Check a source for a specific question

All names, dates, records and counts here are invented offline source cards. No website visit is required. Ask who created the source and their access, its purpose, method, date, and source trail. A source can support a narrow question without proving a wider claim.

Teaching example — reasoning intentionally shown

Card A: Tool Room Repair Log Summary. Creator: technician Val. Date: 6 October 2026. Purpose: summarize repairs, not recommend a brand. Method: copied entries from a workshop log: four lamps had loose switches and two had broken plugs in September. The log itself is not attached. No count of all lamps or other workshops is given.

> For ‘Which faults were recorded in this workshop in September?’, Val’s repair role and claimed log access are relevant. The summary reports four loose switches and two broken plugs. Its purpose and month fit that narrow question. I would inspect the original dated log to verify the copying. It cannot establish which brand is most reliable: it gives no total lamps, brand comparison or other workshops.

Guided comparison — keep the question fixed

Question: What should the club consider before choosing an afternoon repair session? Card B: Club Availability Replies. Creator: club secretary, 8 October 2026; purpose: summarize possible availability. A form went to all 20 members; 12 replied, 8 choosing afternoon and 4 morning. The tally is not attached. Card C: Caretaker’s Hall Note. Creator: caretaker, 8 October 2026; purpose: flag a room constraint. The caretaker says the hall is booked on two of the next four afternoons, based on a calendar check. No calendar is attached; other rooms were not checked.

For each card, identify creator/access, purpose, method and date. Explain what it contributes to the question. Give a cautious recommendation, a limit and a useful next record/comparison check. A later date or a job title alone does not prove accuracy. Keep claims within the records described.