

# Reading report sample

[Technology](#), [Internet](#)



\n[[toc title="Table of Contents"](#)]\n

\n \t

1. [Introduction](#) \n \t
2. [Analyzing how Wikipedia works](#) \n \t
3. [Conclusion](#) \n \t
4. [Work Cited](#) \n

\n[/toc]\n \n

## **Introduction**

The critics on Wikipedia are just a mere speculation; the Wikipedia is an otherwise “black book test”. The judgment inflicted on Wikipedia is baseless. Wikipedia does not dispute the scientist or the decision makers. Judging the information that was extracted from Wikipedia and claiming it is not accurate is not true. After all this information is extracted from the printed encyclopedia which derives most of its explanation from different materials which are accepted. For instance, information that the writer gave about swine flu is globally accepted. It is a fact that swine flu was not the first disease in the continent. My studies were all based in wiki and the information is equally acceptable.

The study that was conducted to test the usability of Wikipedia demonstrated that it is all about how one uses it. The ability to edit the information retrieved from Wikipedia depends of the one’ skills on how to use the wiki information. The fact that instructors insist that the citation in any given work should not include Wikipedia does not mean that you shouldn’t use Wikipedia while doing your research. As per the swine flu

example, it is evident that the information on the different factors of the disease is contained in Wikipedia. Any search engine one visit has Wikipedia among the top links displayed. Though the information therein might not be updated for some field of study, at least it is relevant enough to make one understand the idea sought. The question about the credibility of Wikipedia is what the research was trying to find out.

### **Analyzing how Wikipedia works**

Any evaluation done on Wikipedia is based on both heuristic process and systematic process. One has to balance the two in order to fully utilize the material. The evaluation of any website entirely depends on three factors. These are the credibility of the sponsor, the credibility of the message and the credibility of the site. From critical analysis, the concern in Wikipedia is the information therein. The idea of the sponsor and the site credibility is not given consideration. Wikipedia is an open source and hence faces a lot of competition from the other sites whose information is customized by the sponsor. The site credibility of Wikipedia entirely depend on the knowledge of the user. For a user who does not know that the Wikipedia can be edited by any individual, the site credibility is high. This implies that such a user is right unless the information in the wiki is obviously wrong.

The data used in this research were collected using two methods which are appropriate for this particular research. Observation of how users seek information from a source is more accurate than the reports that individuals give on a particular subject. This has become the preference after research displayed massive discrepancies on user's opinion on the credibility of a site. The formulation of search task used in the on campus environment would

give the sought information. After all, the heavy users of learning sites are the students.

The research indicated that more than 70% of the participant accessed Wikipedia during information looking session. Approximately 20% directly used Wikipedia. From my own analysis, the direct access to Wikipedia could be attributed to the time that one had and the level that one has on the credibility of the information in Wikipedia. Probably, these are the users who are not aware that the information in Wikipedia can be edited by anybody. The result proved that it is the ability of the user to know how to search information from a site that matters. For example, the social studies student who found it difficult to find information from Wikipedia can be said to have little knowledge in internet skills. This can be ascertained by the male student whose negative attitude towards Wikipedia changed after some time. My opinion is that the prejudice that the student had on Wikipedia was a result of the notion inflicted to them by their lecturers. The idea of insisting that any professional work should not have Wikipedia as one of the cited work, has impacted on the students' use of Wikipedia. The time one has to search for information is also a factor. Considering the fact that most search engines give priority to Wikipedia proves that it is a valid source when one is looking for a blueprint for a particular subject. Moreover, there are several links in Wikipedia which one can follow to get information which could be more relevant. It cannot be argued that the information in all the links and other web paged linked to Wikipedia is not valid.

As indicated earlier, the knowledge of editing feature of Wikipedia was profound among the participants. The highest number of students who

accessed Wikipedia are those from engineering and mathematics. This could be attributed to the fact that the mathematical and engineering formulas never, change. For instance, the laws of damodynamics which a student saw in a book or was given by a lecturer are the same as the one in Wikipedia. This implies that a student will be convinced that the content of Wikipedia is credible despite several critics. “ Wikipedia, I don’t know if a normal person like me is allowed to edit it, but people are hired, and they edit, like, scholars, people that were expert in the technology, or in the issue.” Is a prove on the users knowledge of edit feature on Wikipedia. The statement by the computer science student shows that the experts in the computer field can justify why most lecturers or teacher doesn’t trust Wikipedia.

## **Conclusion**

The responses from different participant is a clear indication that the existing mindset on the credibility of Wikipedia among people is has massive implication on the use of Wikipedia. I disagree with this preemption because the information in Wikipedia is credible. After all this information is extracted from the printed encyclopedia which derives most of its explanation from different materials which are accepted. For instance, information that the writer gave about swine flu is globally accepted. It is a fact that swine flu was not the first disease in the continent. My studies were all based in wiki and the information is equally acceptable.

The opportunity for web users to edit the information in Wikipedia does not discredit Wikipedia. In fact, it is an empowerment to both individuals and community. Having a project that is user generated in is crucial factor when it comes to gathering of knowledge database. It is a fact that knowledge is

continually acquired. The edit feature in Wikipedia was to enable the developers gather more knowledge from the users who have more information on that particular topic. I strongly believe that Wikipedia is credible as far as the perception on the edit feature remains the same. The credibility can only be discredited if there are massive false on the content of a wiki page. This decision should only be made after a critical assessment of any arising allegation.

## **Work Cited**

Cunningham, Walter . Correspondence on the Etymology of Wiki, [online]

Available at,

<http://c2.com/doc/etymology.html> (5 June 2009).

Hargittai, E., Fullerton, L., Menchen-Trevino, E., & Thomas, K. 'Trust Online: Young Adults

Evaluation of Web Content', International Journal of Communication, vol. 4.

[online] Available at:

<http://ijoc.org/ojs/index.php/ijoc/article/view/636> (1 July 2010)