**CRAAP Testing Guide: websites**

Use this guide to help you when you use the CRAAP test table to rate a resource.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Ask yourself…** |
| **C**urrency | When was the information written and last updated?   * How important is it that your information is up-to-date? Is it a science, technology, current affairs or health-related topic? * When was the Web page originally published, last updated or revised? Are all of the links on the page functional? |
| **R**elevance | Is this the information you need for your topic?   * Does this information help you answer your question? * Is it written at the right level (not too simple or too complicated)? * Is there a better source you could use with similar information? * Is it the right type of information (e.g. have you been asked to find data, primary sources, expert opinions…)? |
| **A**uthority | What qualifies this author to provide information on this topic? How can you tell whether they know what they are talking about?   * Who is responsibility for the information on the page (the author, creator, sponsor?). This might be a ‘corporate author’ (a group or organisation rather than an individual). * Are there any credentials given – academic qualifications, job title, employment history? Use a search engine to do some quick background research on the author (or corporate author) – what qualifies them to write about **this topic**? Being an expert in an entirely different field doesn’t count! Do they have a good reputation? * Learn about the organization on their home page. Look for “About Us” link – but don’t rely on this. Check what others are saying about it too. |
| **A**ccuracy | Is the information backed up by evidence? Are there any sources cited?   * Where did the information on the page come from? Did the sponsor/author of the page create the information? * Are there cited sources or links to the original source of the information? Do these sources look trustworthy? Watch out for articles with long lists of sources that are just articles from the same publication or websites with no authority. Can you find the original sources? * Can you check any of the information in other independent sources or from your own knowledge? * Are there obvious spelling, grammar or layout errors? * This site from the University of Georgia (<http://guides.libs.uga.edu/factchecknews>) has an excellent list of fact checking organisations, which includes the UK based <https://fullfact.org/> and <https://mediabiasfactcheck.com/> which rates news sources for both factual accuracy and bias. |
| **P**urpose | What was this source written **for**? Is there any obvious bias?   * Why has the page been created? Is it to inform, teach, sell, entertain or persuade? Is there obvious bias or does the author seem fair and objective? * Is the information based on facts or is it opinion? Is the author using good evidence for their opinion? * If the site is linked to an organisation, does that group have a particular agenda? * Use a site like <https://www.computerhope.com/jargon/num/domains.htm> to check the meaning of the domain suffix (e.g. .edu is a US education site) * If it is a news source try a site like <https://mediabiasfactcheck.com/> to assess accuracy and bias. |

**CRAAP Testing Table: Websites**

Read the separate CRAAP Testing Guide then use this table to help you decide how to rate your resource. **Remember**: A low score for **Authority** or **Accuracy** means you should be very careful about using a source, even if it scores highly in every other category.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** |
| **C**urrency | I can’t find out when this page was published or last revised. | The creation/last revision date is 5 or more years ago. | The site/article was created/updated between 2 and 5 years ago. | The site/article was created/updated within the last 2 years. |
| **R**elevance | The page may mention my topic but isn’t relevant to my question, or doesn’t have the type of information I need. | This gives some general background but doesn’t cover my main question. *Or* the level is too hard or too easy. | This will address my question and will give me some useful information but isn’t quite what I am looking for. | This gives me most of what I need to answer my question and is exactly the right type and level of information. |
| **A**uthority | I either cannot find out who wrote this (person or organisation) **or** there is evidence that the author or the organisation has a history of being misleading on this topic. | The author is named but has nothing obvious that qualifies him/her to write about this topic).  Or the organisation has questionable authority. | The author is named but the degree of expertise **on this topic** is not that high.  Or the organisation is well-known but degree of expertise **on this topic** is unclear. | The author is a respected expert on this topic.  Or the organisation is well-known and has a good reputation on this topic. |
| **A**ccuracy | Obvious spelling, grammar or layout errors.  *Or* it isn’t clear where the information comes from – it might just be someone’s opinion. | Sources are mentioned vaguely, but not enough information is given to find them.  *Or* sources are cited but they are clearly not trustworthy. | Sources that seem trustworthy are given for some but not all of the information. Some links may be broken, but I could probably find the original sources. Images may not be referenced. | **Trustworthy** sources clearly given to back up claims, including enough information to find the original sources easily. Any images/ photos are labelled. |
| **P**urpose | The purpose is to sell or promote an idea or service. The page presents an unbalanced, biased view. It is not backed up with facts or they are distorted. A background check on the author or organisation may suggest strong bias. | The purpose may be to sell something or promote an idea, but the page also provides some clearly referenced, accurate factual information. Argument seems one-sided. | The purpose is to educate. There may be some bias (which may be acknowledged) but opinion is logical and backed by evidence. | The purpose is to provide high-quality scholarly information. Enough factual evidence is given to justify any opinions and may include graphs, charts, tables or statistics. Effort is made to address both sides of an argument. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total score** | 0-3 points | 4-7 points | 8-11 points | 12-15 points |
| /15 | Highly questionable source – do not use | Might be useful for initial ideas or casual interest but do not cite in academic work | Good source for academic work but confirm information with other sources | Excellent source for academic work |
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