**ENG-112S Week 3 Assignment: CRAAP Method Evaluation of Sources**

**Preparation for Week 7 Call to Action Research Project: using CRAAP method to evaluate 2 sources**

Step #1: **Select a website** relevant to your chosen topic (from Week 1) to evaluate using the CRAAP method.

Step #2: **Fill out the following worksheet** to help you evaluate the website. Answer the questions, and then rate each of the 5 parts from 1 to 10 (1 = unreliable, 10 = excellent). Put your rating in the blue box. Add up the scores for all sections to give you an idea of whether you should use the resource (and whether your instructors would want you to!). There is a score guide at the bottom of the worksheet to help you decide the level of credibility.

Step #3: **REPEAT STEPS 1 TO 3 ABOUT SECOND SOURCE**

**Copy/Paste the Link to your website in the box below:**

|  |
| --- |
| **https://www.rand.org/research/gun-policy/analysis/firearm-safety-training-requirements.html** |

**Currency:** **the timeliness of the information**…………………………..........................

8

• When was the information published or posted? April 2020

• Has the information been revised or updated? Unable to be sure, but is a recent article

• Is the information current or out of date for your topic? Current

• Are the links functional? Yes they are

9

**Relevance:** **the importance of the information for your needs**………..…………….

• Does the information relate to your topic or answer your question? It doesn’t answer my question or call to arms by saying I am completely right or wrong. It does however give a lot of statistics about current laws in place for this

• Who is the intended audience? For people like me, who are interested in learning more about the effectiveness of weapons safety classes

• Is the information at an appropriate level? Absolutely

• Have you looked at a variety of sources before choosing this one? Yes I have and this one seemingly had the most knowledge to share about my topic

• Would you be comfortable using this source for a research paper? Absolutely

6

**Authority:** **the source of the information**…………………….......................................

• Who is the author/publisher/source/sponsor? RAND.org

• Are the author's credentials or organizational affiliations given? No specific author mentioned

• What are the author's credentials or organizational affiliations given? They are not, however, the official statement for the RAND is “RAND's research findings and recommendations are based on data and evidence and therefore do not necessarily reflect the policy preferences or interests of its clients, donors, or supporters.”

• What are the author's qualifications to write on the topic? No specific author mentioned. RAND itself is a very good dependable website

• Is there contact information, such as a publisher or e-mail address? You can contact the customer support for RAND

• What does the domain or URL reveal about the author or source? This is a non profit

8

**Accuracy:** **the reliability, truthfulness, and correctness of the content**................

• Where does the information come from? Studying the current states that require these courses already

• Is the information supported by evidence? The information is supported by a lot of evidence and has a very extensive citations and references list

• Has the information been reviewed or refereed? Unable to be sure

• Can you verify any of the information in another source? This particular article has a very extensive citations list

• Does the language or tone seem biased and free of emotion? Yes it relies on statistics and facts

• Are there spelling, grammar, or other typographical errors? No there are not

8

**Purpose:** **the reason the information exists**………………………….………….……..

• What is the purpose of the information? To analyze the few states that currently have weapons safety courses in place and figure out what the effects are

• Do the authors/sponsors make their intentions or purpose clear? They do, this article is intended to study current laws in place to find out what the effects are

• Is the information fact? opinion? propaganda? This article uses a lot of statics and does not seem to have it’s own independent opinions

• Does the point of view appear objective and impartial? Yes it does

• Are there political, ideological, cultural, religious, institutional, or personal biases? This article does not have indicators of it being biased

41

**Total:**

**Score Guide:** 50-41 = Excellent | 40-31 = Good | 30-21 = Average | 20-11 = Borderline Acceptable | Below 10 = Unacceptable

**Continue to the next page to complete a CRAAP evaluation for your second source website…**

**Copy/Paste the Link to your SECOND website in the box below:**

|  |
| --- |
| **https://www.reuters.com/article/us-gun-safety-training/gun-training-covers-many-safety-issues-but-not-some-major-ones-idUSKBN1CT28N** |

**Currency:** **the timeliness of the information**…………………………..........................

6

• When was the information published or posted? \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_October 2017\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

• Has the information been revised or updated? \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Not to my knowledge\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

• Is the information current or out of date for your topic? This article is current for my topic

• Are the links functional? \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Yes they are to BMJ Journals, which also has it’s extensive citations

7

**Relevance:** **the importance of the information for your needs**………..…………….

• Does the information relate to your topic or answer your question? Not entirely, but to understand what needs to be taught in such a class that I’m proposing, the article is very helpful

• Who is the intended audience? To anyone who is curious what weapon safety courses teach

• Is the information at an appropriate level? Yes

• Have you looked at a variety of sources before choosing this one? I have looked at a lot of statistics and then saw that this one stands out in that it is actually having people take these courses in several different states.

• Would you be comfortable using this source for a research paper? Yes

5

**Authority:** **the source of the information**…………………….......................................

• Who is the author/publisher/source/sponsor? Carolyn Crist for Reuters writing about a testing that was done and reported by 5 authors

• Are the author's credentials or organizational affiliations given? Carolyn Crist’s credentials are not given other than that she is a journalist for several different sites

• What are the author's credentials or organizational affiliations given? A journalist for Reuters and WebMD

• What are the author's qualifications to write on the topic? She is just writing an article about a test that was conducted (not her test)

• Is there contact information, such as a publisher or e-mail address? There is publisher and social media links

• What does the domain or URL reveal about the author or source? No .com is very common but Reuter’s is a fairly respected news agency though.

9

**Accuracy:** **the reliability, truthfulness, and correctness of the content**................

• Where does the information come from? A study that sent people to actual weapons safety courses to discover what is being taught there

• Is the information supported by evidence? This article is written about at test done with 14 subjects in several different states to take weapons safety courses and see what is being taught and what they believe should also be taught there.

• Has the information been reviewed or refereed? Yes, in the citation, there are several authors listed with all of their credentials

• Can you verify any of the information in another source? On BMJ Journals

• Does the language or tone seem biased and free of emotion? Does not seem biased at all

• Are there spelling, grammar, or other typographical errors? No this is a professional article on Reuters

**Purpose:** **the reason the information exists**………………………….………….……..

9

• What is the purpose of the information? Do discover what subjects weapons safety courses teach

• Do the authors/sponsors make their intentions or purpose clear? Clear from the very beginning

• Is the information fact? opinion? propaganda? The reported information in this article is fact

• Does the point of view appear objective and impartial? Yes it does

• Are there political, ideological, cultural, religious, institutional, or personal biases? It does not seem like there are biases present in this article

36

**Total:**

**Score Guide:** 50-41 = Excellent | 40-31 = Good | 30-21 = Average | 20-11 = Borderline Acceptable | Below 10 = Unacceptable