**Web Programming Program Assignment Unit 1**

For this assignment, I used the following 3 websites, which I have visited in the past:

<https://www.uopeople.edu/>

<http://web.mit.edu/>

<https://www.google.com/>

To validate these three websites, I used the validation software provided in the Learning Guide, <https://validator.w3.org/>.

*For your convenience, I added a copy of the list of problems found for each website validated as* ***separate .pdf files*** *attached to this assignment.*

**Validating https://www.uopeople.edu/**

First, I thought it would be interesting to look at the University of the People’s website, <https://www.uopeople.edu/>. Of the three websites I validated, this had the most problems. There were *78 problems* identified in total when I ran the validation software. There were 47 errors and 31 warnings. (See validation results .pdf attachment for full list of problems.) The types of problems that the website had were mostly having to do with CSS. Even so, there are no easily noticed problems with the website’s look and all of it works properly. To improve their website, UoPeople should fix CSS syntax problems, CSS properties that do not exist, element hierarchies, and values.

**Validating http://web.mit.edu/**

Then, for comparison, I ran the validation tool on MIT’s website, <http://web.mit.edu/>. The logic was that if any school should have few validation errors, it should be the technical school with a great reputation. There were only *10 problems* identified in total when I ran the validation software. There were 6 errors and 4 warnings. (See validation results .pdf attachment for full list of problems.) This was substantially less problems than the UoPeople website. There were only 2 main categories of problems in this website. First there were tags that were not started and ended properly. Second, some of the attributes of the meta element were bad. These are minor issues, so overall the website works well. The minor tag issues and fixing the meta element attributes would improve the website.

**Validating https://www.google.com/**

Lastly, I decided to test Google’s website, <https://www.google.com/>, since they were listed as one of the companies that worked on the W3C standards in the first place. There were *23 problems* identified in total when I ran the validation software. There were 21 errors and 2 warnings. (See validation results .pdf attachment for full list of problems.) Once again the website works great and has no obvious problems. To improve the website, they need to upgrade their encoding. The site may work well now, but with old encoding, this may be a problem in the future. Another problem is that they have a lot of obsolete attributes on many elements, which can be a problem in the future. Also their elements are not in the right hierarchy.

**Summary of validation results**

Of the three websites, MIT had the fewest and least significant problems. UoPeople had the most problems listed. However, their problems were not very significant. Google had a moderate number of problems, but the problems may cause issues in the future because most of the errors have to do with obsolete code.