

Good essay about  
accuracy, authority,  
objectivity, currency  
and coverage:  
knowing...

[Science](#)



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

The first source studied in the topic of Chief Wahoo is Wikipedia, the online encyclopedia. Wikipedia has one problem: anyone can edit its contents, which subtracts accuracy and authority from it. There is no way to know who is the author, much less contact him or her. It attempts to be objective for its very encyclopedic nature, and its coverage is fairly wide, as it exposes the history and current status of the Cleveland Indians' logo. This is not a reliable source for a serious investigation.

Secondly, there is an article in The Christian Science Monitor, by Jonathan Zimmerman. Upon researching the author, many other articles regarding him pop out, and it can be seen that Zimmerman is a well-respected author with a focus on history, and a teaching spot at New York University. It is evidently not objective, but the point of the article is clearly to push an agenda (the elimination of this logo), and it's interesting because it's pushing a somewhat Liberal topic in a right wing website. Its coverage is limited to Chief Wahoo's history, but it's very accurate about the topic. Due to the author's knowledge in the field, this can be used as a possible reference in an argument.

The third piece is a scientific article by different authors (Stephanie A. Fryberg, Hazel Rose Markus, Daphna Oyserman and Joseph M. Stone), all of whom are researchers in different universities of the United States. Their research stands on scientific basis, citing academic authors, and their coverage is limited to representations of Native Americans as mascots (although Chief Wahoo is technically a logo). While it also exposes the agenda of the elimination of the logo, it does so based on other authors and

further investigation. As such, this scientific paper is a reliable source for further research, having a strong foundation for its claims.