

Trust Check

Examine evidence before accepting a historical claim.

6.19.F "evaluate a variety of historical and contemporary sources for validity, credibility, bias, and accuracy."

NAME _____

DATE _____

1 READ AND MARK

Read it twice

YOUR JOB Underline one detail that supports trust in a source, circle one detail that could limit trust, and number the three sources 1, 2, and 3. Your marks will help you evaluate credibility, bias, and accuracy.

Sources from an Earthquake

- ① When people investigate a past event, they must ask who created each source, when, and for what purpose. Consider sources about the 1906 San Francisco earthquake. On April 18, a powerful earthquake and fires damaged much of the city. A resident's diary, written that week, describes shaking, fallen buildings, and people sleeping outdoors. The diary is a primary source, created by someone who was there. It offers close observations, but one person's view cannot show what happened across the entire city.
- ② A local newspaper printed a headline saying the city was "completely destroyed." Its reporters worked quickly, with limited information, while fires still burned. The headline may reflect real fear and severe damage, yet it is not fully accurate because parts of San Francisco remained standing. Newspapers often use dramatic words to attract readers. This purpose can create bias, or a slant in presentation. A careful reader compares the headline with reports from other places before deciding how much to trust it.
- ③ Decades later, a museum website explained that the earthquake occurred near the San Andreas Fault. The page named its authors, listed a publication date, and linked to government records, photographs, and research. These details make the source more credible because readers can check its evidence. Still, the website is not automatically correct. A researcher should check whether its claims match reliable records, such as United States Geological Survey information. Using several independent sources helps separate supported facts from opinion or exaggeration.

2 ANSWER WITH EVIDENCE _____ Use the passage

1 What makes the resident's diary a useful source, and what is one limit of using it?

2 Why might the newspaper headline be inaccurate, even though the city had severe damage?

3 Name two details that make the museum website more credible.

4 According to the passage, how can a researcher check whether a source's claims are accurate?

3 YOUR TURN _____ Your own words

Choose a historical claim you have heard. Write a five-sentence source-check plan that names two sources you would seek, identifies a credibility detail, names one possible bias, and explains how you would check accuracy.

PART 1 • READ AND MARK

Underline one detail that supports trust in a source, circle one detail that could limit trust, and number the three sources 1, 2, and 3. Your marks will help you evaluate credibility, bias, and accuracy. Accept any marking that follows this job and points at the right text.

PART 2 • ANSWERS

#	QUESTION	ANSWER
1	What makes the resident's diary a useful source, and what is one limit of using it?	It was written by someone who was there and gives close observations. It shows only one person's view, so it cannot show what happened across the whole city.
2	Why might the newspaper headline be inaccurate, even though the city had severe damage?	Reporters had limited information while fires still burned, and parts of San Francisco remained standing.
3	Name two details that make the museum website more credible.	It named its authors, listed a publication date, and linked to records, photographs, and research. Any two details are acceptable.
4	According to the passage, how can a researcher check whether a source's claims are accurate?	Compare the claims with reliable records and several independent sources, such as United States Geological Survey information.

PART 3 • YOUR TURN (SAMPLE ANSWER)

I would investigate the claim that astronauts first landed on the Moon in 1969. I would seek NASA mission records and a contemporary newspaper report. I would check whether each source names an author, gives a date, and cites evidence. NASA may emphasize the success of its mission. I would compare dates and events in both sources with an independent history source.

Accept any historical claim and two reasonable, different source types. The plan should include a specific credibility check, a plausible bias or limitation, and comparison with independent evidence to check accuracy.