

# Extending WebCred: Assessing the Credibility of Web Sites

Christopher Hopper  
Computer Information Science  
Benedict College  
Columbia, SC 29206  
[bob12345629223@yahoo.com](mailto:bob12345629223@yahoo.com)

## Abstract

The evolution of the Internet has made the sharing of information essential to the intellectual growth of human society. Along with the ability to exchange information relatively quickly brings the question of credibility. The credibility of the authors, the quality of the information, and the validity of sources are some of the legitimate user concerns. An automatic assessment of credibility can offer some answers to questions about the credibility of information found on the Web. Through the use of an automated system the credibility of websites can be gauged based on a number of criteria. A program called WebCred has been implemented for this purpose. WebCred rates the credibility of URLs for the medical domain. This program rates the URLs based on the following factors: the number of page errors, credibility of the links, and the number of credible ads. This paper focuses on implementing WebCred for several domains and to provide end-users several levels of security from malicious HTML.

## 1. Introduction

Credibility of information is a complex issue due to the fact that it is largely based on the individual. For example, a professional who is seeking information on a specific topic may have biases that influence their willingness to accept the credibility of information submitted by a rival. Another example is a website that could be considered a credible source and yet contain inaccurate information. There are always credibility issues when searching for useful information. When doing research more than one reference is generally required to be considered as credible. The majority people may consider some information that comes from the government to be dependable, but there are always others who distrust the government and any information that is put out they consider to be untrustworthy.

A system for automated assessment of credibility can provide confidence in searching the Web. Users want to make sure the information they find is accurate and up-to-date. A tool like WebCred can shorten their time searching the Web by eliminating websites that it rates as not reliable. The program itself can be dependable if it does this task well and it safe to use. Safety in web searching is also vital to users. Some websites contain malicious links and data. The possibility of providing the detection of malware will make the program even more of an asset to use. Section 2 of this paper will discuss related work in this area. Section 3 will describe the current implementation of WebCred along with added features. The evaluation of the program's performance will be discussed in section 4. Finally, section 5 contains the conclusions of the research and a discussion of future work.

## 2. Related Work

Research that is related to WebCred involves two different sources. The first source is concerned with teaching Web evaluation for K-12 schools. It is primarily concerned with the following concepts:

- Why Evaluate Web Information
- Methods of Evaluation
- Teaching Web Evaluation

Here are some of the tools designed for educators teaching web evaluation for K-12: Kathy Schrock's Guide for Educators, Alexander and Tate's checklist, and the CARS checklist (Brown, et al., 2002). I searched all three of these sites and found some good criteria for web credibility. Kathy Schrock's site is a series of surveys for elementary to middle schools students. Alexander and Tate's checklist is really a list of practice tips for evaluating Web pages. They include determining the purpose/type of the site in the following categories: entertainment, business, information, news, advocacy, or personal presentation (Rutherford, 2004). The CARS website is an acronym for Credibility, Accuracy, Reasonableness, and Support (CARS, 2002). These tools are all fine criteria for evaluating Web Credibility but they are not trying to implement an automated system that supports their theories.

The second source is a Web credibility project for Stanford University. The group's research falls within four broad areas: evaluation strategies, design, individual factors, and contextual factors (Stanford, 2005). They will also attempt to (1) develop new experimental methodologies useful for investigating Web credibility, (2) synthesize existing research in the Web credibility literature, and (3) advance theory in the field (Stanford, 2005). This research will provide a great deal of information on how to perform credibility research on the Web. This is similar to the program, because it is for specialized users. The users of the WebCred program will often know the domain they want to pursue. The users of the Stanford research method are searching for specified information. The scientific approach to Web credibility will cut down on lost time spent on useless websites or useless information found on credible websites. The creation of a system would be a welcome addition to Stanford's research. All of the techniques that are being considered for human effort to perform could be applied to a system such as WebCred.

### 3.1 Implementation

The current program WebCred was written in Microsoft Visual C++ .NET by a former USC REU 2004 intern named Marcus Wassmer. The program is really part of a suite that encompasses three tools to achieve its goal. The first tool is an online validator program. This program is available on the W3C website (see references). The W3C Markup Validation Service program version 0.67 takes the URL entered by the user and finds the page errors with a SGML parser. The types of errors that are found are most often within the HTML syntax.

Figure 1

1. *Line 138, column 116: cannot generate system identifier for general entity "z"*
2. `...d.com/pages/dir/toc.asp?sponsor=core&z=1727_00000_2209_dp_04">
- [2] Wget-retrieves files from the Web (n.d.) 2005. Web Authoring. Msc. Wget . Retrieved June 28, 2005 from <http://directory.fsf.org/wget.html>
- [3] Stanford Web Credibility Research (n.d.) 2005. Retrieved July 17, 2005, from <http://credibility.stanford.edu>
- [4] Rutherford, LeAne H. (2004, April 22). Caveat Empter: Weighing the Worth of Web Resources. Instructional Development, Spring Quarter, 3, pp 3-5. Retrieved July 19, 2005 from <http://www.dumn.edu/~schilton/Courses/WebSources.html>
- [5] Javacool Software (n.d.) 2005. SpywareBlaster 3.4. Retrieved June 30, 2005, from <http://www.javacoolsoftware.com/sbdownload.html>
- [6] Internet Security Systems (n.d.). 2005. Microsoft Internet Explorer Domain URL Spoofing Filter. Retrieved June 1, 2005. from [http://www.iss.net/support/product\\_utilities/domain/spooffilter/](http://www.iss.net/support/product_utilities/domain/spooffilter/)
- [7] Index of /pub/gnu/wget. (n.d.) 2005. Retrieved June 10, 2005, from <http://ftp.gnu.org/pub/gnu/wget/>
- [8] GNU wget manual. (2005, June 15). 2005 Free Software Foundation. Retrieved June 10, 2005, from <http://www.gnu.org/software/wget/manual/wget.pdf>
- [9] Chapman, Davis (2002). SAMS Teach Yourself Visual C++.NET in 21 days. Indianapolis, Indiana. SAMS Publishing
- [10] Cert Coordination Center. (2004, December 7). Frequently Asked Questions About Malicious Web Scripts Redirected by WebSites. Retrieved June 30, 2005, from [http://www.cert.org/tech\\_tips/malicious\\_code\\_FAQ.html](http://www.cert.org/tech_tips/malicious_code_FAQ.html)

## 6. References Cont'd

- [11] The CARS Checklist (n.d.) 2002. Source Evaluation Tutor: CARS. Retrieved July, 20, 2005 from [http://www.mnhe.com/science/english/allwrite3/seyley/ssite/se\)3/vcs.mhtml](http://www.mnhe.com/science/english/allwrite3/seyley/ssite/se)3/vcs.mhtml)
- [12] Brown, Josh, Hickey, Kathy, Pozen, Valerie. (2002, July 1) An Educators' Guide to Credibility and Web Evaluation. Teaching Web Evaluation. Retrieved June 12, 2005, from <http://lrs.ed.uiuc.edu/wp/credibility/index.html>