“Research Bias/ Misinformation”


The article written by Peter M Bednar and Christine Welch develops a thesis in which states that the main definition of a bias is created in attempt to distort a viewpoint. The article is an academic journal. “Bias, Misinformation and the Paradox of Neutrality”, supports the authors’ thesis by reviewing a study that examines the impact of bias in human activity. The purpose of the article is to distinguish the difference among research bias, misinformation and the paradox of having neither a bias nor misinformation. Bednar’s intended audience is probably to his associates in the science community.

Bednar approaches his readers without a bias in his abstract in the beginning of his article. He establishes this by explaining how objectivity is usually considered as a rejection of bias. Although there is no exact bias the article remains credible because it has a neutrality that the reader can trust. The article is very relevant to my topic. This gave me a general idea of what to look for in a bias and how I can apply it to different types of bias that I will encounter.

This article has some tight connections with another source I found. They intermix when they discuss the idea of identifying what a research bias is. The article I am talking about is “Identifying and Avoiding Bias in Research”, written by Christopher J Pannucci. By putting the two sources together I was able to understand the wide variety of bias and how to search for them not only during research but in everyday life.


The article, “Identifying and Avoiding Bias in Research” was written by two main authors: Christopher Pannucci and Edwin Wilkins. Pannucci and Wilkins created the scientific academic journal to support the idea of bias and how it affects conclusions like the one conducted in their research, is just learning to comprehend that a bias is crucial to the practice of evidence-based medicine. The article states that a bias can come from a variety of places. Deducting that the article is written to inform those in a relation to the committee of Informing Science, the readers can get the feel that it is aimed toward the science community.

The evidence provided by Pannucci makes the piece reliable because a reader, if they really wanted to could probably trace back any of the information provided through the forty references provided at the end of the article. I believe it could all be located and verified. The date of the article is pretty relevant to evaluation of it. It was written in 2010 and published the year after that online.
I had to do a lot of close reading with this article because it had many variations and deviations of bias. Not many assumptions can be made by the way the author organized the definitions of the bias. It was all pretty straight forward on the flow of ideas. A reader could say the reading does lack some deeper meaning simply because it only delivers characterizations of the different categories of biases.


Mark G Rivardo wrote the article, “Collaborative Recall of Eyewitness Event Increases Misinformation.” The article is written from a psychology experiment that examines how recalling collaboratively can create a string of misinformation. The purpose was to conduct an experiment on college students to analyze how one can simply be put into a situation where you would be giving misleading information. The author supports his main claim by providing evidence of the experiment conducted on the college students. The positions his claim as a general thesis in his psychological work. However this can be interpreted for research purposes.

The article is very relevant to my topic. Although it mostly talks about misinformation it broadens the readers’ mind how easy it is to believe and trust common fallacies. The evidence provided in this work

“Collaborative Recall of Eyewitness Event Increases Misinformation Effect at 1 Week”,
