Unit 5 — Media and Truth — Teacher copy

Track G+M · Klasse 10 · Niveau G/M

Niveau G+M

1. Vocabulary

Match each item to its meaning or use it in a sentence.

Term	Your note
verify	
source	
primary source	
secondary source	
fact-check	
peer-reviewed	
citation	
anecdote	
correlation vs. causation	
statistical sample	
bias	
framing	
context	
viral	
debunked	
retracted	

2. Reading

Read the text and use it for the activities below.

Reading — *Five-Minute Fact-Check*

Most viral claims feel true because they fit a pattern we already believe. The fact-checker's job is small but stubborn: ask three questions. Where is this from? What is the actual evidence? What would change my mind? If a claim cannot survive these questions, it does not belong in your shareable list.

Vocabulary — media literacy

verify, source, primary source, secondary source, fact-check, peer-reviewed, citation, anecdote, correlation vs. causation, statistical sample, bias, framing, context, viral, debunked, retracted.

Cautious-claim language

It appears that … / Evidence suggests that … / According to (named source) … / Critics argue that … / This is contested / Studies indicate that … / There is some evidence that …

3. Practise

Niveau G

1. Match: peer-reviewed → expert-checked; primary source → original; debunked → shown false.
2. Choose cautious phrase: *(my own claim)* → ___ ; *(another expert's claim)* → ___ .

Niveau M

3. Build 4 cautious-claim sentences from a real or imagined news topic.

4. Your turn

Media-literacy review, 180 words. Pick a viral claim. Apply the three-question check. Use 4 cautious-claim phrases.

Sample

A widely-shared post claims that one cup of green tea per day reduces the risk of dementia by 40 %. The post links to a science-sounding website. According to the linked website, the claim is based on a 2019 study. It appears, however, that the study sampled only 70 participants over six months — too small to support a 40 % claim. There is some evidence that green-tea polyphenols affect inflammation, but this is contested. Critics argue that the study has not been replicated. What would change my mind: a larger, peer-reviewed study with at least 1,000 participants over five years, ideally a meta-analysis. The original post itself shows two warning signs: the round number (40 %) and the absence of a named researcher. I would share it only after a serious follow-up.

5. Further reading / listening

- BBC Reality Check.
- FullFact.org (UK).
- Snopes.com — wide range of fact-checks.

6. Teacher answer key

G. 1. all true.

2. *In my view / Studies indicate that.*

M. 3. Open.