

Table 1.

Methods for Teaching Evaluation of Information

	<i>Trust-based</i>	<i>Use-based</i>	<i>Developmentalist*</i>
What does <i>good</i> mean?	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>).
Benefits	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).
Limitations	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.
Does it address conclusion-driven research?	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.
Ideal time for implementation	Learning search techniques.	Drafting the argument.	Collecting information for annotated bibliography.

* See Richard Kraut, *What Is Good and Why: The Ethics of Well-Being* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007).

† See Candice Benjes-Small, Alyssa Archer, Katelyn Tucker, Lisa Vassady, and Jennifer Resor, “Teaching Web Evaluation: A Cognitive Development Approach,” *Communications in Information Literacy* 7, 1 (2013): 39–49.

‡ See Joseph Bizup, “BEAM [background, exhibit, argument, method]: A Rhetorical Vocabulary for Teaching Research-Based Writing,” *Rhetoric Review* 27, 1 (2008): 72–86.

Examples	CRAAP (currency, relevance, authority, accuracy, and purpose) Test CARS (credibility, accuracy, reasonableness, and support) Checklist Students create their own criteria†	Bizup's BEAM‡ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background • Exhibit • Argument • Method 	Annotated bibliography revised to emphasize comparing information sources with one another and with the researcher's prior experience.
----------	--	--	--

* See Richard Kraut, *What Is Good and Why: The Ethics of Well-Being* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007).

† See Candice Benjes-Small, Alyssa Archer, Katelyn Tucker, Lisa Vassady, and Jennifer Resor, "Teaching Web Evaluation: A Cognitive Development Approach," *Communications in Information Literacy* 7, 1 (2013): 39–49.

‡ See Joseph Bizup, "BEAM [background, exhibit, argument, method]: A Rhetorical Vocabulary for Teaching Research-Based Writing," *Rhetoric Review* 27, 1 (2008): 72–86.