

# Bag Fee Claims

Trace claims, evidence, and source motives before drawing a conclusion.

**S.WG.j** “contextualizing, corroborating, and evaluating sources for credibility, propaganda, and bias to determine patterns and trends to understand the world.”

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

## 1 READ AND MARK \_\_\_\_\_ Read it twice

**YOUR JOB** Underline the evidence statement in each of the two research sources. Circle these three flyer clues: “destroy local jobs,” “named no author, gave no data,” and “asked readers to sign a petition.”

### Checking a Claim About Plastic Bags

- ① In 2024, the fictional city of Harborview considered a fee on single-use plastic bags. A flyer from the Harborview Retail Alliance said, “A bag fee will destroy local jobs.” The flyer named no author, gave no data, and asked readers to sign a petition. Because the alliance represents store owners, its goal may shape its message. Its emotional phrase and missing evidence are clues of possible bias or propaganda, not proof that the claim is true.
- ② The city sanitation department published a 2023 waste audit. Workers sorted trash from 12 collection routes during one week in October and found that plastic shopping bags made up 3 percent of the litter items counted. The audit explains its method and date, so readers can evaluate its evidence. However, one week of counts cannot show whether a bag fee would affect jobs or predict results for every season. It supports only a narrow claim about local litter.
- ③ A local newspaper compared the audit with a 2022 university study of litter at four nearby parks. The study also found plastic bags among common litter items, although it used a different place and method. Together, the two sources corroborate a pattern: plastic bags appear in local litter. Neither source proves the alliance's job prediction. When sources agree on a limited fact but not on a broader prediction, treat the shared fact as stronger than the unsupported claim.

## 2 ANSWER WITH EVIDENCE Use the passage

1 Which group produced the flyer, and what interest might shape its message?

---

---

2 According to paragraph 1, which two features of the flyer are clues of possible bias or propaganda?

---

---

3 What did the October waste audit find, and what is one limit of that finding?

---

---

4 What pattern do the audit and university study corroborate, and what claim do they not prove?

---

---

## 3 YOUR TURN Your own words

Write exactly three sentences evaluating the flyer's claim that a bag fee will destroy local jobs. Identify one bias or propaganda clue, use evidence from both the audit and university study, and explain what conclusion is and is not supported.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**PART 1 • READ AND MARK**

Underline the evidence statement in each of the two research sources. Circle these three flyer clues: “destroy local jobs,” “named no author, gave no data,” and “asked readers to sign a petition.” Accept any marking that follows this job and points at the right text.

**PART 2 • ANSWERS**

| # | QUESTION                                                                                            | ANSWER                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|---|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Which group produced the flyer, and what interest might shape its message?                          | <b>The Harborview Retail Alliance produced it. Because it represents store owners, it may oppose a bag fee that could affect those businesses.</b>                                                |
| 2 | According to paragraph 1, which two features of the flyer are clues of possible bias or propaganda? | <b>Its emotional phrase, “destroy local jobs,” and its missing evidence are clues of possible bias or propaganda.</b>                                                                             |
| 3 | What did the October waste audit find, and what is one limit of that finding?                       | <b>It found that plastic shopping bags were 3 percent of the litter items counted. The count lasted only one week, so it cannot predict every season or show how a bag fee would affect jobs.</b> |
| 4 | What pattern do the audit and university study corroborate, and what claim do they not prove?       | <b>They corroborate that plastic bags appear in local litter. They do not prove that a bag fee will destroy local jobs.</b>                                                                       |

**PART 3 • YOUR TURN (SAMPLE ANSWER)**

The Retail Alliance flyer claims a bag fee will destroy local jobs, but its emotional wording and lack of data make the claim less credible. The 2023 city audit counted plastic bags as 3 percent of litter items, and the 2022 university study also found bags among common park litter. These sources support a local litter pattern, but they do not show that a fee would destroy jobs.

Accept accurate paraphrases of source motive, evidence, limits, and the corroborated pattern. In Part 3, require exactly three sentences that address the flyer clue, both research sources, and the supported versus unsupported conclusion.