# The Oculus rift is a headset that projects an image to a screen inside the headset. It’s an amazing technology that can be used for video game systems and movies to make it feel like you’re inside the game or movie. Although I don’t see it having much appeal outside of the entertainment world, Oculus has a lot of people curious as to what it would feel like to be inside a movie. The only issue with this is with younger children- The idea of isolating yourself within a movie or a game can make people not only less social but It could wear down the line of distinction between fiction and reality. *Web Programming I (420-C10-HR)*

# *Assignment 1 – Research*

Date assigned: Friday, September 11, 2015

Date due: **Monday, September 28, 2015**

**Learning Objectives**

Upon successful completion of this assignment, the student will be able to:

* Exam some sites to determine if they are valid/correct
* Select key words for a search
* Cite a book, newspaper or magazine, and electronic source
* Evaluate websites

To do:

1. Save this document with the name **YourUserName\_C10\_A01\_Research.docx** in H:\420-C10\Assignments.
2. This assignment involves the research of current technology related trends in the Information Technology (IT) field as the source for the topic of an in-class presentation. The presentation should cover the following, so look for related information when researching:

* the name of the technology
* a description of the technology
* how the technology is used (business, pleasure, etc)
* the future of the technology

1. To get started, identify the key words or phrases that will be used to search for trends in the IT field. Include synonyms, related terms, or other variations of the keywords. List at least 5 different key words or phrases that can be used to search for IT related trends.
2. Find at least 5 different technology related trends in the IT field using the keywords identified above and a variety of sources, including books in the library, web sites, textbooks, magazines, newspapers, videos, etc. For each technology trend which is found, list the name of the technology, a brief description **in your own words**, and the source of the information (the actual web site or book that shows or identifies the technology as a trend, not the search engine used to find it or the site that provides details about the trend). Cite the source according to the MLA style.

**Note:** **You must include at least one non-Internet based source**, such as a book, magazine or newspaper. This resource may be found online, but must be a book, magazine, newspaper or journal

**Note:** You cannot use blogs or forum sites. These sites are populated by people (sometimes experts) who state their (sometimes well-informed) opinions. While these sites are great if you have a question about how the Java Scanner class works or the link pseudo-class modifies the anchor tag in html, they are not appropriate for research.

**Note:** You cannot use Wikipedia or any of the wiki-based sites to do determine these trends. Wikipedia contains some very valuable information and can certainly be used to get an overview of the technology you choose and perhaps some links for further research, but it cannot be used as a primary source.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of IT Trend** | **Description** | **Source that identified the trend** |
| Oculus VR | The Oculus rift is a headset that projects an image to a screen inside the headset. It’s an amazing technology that can be used for video game systems and movies to make it feel like you’re inside the game or movie. Although I don’t see it having much appeal outside of the entertainment world, Oculus has a lot of people curious as to what it would feel like to be inside a movie. The only issue with this is with younger children- The idea of isolating yourself within a movie or a game can make people not only less social but It could wear down the line of distinction between fiction and reality. | URL:  <https://www.oculus.com/en-us/>  Article Title:  Step into the Rift  Website Title:  Oculus |
| Control VR | Control VR, like the oculus is a form of virtual reality that does more than just project a virtual image. It’s a system of sensors that detect movement from all over your body and allows you to control a virtual body inside a simulation. It can be used to completely change the way that we learn things instead of just being used for entertainment unlike the Oculus rift. Doctors can simulate surgeries, we can learn to drive a car without the physical danger of being an unexperienced driver or pilot. It can be used to simulate so much more than just an entertainment system. | <https://www.kickstarter.com/projects/controlvr/control-vr-motion-capture-for-vr-animation-and-mor/description> |
| Google self-driving cars | The google self-driving car is exactly what it sounds like- it’s a car that drives itself. It has sensors that are able to detect other objects around it. The cars communicate with each other and that can allow for safer driving. Accident rate can greatly decrease when the cars are communicating directly with each other. Human error can no longer be the cause of accidents, which is 94% of all accidents in the US every year. | URL:  <http://www.google.com/selfdrivingcar/>  Article Title:  Google Self-Driving Car Project  Website Title:  Google Self-Driving Car Project |
| 3D Printers | 3D printers are machines that can be used to make just about anything you want. They melt plastic or other materials and make objects that have been designed on a computer and allow for people to make these objects in their own homes. You can print off pieces from a broken machine or new toys for your kids just by going online, finding a blueprint and printing it out. Most machines in factories make things by taking larger blocks of the material you’re working with and cut it and shape it down to what you want to make, but 3D printers build from nothing, so it’s incredibly efficient and eliminates the waste from what’s cut off of a block of plastic or aluminum. | URL: <http://www.3dprinter.net/reference/what-is-3d-printing>  Article Title:  What is 3D Printing? An overview.  Website Title:  3D Printer  Publication date:  2012-03-28 |
| Apple iWatch | No matter how you look at it, the apple iWatch is pretty cool. It syncs with your phone and allows you to read text and emails right off your wrist. You can receive calls and instantly see whenever someone is trying to communicate with you. It also measures your heart beat so it becomes an awesome tool while going for a run or a doing any sort of physical activity. You can look at maps just by looking down at your wrist so you can figure out exactly where you need to be going. And they come in a multitude of different styles for everyone. You can have ones that look very modern with a digital face or have an older look that projects an analogue clock face. You have everything you could possibly want to use for quick convenience on your phone available on your wrist to find it even faster. | URL:  <http://www.apple.com/ca/watch/>  Article Title:  To wear it is to love it.  Website:  Apple (Canada) |

