

FAMILY

Evaluating Family Life Web Sites

no. 10.253

by R.J. Fetsch and R. Hughes Jr.1

Quick Facts...

A Janurary 2005 search using the keyword "parenting" found 11,300,000 Web sites; one using "family life" found 71,300,000 sites.

The Web currently has a great deal of data, a fair amount of information, some knowledge, and very little wisdom.

This fact sheet presents some simple, practical guidelines to evaluate the quality of information in family life education Web sites.

Colorado State University Cooperative Extension

Putting Knowledge to Work

© Colorado State University Cooperative Extension. 1/02. Revised 1/05. www.ext.colostate.edu The Internet may be one of the fastest growing resources for both parents and family life educators. Information is available through e-mail, mailing lists, chat rooms, bulletin boards and Web sites. The number of family life educators and parents who access the Internet is growing exponentially.

According to Morris, Dollahite and Hawkins (1999), "as of October 2, 1998, there were over 4.8 million registered Web sites with a weekly growth rate of over 75,000 (www.domainstats.com)." Morris and colleagues reported nearly 3 million commercial sites and fewer than 5,000 educational sites. The number of domains requested worldwide is exploding from 2,154,634 on July 1, 1998 to 26,161,187 on November 27, 2000 to 29,629,818 on November 17, 2002 to 44,158,128 on November 14, 2004 (www.zooknic.com/domains/counts.html, retrived January 29, 2005). Of these, 31,931,475 were commercial and 7,449 were educational

A great deal of family life and parenting information is on the Web. A January 29, 2002, Yahoo search (www.yahoo.com) using the keyword "parenting" found 764 hits; one using "family life" found 561 hits. A January 29, 2005 Yahoo search using the keyword "parenting" found 11,300,000 hits; one using "family life" found 71,300,000 hits.

Need for Guidelines

Of course, there is information and there is Information. Colorado State University's Provost, Loren Crabtree (1998), drew the following continuum.

Data ----- Information ----- Knowledge ----- Wisdom

He pointed out that the World Wide Web currently has a great deal of data, a fair amount of information, some knowledge, and very little wisdom. With the number of parenting sites and family life sites surging, how can you decide which site is an authoritative one and which is not? Which sites provide quality information? Whom can you trust?

Hughes (1997) says: "At present Web site developers have yet to establish professional standards and conventions to document the sources of their information and the necessary standards to ethically present credible information. In many cases the conventional ethical standards that govern teaching family life and conducting clinical work still apply, but the brevity and anonymity of the electronic communication programs pose significant challenges."

Resources

These guidelines are offered as quick and practical ones. For additional in-depth guidelines on how to critique family life sites, see the following (Elliott, 1999; Morris et al., 1999):

- Colorado State University Libraries: manta.library.colostate.edu/howto/ evalweb.html
- Ohio State University Extension: www.hec.ohio-state.edu/famlife/ technol/guide/standard.htm www.hec.ohio-state.edu/famlife/ technol/webcon.htm www.hec.ohio-state.edu/famlife/ technol/webpro.htm
- Yahooligans!: www.yahooligans.com/content/tg/ evaluatingwebsites.html

References

- Crabtree, Loren. Personal communication, September 29, 1998.
- Elliott, M. (1999). Classifying family life education on the World Wide Web. Family Relations, 48, 7-13.
- Hughes, R., Jr. (1997). Web site review form. Columbus: Ohio State University, Department of Human Development and Family Life.
- Morris, S. N., Dollahite, D. C., & Hawkins, A. J. (1999). Virtual family life education: A qualitative study of father education on the World Wide Web. Family Relations, 48, 23-30.

Suggested Guidelines

Here are some simple, practical guidelines to evaluate the quality of information in family life education Web sites.

