



Lesson 3 Handout: Identifying Reputable Resources Answer Sheet

- T** **F** “[Scientific Consensus: Earth’s Climate Is Warming.](#)” NASA, 31 July 2023.
NASA is a government agency and should be seen as a reputable source as they do not have a commercial interest. Websites with “.gov” domain suffixes should generally be seen as reputable so long as the material is current.
- “[Energy Transition.](#)” Chevron.Com, 7 July 2023.
F The first indicator that it is not a reputable source is that this website’s domain suffix is “.com”. “.com” websites are considered commercial and they exist to promote a product. Also, Chevron is a well-known oil company that may want to reference sustainability as a way to “greenwash” their company to make it seem as if they are helping to address the problem, when in fact their very existence is a cause of climate change. Greenwashing is when a company makes an environmental claim to make it seem like they are having a positive effect on the environment when in actuality this may not be true.
- F** Sutter, John D. “[Stop Blaming Yourself for the Climate Crisis.](#)” CNN, 13 Aug. 2021.
While some articles may seem reputable on the surface, they cannot be seen as reputable for research if published as an opinion piece.
- T** **F** Mokku, Jarso. “[Climate Change Destroys the Livelihoods of Kenyan Pastoralists | Africa Renewal.](#)” United Nations, United Nations, 4 Jan. 2023.
This article is from a not-for-profit organization, hence the “.org” domain suffix. This generally means that the content within is more credible as it is intended to inform using data and factual information.
- F** “[Climate Change - an Open Discussion.](#)” Facebook.
Research should never be done using social media sources. Since this is from Facebook, it should be seen as unreliable as Facebook is simply an open forum for individuals to share information as they please. Even when sources from Facebook align with the focus of your research, it should not be used as a credible source.
- “[Supporting Local Voices, Choices, and Action Is Foundational to Conservation Success.](#)”
T **F** The Nature Conservancy. 10 Jan. 2023.
The Nature Conservancy is a global, environmental non-profit organization. It is funded primarily by dues from members and donations. Governmental grants also fund it. Non-profit organizations can generally be seen as reputable as they are built around a core mission and will seek public funding to support this mission. Be discerning as some non-profits slant their perspectives to meet their goals. In this case, it is perhaps worth digging deeper to identify the organization’s mission statement, objectives, and funding sources.
- F** [Climate Change: The Public Health Response](#) | AJPH | Vol. 98 Issue 3, Mar. 2008.
While this source should be seen as reputable as it is a publicly funded source and has a domain suffix of “.org”, it was published over 15 years ago in 2008. Anything over 10 years old should be considered unreliable in any context.
- “[Amazon Summit Nations Will Face Differences on Drilling, Deforestation.](#)” NBCNews.Com, 21 Sept. 2022.
F While the content of an article may seem reputable and the source recognizable, obtaining research from big news organizations like NBC News is generally frowned upon as these organizations are for-profit institutions.
- “[Dive into Anything.](#)” Reddit, May 2023.
F Reddit is a social media platform where content is socially curated and voted upon by its users. This is a forum for opinions that may be grounded in truth but can just as easily be unfounded.
- Robin Wall Kimmerer shares the “[Lessons of the Honorable Harvest, Bioneers series.](#)”
T **F** Seeding the Harvest: June 11, 2013.
Traditional knowledge is passed down through generations, and so practices such as “Seeding the Harvest” are valid approaches because they have a long standing history within their respective communities.