

**Lesson #2: Source Credibility**

**Duration: 2-3 days (in order to complete the process for all 4 sources)**

**Learning Targets: Students will:**

1. evaluate the credibility and relevancy of various sources found online while researching the question, “Should New York continue to use the ‘Stop and Frisk’ policy as a way to reduce crime in Manhattan?”

**Materials Needed / Pre-Lesson Prep: (When reading this lesson, it’s helpful to have the materials in front of you for reference.)**

- Copies of [Source #1](#) and [Source #2](#)
- Links to video sources: [Source #3](#) and [Source #4](#)
- [Packet titled “Intro to Research Unit: Examining the ‘Stop and Frisk’ Policy in New York”](#)
- [Teacher sample of completed “Intro to Research Unit” packet](#)

Task and Steps	Description of Task
<p><b>Do Now/Warm Up</b></p>	<p><b>Posted on Board:</b> Imagine your good friend tells you that he or she saw your girlfriend or boyfriend making out with another person at the mall (or at least he or she <i>thinks</i> she saw this). You go to investigate this rumor. What would you need to know to convince you that your significant other is innocent and did not cheat? Make a list of everything you would need to know to prove his or her innocence.</p> <p><b>Do Now Share Out/Review:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Before the students share their responses, the teacher writes three categories on the board: Ethos, Logos, and Pathos.</li> <li>2. As students share, the teacher engages the class in thinking through under which persuasive appeal the answer falls. For example, if a student says, “I wouldn’t need to investigate anything. I trust my girlfriend and know she would never do that,” the teacher would guide the class toward recognizing ethos in that statement. If a student says, “I would need my boyfriend’s alibi. If he wasn’t at the mall making out with some other girl, where was he?” The teacher would then guide the students toward recognizing the logos in that statement. Logically, the boyfriend couldn’t be in two places at once, so an alibi would prove his innocence.</li> <li>3. Students should be taking down the notes from their Do Now share out as the class engages in this exercise.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Task #1: Examining the credibility of source #1 on the language of New York’s “Stop and Frisk” law</b></p>	<p><b>Introduction to assignment:</b> Teacher explains:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Do Now exercise is meant to get us thinking about the subjects of trust and credibility, which are directly tied to the three persuasive appeals: ethos, logos, and pathos. What it takes to trust a person is very similar in many ways to what it takes to trust a textual source, except with new texts, you don’t have the same amount of personal experience or context. Therefore, you have to treat the text like a stranger you’re deciding whether or not to befriend.</li> <li>2. Teacher gives definition of “credibility”: the quality of deserving to be believed and trusted. The teacher explains that over the next few days, we will be practicing examining the credibility of each of our four sources. Just like with the cheating situation we just discussed, all we can do is use the information we have to determine the <i>extent to which a source is credible</i>. It’s important to emphasize the word “extent” because we want our students to be thinking about the strengths and limitations of each source over the next few days.</li> <li>3. Lastly, the teacher directs students back to the assignment instructions on the first page of the “Intro to Research Unit” packet. The teacher explains that over the next few days, the student will be going back to each source and completing sub-steps (c), (d), and (e) under step #2.</li> </ol>

	<p><b>Teacher reviews the 2-day learning target:</b> Students will evaluate the credibility and relevancy of various sources found online while researching the question, “Should New York continue to use the ‘Stop and Frisk’ policy as a way to reduce crime in Manhattan?”</p> <p><b>Direct Instruction and Modeling:</b> Teacher explains and models through use of a “think aloud” the following steps while students copy the teacher’s notes into their credibility table for Source #1 (see the <a href="#">teacher sample</a> for ways you can model this step):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify at least 3 reasons you trust the information in this source and write the reasons in the “Reliable/Trustworthy” side of your credibility table. Consider the 6Ws of the source and the information the source provides. This is the easier step because students can analyze the information provided in the source.</li> <li>2. Identify at least 3 reasons you don’t completely trust the information in this source and write the reasons in the “Unreliable/Untrustworthy” side of your credibility table. This can be trickier because students have to identify what might be missing from the text. Another way of framing this is to consider what questions this source still leaves me asking and then to restate those questions as statements.</li> <li>3. Once you have your list of reasons on either side, write a sourcing statement using the sentence frame provided. Complete the sourcing statement with the best reasons you came up with in your brainstorm. Note that you may need to change the language of the sentence frame slightly in order to make it work with your reasoning and analysis of the source’s credibility.</li> </ol> <p><b>Teacher Notes:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Source #1 is a weird one to use to model credibility analysis because it is an objective source (it’s the language of the law). However, with the examples I provide, you can still show students how to think about credibility before they move on to the last three sources that merit more attention with this step.</li> <li>2. Because source #1 is just the law, it might be hard to come up with 3 reasons on either side of the credibility table. I usually just explain to students why this source is different and why I’m keeping them to the expectation for three reasons on either side for sources 2-4.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Task #2:</b> Examining the credibility of source #2 with Guided Practice</p>	<p><b>Guided Practice:</b> The teacher guides the class through practicing the above steps with source #2 by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. modeling one reason for why the source is trustworthy and one reason why its credibility is questionable:       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Trustworthy: The ACLU is an organization that tries to look out for and protect those who can’t or don’t always know how to protect themselves (the historically disadvantaged groups in our society). They have good ethos because they have good ethics.</li> <li>b. Untrustworthy: The ACLU might be biased toward citizens of color affected by the “Stop and Frisk” law. They might be withholding facts and information that show why the law is helpful at reducing crime.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. asking students to work with a partner to complete the credibility table for source #2 before sharing out with the whole class.</li> <li>3. engaging the class in discussion of why the source is and is not entirely trustworthy. During this time, the teacher should be writing all shared reasons on the board while students add to their credibility tables.</li> <li>4. After the discussion, the students should work with a partner to complete the sourcing statement for source #2 before the teacher has pairs share out their statements with the class.</li> </ol> <p><b>Teacher Notes:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is common for students to confuse textual evidence about whether or not “Stop and Frisk” is good/bad with reasons the source is or is not credible. When a student demonstrates this misunderstanding, I add the evidence they shared above in the “Evidence/Analysis” box, so they can visually see how it’s different.</li> <li>2. Many students may not know much about the ACLU or its political leanings. This is why, when modeling with source #2, engage the class in a discussion about the organization and use examples to show organizational credibility and organizational bias.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Task #3:</b> Students</p>	<p><b>Direct Instruction:</b> Teacher explains that the students will now watch the videos for sources #3 and #4 again and use the information</p>

<p>examine the credibility of sources #3 and #4</p>	<p>provided to complete credibility tables and sourcing statements for each.</p> <p><b>Academic Discussion:</b> After students have completed the steps above for Sources 3 and 4, the teacher might ask the students to engage in another “Last Word” discussion, with a focus on their analysis of credibility of all four sources. The discussion question could be: “After examining the credibility of all four sources, do you feel you have enough credible evidence to make an argument about whether or not New York should continue to use its ‘Stop and Frisk’ law as a way to reduce crime in Manhattan? Why or why not?”</p>
<p><b>Task #4:</b> Review Learning Target, Close Out, and Set up Transition to Next Steps</p>	<p>The teacher reviews the learning target from this lesson and explains how these steps have set the class up for the next lessons. In the coming lessons, students will learn how to take examples of evidence from different sources and examine how they work together to support a particular argument. We call this “synthesizing corroborative and contradictory” information.</p>