

f
by F F

Submission date: 02-Jul-2020 04:39AM (UTC-0700)

Submission ID: 1352575149

File name: tech_website.edited.edited.edited.doc (24K)

Word count: 691

Character count: 3752

2

<https://www.rasmussen.edu/degrees/technology/blog/what-is-information-technology/>

I found this website a reliable source because first, the website has focused on information concerning my field of study. Information technology is a critical field and therefore getting the right information is crucial. The website provides information about the author of every article thus indicating that it is a credible site. Moreover, provision of the author's name designates that they are responsible for the information provided. Similarly, the publication date of the research is very essential. Gizmodo websites provide the date of publication making their readers realize it is present enough for their tenacities. Also, the website provides reviews where people can provide their appraisals about the content presented thus knowing whether information available is reliable or not. With information technology being the center of everything currently and things are changing, it is essential to read technological news and be ready to get credible information on how the field is expanding as well as the challenges encountered.

1

<https://gizmodo.com/hackers-have-already-started-to-weaponize-artificial-in-1797688425>

I have found **this** website to be a poor reference for my field. Although the website has presented the author's name as well as the date which shows the information is current, the site is a blog and thus the author may present information that might be bias or based on someone's perception. Besides, there are no facts that represent where the information was obtained. Sources of where certain ideas were obtained are critical as it ensures the writer appreciates and recognizes other author's work. Normally, blogs are written by individuals who might be professionals or not and thus making it hard for readers to evaluate the credibility of those

sources hence not functioning adequately. Although these individuals work hard towards getting current news, no one can justify if they are correct, because they can blog based on their interest.

Reply 1

I concur that the two websites are reliable and can be used as references because first, they have authors who are responsible for the information provided. Moreover, the date of the content provided also ensures that the information is current. For every research to be viable it should use current sources since outdated information can lead to misinformation. Furthermore, the websites provide links to where their information is taken from, thus indicating that they recognize other people's work and in case the reader wants to read more about the information they can follow the links. Consequently, I agree that Wikipedia is not a reliable source because individuals from around the world can edit the pages and write what they want. Therefore, allowing everybody to edit information will lead to bias and incredibility because people will write based on their understanding and not facts. Although they provide references for the information provided which is important, anyone editing the information makes it unreliable.

Reply 2

Nursing being an essential field that requires credibility and keenness of information, I agree that these references are important and can be used in research. Furthermore, the websites have used evidence-based resources indicating where information has been obtained hence showing that it is based on facts and not personal views. Also, the sites are easy to navigate and thus make it easy for the researcher to explore more content as well as current information available. I accede that Wikipedia can be viewed as both a good and a bad source. First, it is considered a good source because it is current and provides references where they have obtained

their information. However, the bad side is that the pages can be edited by anyone irrespective of whether they are professionals or not.

Reply 3

I agree that the CDC website is a good source to be referenced because it is a .gov domain managed by the government. Therefore, the government will provide reliable information that is up to date and with sources of where they have obtained their facts. However, I ascent that natural news is not a reliable source because it provides information not backed up by sources making it incredible. Sources of where facts are taken from should be provided to ensure the reader can find and read more about it rather than creating fear.

ORIGINALITY REPORT

3%

SIMILARITY INDEX

2%

INTERNET SOURCES

2%

PUBLICATIONS

3%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1

divergentoptions.org

Internet Source

2%

2

Submitted to London School of Commerce

Student Paper

2%

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude bibliography On

Exclude matches Off