

Analysis

- 1. Accepting the fact bias cannot be removed
- 2. Whichever 'reality' the journalist is trying to create or message he/she is trying to convey, they must be factually supported.
- Good, factual argument = high performance
- Good, non-factual argument = average performance
- Bad, factual argument = average performance
- Bad, non-factual argument = bad performance

Transparency in Writing

- 1. Any claims/arguments not supported by evidence of facts should be noted (clearly) in the article
- 2. Any contradictions to the arguments made in the article should be noted (clearly) in the article
- Presence of Bias with disclaimer = good performance
- Presence of Bias without disclaimer = bad performance
- No presence of Bias = good performance

Transparency Out of Work

- 1. Journalists engaging in political discussions outside of work via Social Media (Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, etc) should be noted
- This does not apply to private conversation or private discussions (privacy)
- Example : a NYT journalist on his official

Language

- 1. Flags of emotional language
- 2. Writing style, tone, and the overall language of the article should be assessed for performance
- No emotional language = high

Twitter account engaging in political discussions on behalf of his/her organisation should affect performance

- Some emotional language = average performance

- Highly emotional language = bad performance

Images

- 1. Images have a higher impact on 'distorting reality' than language
- 2. Obvious mis-representation of reality through use of images should flag the content
- Obvious mis-representation of reality through images = bad performance
- No mis-representation = good performance

Diversity

- 1. Focus on organisation + stories covered by journalists
- 2. Any organisation that is being overrepresented by a single political attitude or showing misrepresented partisanship should be noted
- No diversity = bad performance
- Diversity = good performance