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CSE 005 – Lab 2 01

Topic Chosen: Identity Theft

**Source #1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Web Site or Article** | |
| Your Topic | Identity Theft |
| Title | Identity Theft: What It Is, How it Happens & the Best Protection |
| URL or periodical | <https://wallethub.com/edu/identity-theft/17120/> |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Credibility (0 to 25 Points)*** | |
| The authors are clearly identified. | Y |
| There is a way to contact the author(s) via e-mail, traditional mail, or phone. | Y |
| Education, training, or experience make the author an expert in the subject area. | Y |
| The information originates from a trustworthy organization. | Y |
| The author has a good reputation or standing among peers. | N |
| The information has been peer reviewed. | N |
| Bad grammar and/or misspelled words are absent. | Y |
|  | 20 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Accuracy (0 to 25 Points)*** | |
| The information on the topic is comprehensive. | Y |
| The source is up to date. | Y |
| The information is accurate. | Y |
| The information is detailed. | Y |
| The purpose of the page is obvious. | Y |
|  | 23 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Reasonableness (0 to 25 Points)*** | |
| Any biases towards the subject matter can be easily identified. | Y |
| The writing is objective. | Y |
| Extraordinary claims are backed by extraordinary evidence. | N/A |
| The information is self-consistent. It does not contradict itself. | Y |
|  | 20 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Support (0 to 25 Points)*** | |
| The article supports its claims with facts. | Y |
| Information sources are presented and properly cited. | Y |
| You can corroborate the facts and statements given. | Y |
| The article does not contradict facts or ideas that you already know. | Y |
|  | 20 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| TOTAL  83 | |  |  | | --- | --- | | *Scoring:* |  | | 90 - 100 Excellent |  | | 80 - 89 Good | X | | 70 - 79 Average |  | | 60 - 69 Borderline Acceptable |  | | Below 60 Unacceptable |  | |

Analysis:

This article was published by the CEO of WalletHub, a credit score company. He has informative graphs and information on identity theft and cites sources from professionals in IT, Business, and Law to support his article. Unfortunately, the article is not a scholarly article, so it has not been peer-reviewed. I still think that despite the lack of peer-review the article does a good job at using diagrams and visuals to highlight information and he does cite respectable sources.

**Source #2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Web Site or Article** | |
| Your Topic | Identity Theft |
| Title | ‘Someone Had Taken Over My Life’: An Identity Theft Victim’s Story |
| URL or periodical | <https://www.forbes.com/sites/laurashin/2014/11/18/someone-had-taken-over-my-life-an-identity-theft-victims-story/#771b94a25beb> |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Credibility (0 to 25 Points)*** | |
| The authors are clearly identified. | Y |
| There is a way to contact the author(s) via e-mail, traditional mail, or phone. | Y |
| Education, training, or experience make the author an expert in the subject area. | N |
| The information originates from a trustworthy organization. | Y |
| The author has a good reputation or standing among peers. | N |
| The information has been peer reviewed. | N |
| Bad grammar and/or misspelled words are absent. | N |
|  | 14 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Accuracy (0 to 25 Points)*** | |
| The information on the topic is comprehensive. | Y |
| The source is up to date. | N |
| The information is accurate. | Y |
| The information is detailed. | Y |
| The purpose of the page is obvious. | Y |
|  | 20 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Reasonableness (0 to 25 Points)*** | |
| Any biases towards the subject matter can be easily identified. | Y |
| The writing is objective. | Y |
| Extraordinary claims are backed by extraordinary evidence. | N/A |
| The information is self-consistent. It does not contradict itself. | Y |
|  | 20 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Support (0 to 25 Points)*** | |
| The article supports its claims with facts. | Y |
| Information sources are presented and properly cited. | Y |
| You can corroborate the facts and statements given. | N |
| The article does not contradict facts or ideas that you already know. | Y |
|  | 15 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 69 | |  |  | | --- | --- | | *Scoring:* |  | | 90 - 100 Excellent |  | | 80 - 89 Good |  | | 70 - 79 Average |  | | 60 - 69 Borderline Acceptable | X | | Below 60 Unacceptable |  | |

Analysis:

This article is slightly dated, published on Forbes in 2014. The author does not have credentials and the article is not peer-reviewed. However, I think that it is useful that the author was able to get information from victims of identity theft. That being said, since the article is not peer-reviewed it is difficult to tell whether or not the information is factual or just hear-say.

