Should I Feel It, Or Should I Think It?

Today in our scenario we felt the easiest information to dismiss was the wikipedia pages regarding information on Port Fourchon. This information was quite easily set aside, due to its status as a non credible source. Being a non credible source allowed us to know that this information could easily be false. Because it was a Wikipedia article, we immediately perceived that the information in it was probably untrustworthy. The title “Wikipedia” made us decide very easily that this information was probably not relevant to what we were looking for.

After further research, we returned to the Port Fourchon Wikipedia page, and we discovered that a certain piece of information could help us learn that the port was damaged by Hurricane Lili in October of 2002. In 2005 Hurricane Katrina did not directly hit the port and a quick response was able to keep the port open and running, even though the infrastructure and engineering needed a steady flow of maintenance workers. The meaning of the information on the Wikipedia page changed after a little extra thought because the information revealed the weather damage history of Port Fourchon. Wikipedia is not always a reliable source, but some information may be true. In fact, on the page, there is a docudrama about Port Fourchon which included a fictional hurricane severely crippling the port. This shows how some information can be misleading because, in reality, the port is normally back up and running days after most major storms. The challenge is in being aware of (interpreting) what is credible and what is not. One source may appear to be credible, but upon further investigation, one may find large holes or fallacies. Wikipedia is not considered a credible source by most teachers, but in the case of Port Fourchon, all of the information is cited, and can more or less be proven true.

When we first began studying our information, the generalizations that we were taught were what we used to determine the importance of each source. Our perceptions are not always the whole truth, though. During the course of our investigation, it became clear that we would have to slow down and consider each piece of information equally. We could not just throw something out after glancing at it; we needed the information to make sense of the story. When we stopping assuming that the Wikipedia entry was useless, it opened up new ideas to our investigation. We took our time to examine it, and then we were able to slow down and interpret what the Wikipedia piece really could add to our case. This means that perception makes a person judge something too quickly. Someone can miss out on important information if assumptions are made about every new thing. Instead, it might be better to look at new ideas with an open mind. It is better to look at each idea for itself and take the time to think about it - to interpret the information.