

## Authorship and Authenticity

60 minutes

ICT Specialism 4: The internet and digital literacy

Outcome M4.U2.2

### WHAT THIS LESSON DOES

Explore how to determine the authorship of sources in your research. Assess the expertise and potential agendas of writers or organisations, then create notes to justify the reliability of your evidence.

### CURRICULUM OUTCOMES

| Outcome        | What the specification asks for                                                                                  |
|----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>M4.U2.2</b> | Compare information from various sources in order to evaluate its reliability, validity, accuracy and authority. |

### WHAT STUDENTS SHOULD BE ABLE TO DO

- Investigate who wrote a source and whether they have expertise or an agenda
- Compare anonymous and named sources
- Write two-sentence authorship notes for two investigation sources

### BEFORE THE BELL

- Ensure every student has their sm4\_references file (or can open sm4\_search\_log as fallback).
- Have the named-vs-anonymous figure and one sample investigation URL ready for the live authorship-note demo.
- Have the seven matching terms and their seven meanings ready to write on the board for the pair check at the start of "Where do you stand on authorship?", the full list is in that step's notes.
- Confirm students can open sm4\_references (or sm4\_search\_log fallback) in their Project Portfolio; have the named-vs-anonymous figure ready on the board
- Have worked-example figure ready; leave two-sentence recipe on screen for Portfolio Build
- Print or open authorship\_matching for pairs; open the opinion-line on the board; have one sample investigation URL ready for the live note demo
- Project this table for the whole Portfolio Build block
- Project Common Issues; model one live author find; protect 20 minutes in class and spot-check three portfolios before dismissal
- Spot-check three portfolios for authorship notes inside sm4\_references before dismissal

## Authorship and Authenticity

### HOW THE LESSON RUNS

|               |              |                                   |
|---------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>5 min</b>  | introduction | Introduction                      |
| <b>8 min</b>  | content      | Key concepts                      |
| <b>12 min</b> | activity     | Where do you stand on authorship? |
| <b>3 min</b>  | content      | Common issues                     |
| <b>20 min</b> | activity     | Independent practice              |
| <b>5 min</b>  | content      | Reflection                        |
| <b>7 min</b>  | summary      | Lesson summary                    |

### TEACHING MOVES

- Read the worked example aloud and stress that source type is not source quality.
- Run the matching pairs before the opinion-line, discuss statement 1 before opening the interactive, and demo one live note on the board.
- Circulate during independent practice with the question about who wrote the source and what they gain.
- Keep the Common issues table visible throughout the independent practice.
- Authorship notes stay inside sm4\_references only, no separate authorship file.

### WHAT TO WATCH FOR

- Students cite multiple pages from the same site as independent sources, remind them to seek truly different publishers.
- Students skip checking for author names, direct them to article top, bottom, About page and footer.
- Students name a brand with no person behind it and stop there, the note should say the organisation is the author and that no individual writer could be found.
- Heading drift (Author note / Notes), insist on the exact heading Authorship note.

### DIFFERENTIATION

- Support: Sentence starters are on the Independent Practice card; project them for the whole room if needed.
- Extension: Challenge students to complete notes for a third source (see Lesson summary).
- Support: Allow pair discussion during the reflection phase.