence)". This implies that (explanation). Source ... also wants (the audience) to (do something / impact). Thus, the purpose of source... is to / source... was published to (command word) the (audience) that (purpose) and wants (the audience) to (do something /impact).

Question 2 - Comparison:

similarity: Source ... and source ... are similar in terms of (similarity). In source ... it states / shows, "(evidence)", which shows that (explanation). In source... it states / shows, "(evidence)", which shows that (explanation). Since both sources talk about (issue), therefore, source ... and source... are similar in terms of (similarity).

difference: source... and source ... are different in terms of (difference). In source ... it states / shows, "(evidence)", which shows that (explanation). In source ... it states / shows, "(evidence)", which shows that (explanation). Because source ... talks about (issue) while source ... talks about (issue), therefore, source ... and source ... are different in terms of (difference).

* Bonus tip:
- can also compare perspective (biasness, one-sided, two-sided, neutral?)
- can also compare tone (disappointed, doubtful, sceptical)
- can also compare purpose (what the author wants the audience to do)
  - higher comparison! ↑
  - do not compare provenance! → 4/1 (if you do so >:])

Question 3 - Reliability / Usefulness:

reliable:

source ... is reliable in showing me that (what does it show). In source ... it states/shows, "(evidence)". This means that (explanation). Therefore, source ... is reliable.

When I cross refer source ... to source ..., source ... is reliable/unreliable. In source ..., it states/shows, "(evidence)", which shows that (explanation). Since source... corroborates with/challenges source ..., source ... is reliable/unreliable in telling me that (issue).

useful:

source ... is useful in showing me "...." because it states/shows "(evidence)". This implies that...

When I cross refer to source ..., source ... is supported/not supported by source..., which is seen in "(evidence)". this implies that (explanation). Hence, this shows that source ... is reliable/unreliable as it corroborates with/challenges source..., therefore source ... is reliable/unreliable in telling me that (issue) and hence useful/not useful.

Provenance:

- Bias as it is a comment/speech made by a person (from organisation) and the content supports the organisation.
- Bias as it is a comment/speech made by a person (against the organisation) and the content is not supportive/against the organisation.
- Neutral as it is a comment/speech made by a person (from the organisation) and the content is not supportive/against the organisation which has enhanced reliability.
- Neutral as it is a comment/speech made by a person (from organisation) and the content supports the organisation, 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 tone is one sided
- Bias as tone is exaggerating

* Since source... is biased/one-sided / neutral, source... is reliable/unreliable, because the author... useful/not useful and therefore, source... is reliable / unreliable, in telling me that (issue). Hence, the source is reliable / unreliable/ useful / not useful.

Question 4 - surprise:

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

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

Source ... shows that (issue). In source... it states, "(evidence)". This means that (explanation).

When I cross refer source... to source..., source... states / shows, "(evidence)" which shows that (explanation). Since source... corroborates with / challenges source..., source ... is therefore reliable / unreliable and I am therefore not surprised (corroborates) / surprised (challenges).

Question 5 - assertion:

Through an examination of the sources, there are sources that both agree

and disagree with the statement.

sources... and... both agree with this statement.

This is seen in source... where it states/shows, "(evidence)". This implies that...

Furthermore, source... also agrees with this statement.

This is seen where it states/shows, "(evidence)". This implies that...

On the other hand, sources... and... both disagree with this statement.

This is seen in source... where it states/shows, "(evidence)". This implies that...

Moreover, source... also disagrees with the statement. This is seen in source... where it states/shows, "(evidence)". This implies that...

In conclusion, I would agree/disagree with this statement to a small/large extent.
(If there isn't time to do conclusion paragraph, then just write ↑.)

Conclusion paragraph (only if you have time):

Looking at the reliability of source..., it is written by (author), addressed to (audience) to convince and let them know the message so that they will (do something/outcome). source... might have an incentive to be biased towards/against... thus making it unreliable.

Looking at the reliability of source..., it is written by (author), addressed to (audience), to convince and let them know the message so that they will (do something/outcome). source... might have an incentive to be biased towards/against... thus making it unreliable.

Therefore since source ... and... are both unreliable, it implies that they are not useful to be used to examine the statement and thus I would tend to believe source ... and... more and therefore agree / disagree with this statement to a large extent.