1. For one of the trends you identified **using internet sources**, identify how the source of the information that identified the trend can be evaluated using the following table.

Address all 6 of the areas identified in Lab 2 on evaluating sites (PROMPT). You can check out the lab again if you forget what to look for.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Website URL:** | https://www.oculus.com/en-us/rift/ | |
| **Question** | | **Evaluation** |
| **Presentation** | | |
| What does the URL tell you? Is this a commercial site? A personal site? | | A commercial site. |
| Is the page cluttered with large amounts of text making it hard to know where to look? Are links clear and obvious? What about colours and layout? Are there a lot of spelling mistakes? | | The site has very little text and is mostly all pictures, however finding where you want to go on the site is not difficult. |
| Are there multiple menus to different locations? What can be found by scanning the perimeter of the page? | | There’s multiple pages, however when you click on the share page it brings you to another page that looks very different, it almost looks like it’s part of a different site. |
| Presentation Summary | | The site isn’t poorly designed. There’s less information on how the device actually works than I’d like and the share page brings you to another section that looks completely different, so the website isn’t consistent in its appearance. |
| **Relevance** | | |
| How Relevant is the site to what you are looking up? Does the information meet the requirements of the assignment? | | I mean, the site lets me know what the Oculus VR is, but it presents it in a way that assumes you already know a bit about it, so some of the information you’d like to see isn’t there if you didn’t know anything about this. |
| Is the emphasis of your article relevant to the trend or is the trend simply mentioned in the article? | | The article is the official page for the trend, so it’s very relevant. |
| Is the article too detailed with small details about the trend or too broad mentioning the trend as part of something else? | | The article isn’t detailed enough. It’s directed towards buyers, so there’s nothing on the site about how the VR actually works and just kind of lets you know it’s really cool. |
| Relevance Summary | | The page is directed towards consumers and not people who want to know more about VR, which is slightly frustrating. |
| **Objectivity** | | |
| Is the site objective or biased? Does it provide multiple viewpoints? | | The site is very biased. It’s designed to be looked at by potential consumers and so it makes VR seem as appealing as possible to entice readers. |
| Is the language emotional? Is it a phan-boi site that speaks about the trend based on emotion rather than with facts? | | It uses both. Giving several adjectives to the device such as beautiful and comfortably designed. It’s for the most part information based, but biased in a way to appeal to emotion. |
| Objectivity Summary | | The site is very definitely biased. Although it does have sections where its information based, things are presented in a way to appeal to emotion. |
| **Method** | | |
| If the site is reviewing the trend, how do they review it? Is it reviewed methodically or just certain features? Are all features reviewed or just a few? | | The site doesn’t mention anything negative about the Oculus, although it does cover most aspects of the oculus. |
| If the site is comparing two items either old and new or two from different vendors, what method do they use? Is it biased? | | The site is for one product and has no mention of their competitors, although the information is presented to appeal to the emotion of the person on the site, so it is biased. |
| How do you know the site is accurate? Are their links to back up the author’s comments and claims? | | It’s the official site for Oculus, so the author of the site is someone on the development team for Oculus. |
| Method Summary | | The site is very biased, although none of the information is wrong. It’s a site talking about Oculus, written by Oculus, so information is accurate. |
| **Provenance** | | |
| How do you know if an author is an authority on your topic? What are the author’s credentials? | | The author isn’t stated, although it’s the official site for Oculus, so it’s written by someone who works with or for Oculus. |
| What do you know about the organization that is sponsoring the article? Are they commercial? Volunteer? Statutory? Does the organization have a history? Can you contact them for more information? | | The organization sponsoring the website is commercial. The site is designed to sell a product. There is a forum, but no easy way to contact a representative for the site. |
| Provenance Summary | | The site never says who the author is, so we have to assume it’s someone who works for or with Oculus. The site has no easy way to contact a representative. |
| **Timeliness** | | |
| Is the information clear about when it was produced? Is the date available and obvious? | | The site clearly has in bottom that’s it was published in 2015, although a date isn’t specified. |
| How Current is the site? Do you know when it was last updated? Are there newer articles on your topic? | | The site isn’t clear about updates or when it was published. All it lets you know is that’s from 2015. |
| Timeliness Summary | | The site has no dates specified and only gives you a year at the bottom of the page. |