	How st reloper	trong a r?	re the	e trair	ning a	nd ba	ckgr	ound	of th	ne au	ıthor	or			
W	e a k	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8	9	5	3 t	r o	n g
Loc	ok for s	ources	with s	olid, v	well-fo	ounded	l back	grour	nds.						_
	What is profess to thes Ameri Worke Marria Counc	is his or sional g se orgar can Psy ers, Amage and il on Fa	groups nization ycholo erican Famil amily	? Are ns? So gical . Asso y The Relati	there ome production Association erapist ons, a	links of rofessition, for M , Amen	or addional Natio Iarria rican nerica	resses organi onal A ge and Psych n Soci	s and izati Assoc d Far iatri iety	tele ons to ciatio mily c Ass on A	phone o lool n of (Thera sociat ging.	e nuk for Clin upy, ion,	r are ical Lic , Na	ers e the l Soc eense	e cial ed
	grandf Ph.D.	the auth father w with 20 ately, yo	ith 25 years	years	experience	rience as a li	in be	ing a f ed mar	fathe rriag	er and	l gran l fam	idfa ily t	ther ther	r, or apist	
2. F	How cr	edible	is the	spor	nsorin	g <i>enti</i>	ty?								
		evab		•	2 3		5	6	7	8	9	_		dib	le
		uthoritate the in					supply	y good	l evi	denc	e that	enc	cour	rage	
	with dinform ".edu.' Look f	y educationst action. 'Publication a lin	rated t Web ac school k to th	rack iddressols have	record ses for ve "k1 onsorir	s prov colleg 2" in a	ide th ge and their V ty's V	e mos l unive Web a Veb sit	st cor ersit ddre te, a	nsiste y We ssses. long	ently b site	relia s er an a	able nd ir	e n	
3. F	_	one nui <i>edible</i>													
kno	wledg	e?													
U n	beli	evab	le	1	2 3	4	5	6	7	8	9	С	rе	dib	le
		ources de, a so		_			_				_				
	Is it bat Is it up Is it bat Scient healthy reader and co	information information depends on the date on the info tention of tention of the info tention of tention o	practice, factors scient ormatice siliente more ons, esp	cal real real real real real real real re	source ecurate esearch s limit viduals ident of ly rese	es? Whe, exact exact exact existence ations existence of information	t and there but the there, but the thick armatic that he the the the the the the the the the	nes? A comp refere here ind comp on that as bee	Are to rehe ence s mu mmu it income	hey or sive s to such white white white the contraction of the contrac	ones ye? scient ve kno es. Ge s rese	ou ific ow a ener	sou abou ally h fir	st? arces ut , nding	?
<u> </u>	How real Is the standards the infinite	ecently source ses for formationd.	has the common in the	ne pag mercial nercial	e beer al orga l sites ntext o	n revis anizati usualy of the l	ed and on wind end arger	d upda th sor in ".co pictur	neth om." re in	ing to	ge th	e cr	edit	oility	
	Who e	lse link	s to th	e site	? How	credi	ble ar	e they	7?						

4. How <i>reasonable</i> is the information?
Slanted 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Balanced
Look for sources that discuss the topic thoughtfully and reasonably and are
concerned with providing the truth.
☐ Is the information fair, reasoned, objective and balanced?☐ Is it free of fallacies and biases?
☐ Is there a conflict of interest?
5. How <i>relevant</i> is the information or knowledge to your situation? Irrelevant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Relevant
Look for sources that acknowledge their limitations and that are as relevant as possible to your situation.
☐ Does the information include examples of children, youth and families
similar to yours?
☐ Are the life situations described similar to yours?
☐ Does the author or developer mention that the information may not apply to everybody because of differences in age, gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic
level, or educational level? Sites that acknowledge limitations are generally
more credible than those claiming to provide the right answer under all
circumstances.
6. How accessible is the author or developer of the site?
Inaccessible 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Accessible
Look for sources that offer follow-up interaction.
☐ Does the author or developer include an e-mail address?
☐ Can you contact the author or developer and ask questions directly?
□ Does the author or developer respond in a timely manner to these questions?
7. How many questionable warning signs are apparent?
Many 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Few
Look for sources that are accurate.
☐ How dramatic are the claims? The stronger the claims, the more skepticism is appropriate, especially with information that conflicts with common
knowledge and wisdom. New information may be true, but expect it to be
supported by strong evidence from highly credible sources.
☐ If it sounds too good to be true, it probably isn't true.
☐ Complex issues like violence or alcohol and other drug abuse need more than simple solutions. If the information provides guaranteed, simple solutions to
difficult problems, ask questions.
Raising resilient children and youth and developing healthy families require
many different healthy coping strategies. Question sources that suggest only
one way to handle a parenting problem.
8. In how useful a manner is the information and assistance provided?
Notuseful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Useful
Look for sources that are user friendly.
☐ Is the information well organized?
☐ Is the site searchable?
☐ Is related material connected in an easily understandable way?

☐ Can you easily find what you want?

¹ R.J. Fetsch, Colorado State University Cooperative Extension human development and family studies specialist and professor, human development and family studies; and R. Hughes, Associate Dean, Extension, University of Missouri-Columbia.

We acknowledge and express our sincere appreciation to the following reviewers:
Jerry J. Bigner, Colorado State professor, human development and family studies;
Mitzy Forbes, Colorado State Cooperative Extension Computer Applications Specialist; and Ben Silliman, North Carolina University youth specialist.

We also acknowledge the following people who contributed to the development of these guidelines: Clifton Barber, Jerry Bigner, Karen DeBord, Mark Elliott, Ben Silliman and Charles A. Smith.

Colorado State University, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and Colorado counties cooperating. Cooperative Extension programs are available to all without discrimination. No endorsement of products mentioned is intended nor is criticism implied of products not mentioned.