I believe Geronas' question is about two issues; first is the integrity or creditability of the information within our "network", second is ensuring that the learning that comes from this "network" is not creating bias or false conclusion. I believe it best to deal with these two issues separately.

First, I believe Gerona is touching upon what is one of the keys for success of this digital connectivist world. I believe it is known as reputation management (Wikipedia, 2006). A digital reputation is no different than the traditional meaning of reputation. Items on the "net" (including everyone's online identity) and all other available digital sources of information and knowledge will have some kind of validity or credibility measure. It is about how much you can trust the information (Stephenson, n.d.). I believe this trust will be based upon similar patterns that exist in the non-digital world. Trusting information will be based upon the reputation of the institution or business that created the information, the creditability of the research team or researcher who created the information, the reputation of each person in your network, and many other sources. Presently, these reputation checks exist in both the non-digital and digital worlds. In a non-digital world a person contacts the Better Business Bureau to find out if any complaints have been made against a company or professional. Word of mouth is used to find a good plumber. References are given. Phone calls are made to check references. Letters of recommendation are written. There are numbers of ways to check reputation in the non-digital world. These methods are also finding there way into the digital world. Amazon and e-bay have their reputation mechanisms, and there is a growing interest in such systems for the digital world (Dellarocas, 2003). There are also social networks targeted at the professional where endorsements or references are provided with a person's online profile, http://www.linkedin.com is a perfect example of this. What is most important is that this is a growing area of research and has been identified as an important problem to solve. A companion area for reputation management is identity management. As we know identity management was tried and somewhat failed, Microsoft Passport is still going strong as a Microsoft specific (Leader, 2005) identity management tool, but it failed to capture identity management for the whole of the internet. The charge for a comprehensive identity management is being led by the liberty alliance, and to a certain extent sxip networks. The reason I include sxip is due to its open source roots, and because of Dick Hardts' (2005) excellent presentation on the issue. The last element within solving this issue of credibility will be metadata. Metadata is the data about the data. Metadata's most recent incarnation is in the eXtensible Markup Language (XML). A number of industry standards are forming with the use of XML and creating some very solid international standards. These standards are covering subject areas ranging from financial transactions through identity management, learning objects, resource description, all the way to even including the periodic table. So, if we are to fold identity management and reputation management in with metadata we end up with a comprehensive way of managing the credibility of information. Every piece of information will have a credibility attribute. This attribute will be described in the objects metadata.

Second, how do we deal with bias or false conclusion that comes from the learning that has been "poisoned" by information with a poor rating within its credibility attribute? I

believe the answer to this is through; current and emerging assessment tools, e-portfolios and the reputation applied to the learner's identity. With a good and comprehensive credibility / reputation management system we would know what information a learner has based their biases and conclusions on. We would have a "score" of how well this person has been assessed and the quality of their work based on the quality of the work in their portfolio and other reputation gathering events. This would lead back to how rigorous a learner was in investing their time with reputable information. Through time the learner would develop a reputation for non-bias and solid conclusions. Of course all of this would also have to fit within the balance between freedom of information and information privacy.

Dellarocas, Chrysanthos N., "The Digitization of Word-of-Mouth: Promise and Challenges of Online Feedback Mechanisms" (March 2003). MIT Sloan Working Paper No. 4296-03. http://ssrn.com/abstract=393042

Hardt, D. (2005). Web 2.0 High Order Bit - Identity 2.0. Retrieved February 11, 2006 from http://www.identity20.com/media/WEB2_2005/

Leader. (2005). Passport failure shows the folly of Microsoft's ways. Retrieved February 11, 2006 from http://comment.zdnet.co.uk/other/0,39020682,39183062,00.htm

Liberty Alliance. (2004). Digital Identity Defined. Retrieved February 11, 2006 from http://www.projectliberty.org/index.php

Stephenson, K., (Internal Communication, no. 36) What Knowledge Tears Apart, Networks Make Whole. Retrieved February 10, 2006 from http://www.netform.com/html/icf.pdf.

Wikipedia., (2006). Reputation Management. Retrieved February 10, 2006 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reputation_management