**WEEK OF MARCH 23rd Handout**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue** | An issue is an important topic or problem that is covered in the argumentative text. |
| **Argument** | An argument is a disagreement on the issue. This is a statement of where the problem lies and clarifies why the issue is problematic. Statement of the argument can be made using “whether or not.” |
| **Claim** | A claim is an assertion that something is true. The main claim is the author’s clear statement of the point of view they will argue for and usually, a brief explanation of why. |
| **Reason** | A statement that justifies the claim. Reasons explain why the reader should agree with the claim. |
| **Evidence** | Facts, or proof, that support the reasoning. The strongest evidence comesfrom valid, credible sources. |
| **Counterclaim** | The counterclaim states the other side of the argument and may even include evidence in support of the other side of the argument. This is done so that the author can refute, or demonstrate the weakness of, the counterclaim. |

**Identify the Elements of Argument in one of the Sample Advertisements**

**\*NOTE you many not find every element in every piece!**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue** |  |
| **Argument** |  |
| **Claim** |  |
| **Reason** |  |
| **Evidence** |  |
| **Counterclaim** |  |

**Identify the Elements of Argument in one of YOUR Sources for YOUR Project**

**\*NOTE you many not find every element in every piece!**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue** |  |
| **Argument** |  |
| **Claim** |  |
| **Reason** |  |
| **Evidence** |  |
| **Counterclaim** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Top 10 Clues a Piece Is Biased** |
| 1. The author is known to have strong views or an agenda.  2. Facts are not supported by evidence or multiple credible sources.  A search of www.snopes.com or www.factcheck.org reveals that the information in the piece is not true.  3. There are generalizations without support: Most people believe…  4. The writer omits facts and information that do not support her view.  5. The writer only uses sources that support his view.  6. Little or no attention is paid to opposing views, or they are only mentioned toward the end of the piece.  7. There is a sales pitch or appeal for money.  8. The piece presents a one-sided opinion about a politician, party, or policy.  9. The author uses words and/or a tone that stirs emotions or conveys strong images: bear hunt versus bear slaughter.  10. The headline or content evokes a lot of emotion. |

**5Ws and H to Determine Source Credibility**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **5W/ 1 H** | **Things to Think About** | **Things to Look For** |
| **Who?** | Who is the author?  Who is the publisher?  Who is the sponsor of the material?  Are they recognized as experts on the topic?  Who links to this source, if online? Are they trustworthy?  Is there a bibliography?  Are reputable sources listed? | Look for biographical information about the author.  Conduct an Internet search of the author.  If the material has been produced by an organization, try to determine whether it is reputable. Check for information on history, mission, etc.  Check elements of the URL such as the server and domain name for clues about a source / its producers.  Use the “link:” command in front of a URL to check who is linked to a website.  If sources are cited, are they respected and credible? |
| **What?** | What is fact or opinion in the text?  What are the main ideas, arguments, and claims? Are the claims backed up with sound reasoning and evidence?  Do you agree with the ideas in the text based on your own knowledge?  Is it a primary, secondary, or tertiary source?  Can you find other credible sources that confirm the same information? | Be aware of statements of opinion versus facts. Check if facts in this source are found in other credible sources. If multiple experts agree on something, it is more likely to be true.  Check if assertions are backed up with sound reasoning and evidence, especially if the information is controversial.  Be on the lookout for illogic and inaccuracies in a piece. Don’t be afraid to use your own background knowledge to detect these.  Distinguish between primary source information and secondary source information. Remember: primary sources are written by participants in an event. Secondary sources are produced after the fact and may draw from many sources, which may or may not be credible themselves. Both are subject to the author’s interpretation and bias. |
| **Where?** | Where does this information come from? Where was it published?  Did a reliable source link me to this site? | Check the publishing information, the “About Us” section, or the URL for geographic clues. Use www. betterwhois.com to search for a website’s registrant.  Pay attention to how you get to a web page. A highly credible organization is likely to link to other credible organizations on its website. |
| **When?** | When was it published?  Is it up to date? | If facts or interpretation of facts are subject to change, search for the most recent information. Something true 10 years ago may no longer be accurate. Check publishing dates in print, latest update dates online, or www.betterwhois.com. |
| **Why?** | Why did the author/ producer publish this?  Does the producer appear to be selling something?  Is the material just for fun or satirical?  Is there an obvious agenda or bias? | Try to determine the purpose of the piece.  Review who produced the material, and consider their likely motives. Advertisements or offers of prizes are red flags.  Look for extreme or emotional language that may reveal bias. Do photos portray individuals in unflattering ways?  Do you detect a commercial, political, religious, social, cultural, or other agenda? Are opposing views treated fairly and with respect? |
| **How?** | How is the material presented?  Is the text well edited and free of errors?  Is the formatting well designed and professional looking?  How is the subject described? | Sloppy presentation and errors in spelling and grammar indicate that the material is not reliable.  A website should be easy to navigate. Sloppiness with formatting is unprofessional and may indicate a lack of credibility. Broken links indicate that a web page is not updated or the linking sources are not reliable. |