1. Select the trend/topic that most interests you and briefly explain why it interests you the most.

**The trend that interest me the most is the Control VR. Virtual reality is just such a cool concept and they’ve taken it to the next level. I see a future for the Control VR so far past just gaming and entertainment, I could see it being integrated into eductation systems to give people virtual hands on simulation of anything from driving a car to performing surgery.**

1. Find two web sites associated with the selected trend/topic (different than the initial site) and list them below.
2. For one of these sites, identify how the source of the information can be evaluated, using the table below.

<http://www.wired.com/2014/05/oculus-rift-4/>

[http://www.cnet.com/products/oculus-rift/#](http://www.cnet.com/products/oculus-rift/)!

Address all 6 of the areas identified in Lab 2 on evaluating sites (PROMPT). You can check out the lab again if you forget what to look for.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Website URL:** | <http://www.wired.com/2014/05/oculus-rift-4/> | |
| **Question** | | **Evaluation** |
| **Presentation** | | |
| What does the URL tell you? Is this a commercial site? A personal site? | | It tells you that it’s an article on another site written about the Oculus VR. |
| Is the page cluttered with large amounts of text making it hard to know where to look? Are links clear and obvious? What about colours and layout? Are there a lot of spelling mistakes? | | The page is on a site for a magazine. At the top of the screen things are very clearly organized into different categories of articles. |
| Are there multiple menus to different locations? What can be found by scanning the perimeter of the page? | | Yes, at the top of the page you can see all of the different categories of articles and then when you click on them all of the articles are set out in front of you, although they aren’t horribly well organized. |
| Presentation Summary | | The presentation of the site is very good. The categories of articles is very clear at the top of the page and all of the articles are easy to find and browse through. |
| **Relevance** | | |
| How Relevant is the site to what you are looking up? Does the information meet the requirements of the assignment? | | The information is the article is relevant to the trend. It tells you about kind of the story of the trend and inside the story all about the trend itself. |
| Is the emphasis of your article relevant to the trend or is the trend simply mentioned in the article? | | This article is about the trend, but the site is about all sorts of trends in all different fields from business to entertainment. |
| Is the article too detailed with small details about the trend or too broad mentioning the trend as part of something else? | | The article is about the company as a whole and about the development of the trend. Within the story of the trend that it tells however, there’s a lot of information about the trend itself. |
| Relevance Summary | | The article is very relevant to the trend. It’s about the development of the trend and within that story there’s a lot of information about everything you may want to know about the trend. |
| **Objectivity** | | |
| Is the site objective or biased? Does it provide multiple viewpoints? | | The article is very factual and about the development of Oculus, so it’s an objective article. |
| Is the language emotional? Is it a phan-boi site that speaks about the trend based on emotion rather than with facts? | | The article has no one to appeal to in terms of consumers, so it’s based on facts and not appealing to emotion. |
| Objectivity Summary | | The article is objective and does not appeal to the emotion of the readers. |
| **Method** | | |
| If the site is reviewing the trend, how do they review it? Is it reviewed methodically or just certain features? Are all features reviewed or just a few? | | They cover most topics about the Oculus VR, including some specifics, but it’s written from the perspective of “this is what was wrong, this is how we fixed it”. |
| If the site is comparing two items either old and new or two from different vendors, what method do they use? Is it biased? | | The article I found had little bias. It was written on a timeline of the original VR and early day Oculus to what will soon be available to us as consumers. |
| How do you know the site is accurate? Are their links to back up the author’s comments and claims? | | The article is full of quotes from Oculus employees and people who have partnered with them. |
| Method Summary | | The article has many quotes from Oculus employees and tends to be objective and cover most parts of the Oculus rift, things both good and bad about it. |
| **Provenance** | | |
| How do you know if an author is an authority on your topic? What are the author’s credentials? | | The author is the senior editor for the Wired magazine. He covers articles on everything in terms of entertainment. |
| What do you know about the organization that is sponsoring the article? Are they commercial? Volunteer? Statutory? Does the organization have a history? Can you contact them for more information? | | At the bottom of the page there’s a tab to contact the magazine. The site has some ads here and there, so that’s where they get their sponsor ship from, in addition to people subscribing to the magazine. |
| Provenance Summary | | The site is sponsored by little ads and subscription to the magazine. The author is the head editor for the magazine. |
| **Timeliness** | | |
| Is the information clear about when it was produced? Is the date available and obvious? | | The date and even time of when it was published is very clear across the top of the page. |
| How Current is the site? Do you know when it was last updated? Are there newer articles on your topic? | | The article is fairly old, published in mid-2014. There’s definitely newer articles on the topic, including the second article listed for other articles where you can find information on the topic. |
| Timeliness Summary | | This specific article is fairly old, however when the article was published is still very clear. There’s newer articles on the trend. |

