

The Credibility Index

What is the Credibility Index?

The Credibility Index is a scale that we've established to encourage critical consumption of resources. Resources can be categorized from 0-3 based on the following criteria:

3	Published by a professional researcher and underwent formalized peer review . Examples include articles in academic journals and scholarly books that underwent academic editorial review. This also includes resources by independent authorities that are publicly endorsed by thousands of established professionals, such as the WHO, the ISSTD, etc.
2	Published by EITHER a non-professional researcher under professional supervision (ex. senior theses and student publications) OR a professional researcher that did not undergo formalized peer review (ex. self-help books and personal websites published by professionals).
1	Published by a non-professional (or someone with no credentials), but the information is verifiable from other, more credible sources. Examples include memoirs, blog posts, articles, infographics, etc. that list references and cite their sources .
0	Published by a non-professional who does not cite sources and/or information cannot be verified by other sources. Examples include independently created Tumblr posts, TikToks, infographics, etc. We DO NOT allow these resources to be shared in our library due to the high risk of misinformation and author bias.

I can't tell which category to use!

No worries! **This is an informal system**. Ultimately, the ability to discern credibility lies in the reader.

If you don't know which category to put your resource in, **please list it as a 1**. Otherwise, here are some guidelines for situations with more complexity:

You have a resource that could be either a 3 or a 2. Not sure if an article underwent peer review? Can't tell if the author is a student or a new professional? In ambiguous cases, always assume that the resource is the less credible choice. Please list it as a 2.

You have a resource that would be a 3 or a 2, but the author seems biased or shares misinformation. Authors who let their biases get in the way of presenting information can wreck their own credibility, making it difficult to categorize their resources. If the author is an established professional, but their claims are based in obscure or discriminatory ideologies, please list their resource as a 1. Also, we would really appreciate it if you write the phrase “UNRELIABILITY WARNING” next to the link. Thanks for being thoughtful!

You have a resource that would be a 3, but the language and/or the treatment framework is out of date. Older resources can lose credibility as they age, especially if new editions of the DSM have come out since they were published. If your resource dates itself by referring to DID as *multiple personality disorder* or citing resources that no longer exist, list it as a 2.

You have a resource that would be a 0, but it seems really helpful. Don't share the resource. Don't offer to DM it to someone, either. You could be spreading unknowingly misinformation.