**5Ws and H to Determine Source Credibility**

**\*\*DETERMINE The Credibility of One of YOUR Sources!**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **5W/ 1 H** | **Things to Think About** | **Things to Look For** | **Your Source!** |
| **Who?** | Who is the author?  Who is the publisher?  Who is the sponsor of the material?  Are they recognized as experts on the topic?  Who links to this source, if online? Are they trustworthy?  Is there a bibliography?  Are reputable sources listed? | Look for biographical information about the author.  Conduct an Internet search of the author.  If the material has been produced by an organization, try to determine whether it is reputable. Check for information on history, mission, etc.  Check elements of the URL such as the server and domain name for clues about a source / its producers.  Use the “link:” command in front of a URL to check who is linked to a website.  If sources are cited, are they respected and credible? |  |
| **What?** | What is fact or opinion in the text?  What are the main ideas, arguments, and claims? Are the claims backed up with sound reasoning and evidence?  Do you agree with the ideas in the text based on your own knowledge?  Is it a primary, secondary, or tertiary source?  Can you find other credible sources that confirm the same information? | Be aware of statements of opinion versus facts. Check if facts in this source are found in other credible sources. If multiple experts agree on something, it is more likely to be true.  Check if assertions are backed up with sound reasoning and evidence, especially if the information is controversial.  Be on the lookout for illogic and inaccuracies in a piece. Don’t be afraid to use your own background knowledge to detect these.  Distinguish between primary source information and secondary source information. Remember: primary sources are written by participants in an event. Secondary sources are produced after the fact and may draw from many sources, which may or may not be credible themselves. Both are subject to the author’s interpretation and bias. |  |
| **Where?** | Where does this information come from? Where was it published?  Did a reliable source link me to this site? | Check the publishing information, the “About Us” section, or the URL for geographic clues. Use www. betterwhois.com to search for a website’s registrant.  Pay attention to how you get to a web page. A highly credible organization is likely to link to other credible organizations on its website. |  |
| **When?** | When was it published?  Is it up to date? | If facts or interpretation of facts are subject to change, search for the most recent information. Something true 10 years ago may no longer be accurate. Check publishing dates in print, latest update dates online, or www.betterwhois.com. |  |
| **Why?** | Why did the author/ producer publish this?  Does the producer appear to be selling something?  Is the material just for fun or satirical?  Is there an obvious agenda or bias? | Try to determine the purpose of the piece.  Review who produced the material, and consider their likely motives. Advertisements or offers of prizes are red flags.  Look for extreme or emotional language that may reveal bias. Do photos portray individuals in unflattering ways?  Do you detect a commercial, political, religious, social, cultural, or other agenda? Are opposing views treated fairly and with respect? |  |
| **How?** | How is the material presented?  Is the text well edited and free of errors?  Is the formatting well designed and professional looking?  How is the subject described? | Sloppy presentation and errors in spelling and grammar indicate that the material is not reliable.  A website should be easy to navigate. Sloppiness with formatting is unprofessional and may indicate a lack of credibility. Broken links indicate that a web page is not updated or the linking sources are not reliable. |  |