

## Reliability Analysis: Responses for Class, Spring 2015

### Areas for improvement:

- “His or her” awkwardness: It can be more clear to say “their” or “the author’s.”  
Example: “The author’s educational background is in...”
- A government website is not automatically “peer-reviewed.”  
Determining whether a source is peer-reviewed can be difficult. Some suggestions are here:  
<https://www.angelo.edu/services/library/handouts/peerrev.php>
- Websites ending in “.com” can be reliable.
- Avoid wordiness.
- “Site” vs. “cite”  
One is a place or website, and the other is a verb. It is possible to “cite a site,” but not the opposite.
- When something is influenced by well-educated people, it is not automatically credible and authoritative.

### Commendations / Great patterns I noticed:

I saw some great critiques, full of bright skepticism and new ideas.

Some examples:

- Pointing out who is responsible for administering .gov websites (A. Jarmin)
- Detailed analysis of author’s credibility (K. Caro)
- Noticing that while Wikipedia authors are shown, it is difficult to determine their credibility and contact information (A. Aguirre)
- Suspicion of conspiracy theories at leishmaniasis.us website (S. St Pierre)