**Source #2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Web Site or Article** | |
| Your Topic | Identity Theft |
| Title | ‘Someone Had Taken Over My Life’: An Identity Theft Victim’s Story |
| URL or periodical | <https://www.forbes.com/sites/laurashin/2014/11/18/someone-had-taken-over-my-life-an-identity-theft-victims-story/#771b94a25beb> |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Credibility (0 to 25 Points)*** | |
| The authors are clearly identified. | Y |
| There is a way to contact the author(s) via e-mail, traditional mail, or phone. | Y |
| Education, training, or experience make the author an expert in the subject area. | N |
| The information originates from a trustworthy organization. | Y |
| The author has a good reputation or standing among peers. | N |
| The information has been peer reviewed. | N |
| Bad grammar and/or misspelled words are absent. | N |
|  | 14 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Accuracy (0 to 25 Points)*** | |
| The information on the topic is comprehensive. | Y |
| The source is up to date. | N |
| The information is accurate. | Y |
| The information is detailed. | Y |
| The purpose of the page is obvious. | Y |
|  | 20 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Reasonableness (0 to 25 Points)*** | |
| Any biases towards the subject matter can be easily identified. | Y |
| The writing is objective. | Y |
| Extraordinary claims are backed by extraordinary evidence. | N |
| The information is self-consistent. It does not contradict itself. | Y |
|  | 20 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Support (0 to 25 Points)*** | |
| The article supports its claims with facts. | Y |
| Information sources are presented and properly cited. | Y |
| You can corroborate the facts and statements given. | N |
| The article does not contradict facts or ideas that you already know. | Y |
|  | 15 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 69 | |  |  | | --- | --- | | *Scoring:* |  | | 90 - 100 Excellent |  | | 80 - 89 Good |  | | 70 - 79 Average |  | | 60 - 69 Borderline Acceptable | X | | Below 60 Unacceptable |  | |

Analysis:

This article is slightly dated, published on Forbes in 2014. The author does not have credentials and the article is not peer-reviewed. However, I think that it is useful that the author was able to get information from victims of identity theft. That being said, since the article is not peer-reviewed it is difficult to tell whether or not the information is factual or just hear-say. The article is written well but may be less reliable than a peer-reviewed article.

**Source #3**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Web Site or Article** | |
| Your Topic | Identity Theft |
| Title | Online Identity Theft: What It Is and How it Happens |
| URL or periodical | <https://www.lifelock.com/learn-identity-theft-resources-online-identity-theft-what-it-is-how-it-happens.html> |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Credibility (0 to 25 Points)*** | |
| The authors are clearly identified. | Y |
| There is a way to contact the author(s) via e-mail, traditional mail, or phone. | Y |
| Education, training, or experience make the author an expert in the subject area. | Y |
| The information originates from a trustworthy organization. | Y |
| The author has a good reputation or standing among peers. | N |
| The information has been peer reviewed. | N |
| Bad grammar and/or misspelled words are absent. | Y |
|  | 20 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Accuracy (0 to 25 Points)*** | |
| The information on the topic is comprehensive. | Y |
| The source is up to date. | N |
| The information is accurate. | Y |
| The information is detailed. | Y |
| The purpose of the page is obvious. | Y |
|  | 15 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Reasonableness (0 to 25 Points)*** | |
| Any biases towards the subject matter can be easily identified. | Y |
| The writing is objective. | N |
| Extraordinary claims are backed by extraordinary evidence. | N |
| The information is self-consistent. It does not contradict itself. | Y |
|  | 15 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Support (0 to 25 Points)*** | |
| The article supports its claims with facts. | Y |
| Information sources are presented and properly cited. | N |
| You can corroborate the facts and statements given. | N |
| The article does not contradict facts or ideas that you already know. | Y |
|  | 10 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 60 | |  |  | | --- | --- | | *Scoring:* |  | | 90 - 100 Excellent |  | | 80 - 89 Good |  | | 70 - 79 Average |  | | 60 - 69 Borderline Acceptable | X | | Below 60 Unacceptable |  | |

Analysis:

The article was published on LifeLock, a company that specializes in online theft protection and antivirus tools. The information provided does a good job of explaining how identity theft can occur and how to prevent it. However, the article may seem biased since it is written by the company trying to sell products. The article is not peer reviewed or scholarly, but I think it is credible in terms of the information provided since it was published by LifeLock.