**Part B – Evaluating Sites**

There are other methods to evaluate sites and information to determine their validity. One of these is the CRAP test. CRAP stands for Currency, Reliability, Authority and Purpose/Point of View. It is broken down like this:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Currency | * How recent is the information? * How recently has the website been updated? * Is it current enough for your topic? |
| Reliability | * What kind of information is included in the resource? * Is content of the resource primarily opinion? Is is balanced? * Does the creator provide references or sources for data or quotations? |
| Authority | * Who is the creator or author? * What are the credentials? * Who is the published or sponsor? * Are they reputable? * What is the publisher’s interest (if any) in this information? * Are there advertisements on the website? |
| Purpose/Point of View | * Is this fact or opinion? * Is it biased? * o Is the creator/author trying to sell you something? |

Another test is the SMELL test which is broken down as:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Source | * Who is providing the information? * Is there commercial, political or self-interest bias? * Is the source credible? * What does the URL tell you? Can you bring it back to the root URL and lean more?   Use the PIE test to check the source:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Proximity | * Is it first-hand evidence (primary source), secondary, hearsay? * How close is the author to the real data | | Independence | * Is there a conflict of interest? * Is the source trying to sell you something? * Is the source influenced by a specific manufacturer? | | Expertise | * Is the source part of a specialised study? Does the source have long experience with the topic? | |
| Motivation | * What is the purpose for providing the information? * Are they trying to sell an idea or a product or are they just trying to inform? * Are they providing factual evidence or just promoting their ideals? |
| Evidence | * Ask the question, “How do you know that?” Do they really know that? * Is the source of the information cited? |
| Logic | * Does this make sense? Based on all other evidence you know, does this make sense? * Does the information follow logically or are there gaps? * Are they using innuendo or suggesting conclusions that were not presented? |
| Left out | * Has anything been omitted? * Is bias introduced because there is information missing? |

The following are internet sites that may or may not be legitimate. Go to each site and apply the CRAP and SMELL tests. Determine which sites are valid (contain useful and factual information) and which sites are hoaxes or non-factual or simply false. State the reasons why you came to the conclusions based on the SMELL and CRAP tests.

