



University of Sydney Library: Scholarly Vs non-scholarly resources

Authors

Michael Arndell
Tom Goodfellow

Summary

After completing this *learning tool*, you should be able to:

- Provide a definition of a scholarly resource
- Use the REVIEW criteris to evaluate if a resource is scholarly
- Identify which type of resources are scholarly

Copyright

The material that forms this web site is copyright. Other than for the purposes of and subject to the conditions prescribed under the Copyright Act, no part of it may in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, microcopying, photocopying, recording or otherwise) be altered, reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted without prior written permission from the University of Sydney Library and/or the appropriate author.

Disclaimer

The University of Sydney disclaims liability for the accuracy or completeness of the information provided by this service. The University accepts no responsibility for loss occasioned as a direct or indirect result of the use of the information obtained.

Scholarly Vs non-scholarly resources

What is a scholarly resource?

In your assignments you will be required to use the most scholarly material possible to support your arguments.

Scholarly means written by qualified academic experts and supported by research and references.

You can test whether a resource is scholarly by applying the REVIEW criteria:

- R** – **R**elevance
- E** – **E**xpertise of Author
- V** – **V**iewpoint of Author/Organisation
- I** – **I**ntended Audience
- E** – **E**vidence
- W** – **W**hen Published

The REVIEW criteria

R is for *Relevance*

- How relevant is the resource to your topic or question?
- Does the resource provide a broad overview, or does it relate to just one aspect of your topic/question?
- Have you read a variety of sources to determine whether this one is useful?

E is for *Expertise of Author*

- What is the educational background of the author?
- Is this topic in the author's area of expertise?
- Are they regularly cited by the other authors in the field?

V is for *Viewpoint of Author/Organisation*

- Is the author or organisation associated with a particular view or position?
- What is the purpose of the resource? (is it intended to inform? To persuade? To entertain?)

I is for *Intended Audience*

- Who is the intended audience for the resource?
- Is the resource at the appropriate level for your needs – is it too basic or too technical?

E is for *Evidence*

- Has the author cited appropriate evidence to back up their theories/conclusions?
- Is there a bibliography or reference section? (this may contain further useful resources)
- Has the resource been through the peer review process?

W is for *When Published*

- When was the resource published?
- Is the information still current, or have there been further developments in the topic area?

Applying the REVIEW criteria

What will happen if you apply the REVIEW test to this **textbook**?

Singer, S. Fred.
Unstoppable global warming : every 1,500 years.
 Lanham, Md. : Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2007.

Relevance: Excellent. There is lots of useful information in the book.

Expertise: Very good. The author works at two well-known universities and the publisher is respected.

Viewpoint: Challenging. Disputes prevailing scientific views of climate change.

Intended audience: Good. University students and researchers.

Evidence: Excellent. The author cites in-depth scientific evidence.

When published: Good. Published recently.

Would you use this **textbook** as a scholarly resource?

The REVIEW criteria clearly demonstrate that this is a scholarly work.

Would you use this **peer reviewed journal article** as a scholarly resource for this assignment?

Marcel E. Visser
 "Keeping up with a warming world; assessing the rate of adaptation to climate change"
Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society Series B: Biological Sciences
 Volume 275, Number 1635 / March 22, 2008
 Special Issue 'Evolutionary dynamics of wild populations' compiled and edited by Loeske
 E. B. Kruuk and William G. Hill

Relevance: Deals with the effects of global warming on the evolution of animal species

Expertise: Scholarly affiliation of the author is given. The research is original.

Viewpoint: Objective, as the article has gone through a peer review process

Intended audience: Aimed at scholarly researchers, including students and academics

Evidence: Superb. The article was subject to peer review checking before publication and contains extensive references. However you should still research the alternate point of view.

When published: Recent research on the topic

Would you use this **journal article** as a scholarly resource?

Peer reviewed journal articles are the most scholarly material available

What will happen if you apply the REVIEW Test to this **Wikipedia article**?

Global warming
Wikipedia
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_warming
Accessed on 10/06/2008
No author listed.

Relevance: Very good. It's an article specifically about global warming, covering a range of issues in a structured way.

Expertise: Unknown. Anybody can edit Wikipedia, so you don't know who wrote the information.

Viewpoint: The article aims to reach a consensus for approach and neutrality, but this may not be represented at any given moment, as the site is changing constantly.

Intended audience: Provided for the general public, but contains a large amount of scientific data.

Evidence: There is extensive referencing, Wikipedia articles often refer to more authoritative sources, but the references need to be verified.

When published: Superb. Wikipedia is updated constantly.

Would you use this **Wikipedia article** as a scholarly resource?

Wikipedia articles are not scholarly, because we don't know the qualifications of the author. However, they can be a good source of further reading.

Conclusion

You can apply the REVIEW criteria to all kinds of information – blogs, podcasts etc

If you are not sure whether to use a resource, apply the REVIEW criteria, or ask a lecturer or librarian