**Source #4**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Web Site or Article** | |
| Your Topic | Identity Theft |
| Title | Identity Theft Literature Review |
| URL or periodical | <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/210459.pdf> |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Credibility (0 to 25 Points)*** | |
| The authors are clearly identified. | Y |
| There is a way to contact the author(s) via e-mail, traditional mail, or phone. | N |
| Education, training, or experience make the author an expert in the subject area. | Y |
| The information originates from a trustworthy organization. | Y |
| The author has a good reputation or standing among peers. | Y |
| The information has been peer reviewed. | Y |
| Bad grammar and/or misspelled words are absent. | Y |
|  | 20 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Accuracy (0 to 25 Points)*** | |
| The information on the topic is comprehensive. | Y |
| The source is up to date. | Y |
| The information is accurate. | Y |
| The information is detailed. | Y |
| The purpose of the page is obvious. | Y |
|  | 23 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Reasonableness (0 to 25 Points)*** | |
| Any biases towards the subject matter can be easily identified. | Y |
| The writing is objective. | Y |
| Extraordinary claims are backed by extraordinary evidence. | Y |
| The information is self-consistent. It does not contradict itself. | Y |
|  | 25 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Support (0 to 25 Points)*** | |
| The article supports its claims with facts. | Y |
| Information sources are presented and properly cited. | Y |
| You can corroborate the facts and statements given. | Y |
| The article does not contradict facts or ideas that you already know. | Y |
|  | 25 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 95 | |  |  | | --- | --- | | *Scoring:* |  | | 90 - 100 Excellent | X | | 80 - 89 Good |  | | 70 - 79 Average |  | | 60 - 69 Borderline Acceptable |  | | Below 60 Unacceptable |  | |

Analysis:

This article is well-written, cites information professionally, and is peer-reviewed. The article comes from a federal source; thus, it is credible. The information provided is very detailed. The article details information on patterns in identity theft and the different types of identity theft. The article is supported by well-cited data. I think that this article is reliable since it supports its data with well-cited information.

**Source #5**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Web Site or Article** | |
| Your Topic | Identity Theft |
| Title | Prevention of Identity Theft: A Review of the Literature |
| URL or periodical | <https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1008&context=ccj_capstone> |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Credibility (0 to 25 Points)*** | |
| The authors are clearly identified. | Y |
| There is a way to contact the author(s) via e-mail, traditional mail, or phone. | N |
| Education, training, or experience make the author an expert in the subject area. | Y |
| The information originates from a trustworthy organization. | Y |
| The author has a good reputation or standing among peers. | Y |
| The information has been peer reviewed. | Y |
| Bad grammar and/or misspelled words are absent. | Y |
|  | 20 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Accuracy (0 to 25 Points)*** | |
| The information on the topic is comprehensive. | Y |
| The source is up to date. | N |
| The information is accurate. | Y |
| The information is detailed. | Y |
| The purpose of the page is obvious. | Y |
|  | 20 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Reasonableness (0 to 25 Points)*** | |
| Any biases towards the subject matter can be easily identified. | Y |
| The writing is objective. | Y |
| Extraordinary claims are backed by extraordinary evidence. | Y |
| The information is self-consistent. It does not contradict itself. | Y |
|  | 25 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Support (0 to 25 Points)*** | |
| The article supports its claims with facts. | Y |
| Information sources are presented and properly cited. | Y |
| You can corroborate the facts and statements given. | Y |
| The article does not contradict facts or ideas that you already know. | Y |
|  | 25 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 90 | |  |  | | --- | --- | | *Scoring:* |  | | 90 - 100 Excellent | X | | 80 - 89 Good |  | | 70 - 79 Average |  | | 60 - 69 Borderline Acceptable |  | | Below 60 Unacceptable |  | |

Analysis:

This article was written by the Senior capstone class for Criminology and Criminal Justice at Portland State University. The article is peer-reviewed and clearly states the authors. Although the students may not be the most credible source, they were supervised by Dr. Debra Lindberg. The article is slightly out-of-date, since it was written in 2011. The article focuses mainly on the growth of identity theft as a problem in society, due to the advances and increases in electronic transactions. The article cites facts, quotes, and sources. I believe this article is credible since it was supervised by a professor and peer-reviewed.