1. <http://www.thedogisland.com/>

The website is from 2013, although it has a “daily update” giving the daily temperature of the island and the different dogs on the island. The website gives no information on where Dog Island is. The site is very opinionated, saying this is a “better life” for dogs. There is no quotes to back anything up. The author is never stated, although on the “contact Dog Island” page, it tells you who all works with Dog Island. None of them have any credentials. The publisher is interested only in trying to encourage people to send their dogs to Dog Island. The site is very opinionated, telling people what’s best for the dogs and trying to get them to send off their dogs. The information is given to us by an author who is never stated. The author has a strong personal bias, saying it’s a bad life for dogs if they aren’t on Dog Island. The URL says little, although already you kind of know it’s a joke. There is no data to back up anything the author says. The source is influenced only by a bias of personal interest, trying to get people to send their dogs to Dog Island. The purpose of this information is to get people to set their dogs free on this island. They are just promoting ideals and trying to ‘sell’ this idea. Nothing is backed up with evidence. The information doesn’t make sense. They’re trying to tell people to give away their pets and claiming they know what’s best for them. There is information missing, such as where this place is. The directions to get there are telling you it’s a maze to find your way to their office building. On top of all this, there’s a disclaimer at the bottom of the page letting you know it’s all a joke.

1. <https://www.wto.org/>

The website is very recent, published in 2015, although it doesn’t let you know when recent updates have occurred. The site is information based and not opinionated. They are the primary source for a lot of the information on the page, so references and sources aren’t provided. The articles are written by different authors whose job it was to write them and report information and publish it to the site. The author isn’t trying to sell anything, the information is very factually based and objective. The world trade organization is very reputable. The source of the information is very credible, though bother commercially and politically inclined, they are a 3rd party looking at topics objectively. The URL tells you that it’s a very official organization, some sort of business inclined company. The information is factual and there to educate and allow you to do research on market and trade from a political and commercial point of view. The information is all very credible as they are a reputable source and a primary source of the information. The site gives all of the facts.

1. <http://www.buydehydratedwater.com/>

This website is a little bit out of date. Published in 2013 with no updates. Although biased towards their product, they do present things in a factual way. There is no referenced sources. Nothing on the site is sourced or referenced. The author is never mentioned, nor is there any mention of another team of people or anything. The author is trying to sell us a product, so there is bias involved trying to make us think it’s so much better than regular water. We don’t know who is providing the information although nothing on the site is remotely credible. The URL tells me that the site is trying to sell me a product. Very little on the site makes sense and very little is explained. The FAQ is full of silly questions and answers and the conditions of an application horrible and ridiculous.

1. <http://zapatopi.net/treeoctopus/>

This site was published in 1998 and is frequently maintained. The last update was in May 2015. The site is very objective and factually based. The author doesn’t provide sources of information however. The author isn’t trying to sell you anything, only inform you, so the information is not presented in a biased manner. The information is given to us by Lyle Zapato, whose regular site is linked at the bottom and is a site about hoaxes and conspiracy theories. So the source of the information isn’t very credible. The URL says little other than that it’s a page from another website. The purpose of the information is to educate readers on an endangered species and rescuing this species. They are presenting information factually, although no facts are cited. Anything that is cited is either a source that doesn’t exist, another site by the same person, or something that is real, but has no actual relevance to the subject. The information is not at all believable, nor is it very consistent stating that for example that tree octopi only inhabit a small area, then saying there’s different species in different places, saying they only like temperate climates, then showing them in the snow. It’s very inconsistent. Although regardless of inconsistency, if I wanted to become an activist for an actual endangered species that I wanted to know more about, this site would tell me everything I’d want to know.

1. http://art. yale.edu/

The site was published in 2012 and is a wiki site, so it’s very frequently updated. However due to being a wiki site, there is a multitude of authors, most of which are students or alumni from Yale university, which presents bias in the content. However being university students, alumni or teachers, it means all of the content is from a credible source, someone who is educated on the topic. The authors aren’t trying to promote anything of their own, just help other people out, so the information is all objective. The URL lets you know that it’s a school providing the information, which already gives you an idea that the information is credible. The information is provided by Yale University students, teachers and alumni. The purpose of the information is to help out Yale students. It tells you about different courses, about the university campus and about different services offered that could help you out. None of the information is cited, although there’s nothing that really needs to be. There’s course outlines and dates of classes, but they are the primary source for this. The information all makes sense, there’s no logical or gaping flaws in the information. Not knowing a lot about the topic, all of the information seems to be there. You can find information on anything you need to know about the university art department. The only issue is that the information is very hard to find and even harder to read due to poor design, layout and formatting.

**To submit**

When you have completed the assignment, save this file as a PDF document and submit it to the Moodle page for this course:

* YourUserName\_C10\_A01\_Research.pdf