

# GOOGLE AND WIKIPEDIA

What's wrong with Google and Wikipedia? Nothing as long as you know what you are reading. Google is a search engine and will point you to a variety of Web pages regardless of the validity of the site. You are responsible for evaluating the site to determine if the information is accurate. What about Wikipedia? Below is an article describing the best way to evaluate a Web site. Use the criteria below to determine what's wrong with Wikipedia. It is a great site for entertainment purposes, but for research, it is best to stick to academic journals.

The article below is from a Web site. Use the "Evaluation Criteria" it lists to determine the validity of the article.

---

## **The Good, The Bad & The Ugly: or, Why It's a Good Idea to Evaluate Web Sources**

by

Susan E. Beck

Collection Development Coordinator

New Mexico State University Library

### Evaluation Criteria

#### **I. Authority**

- Is there an author? Is the page signed?
- Is the author qualified? An expert?
- Who is the sponsor?
- Is the sponsor of the page reputable? How reputable?
- Is there a link to information about the author or the sponsor?
- If the page includes neither a signature nor indicates a sponsor, is there any other way to determine its origin?

Look for a header or footer showing affiliation.

Look at the URL. *http://www.fbi.gov*

Look at the domain. *.edu, .com, .ac.uk, .org, .net*

#### **Rationale**

1. Anyone can publish anything on the web.
  2. It is often hard to determine a web page's authorship.
  3. Even if a page is signed, qualifications are not usually provided.
  4. Sponsorship is not always indicated.
- 

#### **II. Accuracy**

- Is the information reliable and error-free?
- Is there an editor or someone who verifies/checks the information?

#### **Rationale**

1. See number 1 above
  2. Unlike traditional print resources, web resources rarely have editors or fact-checkers.
  3. Currently, no web standards exist to ensure accuracy.
-

### III. Objectivity

- Does the information show a minimum of bias?
- Is the page designed to sway opinion?
- Is there any advertising on the page?

#### Rationale

1. Frequently the goals of the sponsors/authors are not clearly stated.
  2. Often the Web serves as a virtual "Hyde Park Corner", a soapbox.
- 

### IV. Currency

- Is the page dated?
- If so, when was the last update?
- How current are the links? Have some expired or moved?

#### Rationale

1. Publication or revision dates are not always provided.
2. If a date is provided, it may have various meanings. For example,

It may indicate when the material was first written

It may indicate when the material was first placed on the Web

It may indicate when the material was last revised

---

### V. Coverage

- What topics are covered?
- What does this page offer that is not found elsewhere?
- What is its intrinsic value?
- How in-depth is the material?

#### Rationale

1. Web coverage often differs from print coverage.
  2. Frequently, it's difficult to determine the extent of coverage of a topic from a web page. The page may or may not include links to other web pages or print references.
  3. Sometimes web information is "just for fun", a hoax, someone's personal expression that may be of interest to no one, or even outright silliness.
- 



**Last updated on 04/03/2008 10:14:31**

---

© 1997 Susan E. Beck

**Educational use:** You are welcome to use and make print copies of these materials for educational purposes only. You may also link electronically to this web site but may not make an electronic copy and mount the site locally. The author assumes no responsibility for this collection of web pages if they do not originate from the New Mexico State University Library's web site (<http://lib.nmsu.edu>).

Please cite the source as:

Beck, Susan. *The Good, The Bad & The Ugly: or, Why It's a Good Idea to Evaluate Web Sources*. 1997. <http://lib.nmsu.edu/instruction/eval.html>

Send comments or suggestions to: Susan E. Beck at [susabeck@nmsu.edu](mailto:susabeck@nmsu.edu)