

LILi 2016

“Ways that Information Can Be Good”

Mark Lenker (mark.lenker@unlv.edu)

	<i>Credibility</i>	<i>Rhetorical</i>	<i>Developmentalist (Kraut, 2007)</i>
<i>What does good mean?</i>	Good information is <i>trustworthy</i> .	Good information helps build <i>convincing arguments</i> .	Good information elicits cognitive or affective stimulation or growth (<i>learning</i>).
<i>Strengths</i>	Addresses the uncertainty of information found online.	Makes students consider their purpose, their audience, and the completeness of their ensemble of sources.	Encourages inquiry for breadth of perspective (limited opportunity for growth if all of your sources confirm your existing beliefs).
<i>Limitations</i>	Can involve unwieldy lists of criteria. Criteria tend to ignore context in which information is used.	Requires considerable instructional time, especially for first-year students.	Requires time for independent reflection.
<i>Does it address conclusion-driven research?</i>	No: Students can adopt a position (or even write their paper), then find credible sources to “back it up.”	No: Students can formulate an argument, then select sources to produce the desired rhetorical effect.	Yes: Emphasis on comparing sources to prior experience encourages students to value developing or changing their point of view.
<i>Ideal time for implementation</i>	Learning search techniques	Drafting the argument	Collecting information for annotated bibliography
<i>Examples</i>	CRAAP Test CARS Checklist Students create their own criteria (Benjes-Small at al., 2013)	Bizup’s BEAM (2008) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background • Exhibit • Argument • Method 	Revised annotated bibliography (flip the page for an example)

What if we made it our goal to help students develop as *connoisseurs* of information?

“To be a connoisseur of wines, bicycles, or graphic arts is to be informed about their qualities; it means being able to discriminate the subtleties among types of wine, bicycles, and graphic arts by drawing upon a *gustatory, visual, and kinesthetic memory* against which the *particulars of the present* may be placed *for purposes of comparison and contrast*” (Eisner, 1976).

What if we used the annotated bibliography as an opportunity to help students develop as connoisseurs? In addition to summarizing potential sources, what if they responded to questions like these?:

- Which information source surprised you the most? Why?
- Which position do you find most convincing? What factors in your personal background or belief-system contribute to this assessment?
- What would make the most convincing position even more convincing for you?
- Was the most convincing source also the most surprising source? Why or why not?
- How would someone from a different socio-economic group think about the question?
- What do you still need to learn more about?
- Are there creative works that relate to your question? Consider movies, TV shows, novels, short stories, music, or visual arts. How do these creative works compare to the informative works that you consulted for this project?

Works Cited

Benjes-Small, C., Archer, A., Tucker, K., Vassady, L., & Resor, J. (2013). Teaching web evaluation: a cognitive development approach. *Communications in Information Literacy*, 7(1), 39-49.

Bizup, J. (2008). BEAM: A rhetorical vocabulary for teaching research-based writing. *Rhetoric Review*, 27(1), 72-86.

Eisner, E. W. (1976). Educational Connoisseurship and Criticism: Their Form and Functions in Educational Evaluation. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 10 (3/4), 135-50.

Kraut, R. (2007). *What is good and why: The ethics of well-being*. Harvard University Press.