

# PolitiFact Analysis

Grace Abels

4/19/2022

```
v8_pf <- read_csv("v8pf.csv")
```

```
## Rows: 2880 Columns: 13
```

```
## -- Column specification -----
```

```
## Delimiter: ","
```

```
## chr  (10): url, title, textualRating, languageCode, publisher.name, publishe...
```

```
## dbl  (1): ...1
```

```
## dtm   (2): reviewDate, claimDate
```

```
##
```

```
## i Use 'spec()' to retrieve the full column specification for this data.
```

```
## i Specify the column types or set 'show_col_types = FALSE' to quiet this message.
```

Table 1: Textual Ratings

textualRating	n
Half True	555
Mostly True	533
Mostly False	499
FALSE	477
TRUE	329
Pants on Fire	133
Needs context	19
Full Flop	18
Accurate	14
Misleading	9
Half Flip	8
Largely correct	5
This is accurate	4
Correct	3
Lacks context	3
Largely accurate	3
Needs more context	3
Not the full story	3
Close to accurate	2
Exaggerated	2
Exaggerates	2
No evidence	2

textualRating	n
No Flip	2
Not full story	2
This checks out	2
This is correct.	2
Wrong	2
'Slip of the tongue'	1
A fair summary	1
Academic study backs it up	1
Accurate as to days	1
Ad watch	1
Admits it's not true	1
Affects a small group	1
Aimed at Bernie Sanders; and it's True.	1
Also didn't say no	1
An element of truth; but exaggerated and misleading	1
Analysis (no rating given)	1
Analyzing president plan Bs	1
Bashed Obama's foreign policy	1
Basically correct	1
Below other figures	1
Best we can tell	1
Biden opposes defunding police	1
Biden; others are named	1
Bill was not a 'game-changer'	1
Blends three heroic events	1
But his staff does	1
Capital flub	1
Cherry-picked time frame	1
Children may be last	1
China was huge factor	1
Cites early Trump remarks	1
Claim has notable support	1
Close; unclear meaning	1
Congress can set rules	1
Correct about grand juries	1
Correct on 2016; Trump	1
Correct; for Canada	1
Correct.	1
Courts may allow it	1
D-minus in 2012 from NRA's political action committee	1
Data backs it up	1
Data checks out	1
Data from one survey	1
Deadline lacks nuance	1
Depends how you count	1
Depends on intent	1
Depends on source	1
Depends on the year	1
DNC didn't direct	1
Don't count your chickens	1
Downplays the figure	1
Earlier scores were weak	1

textualRating	n
Economy was already growing	1
Editing amps up effect	1
Effect not clear	1
Employment and business losses have been large	1
Endorsed Obama in 2012; but not in 2008	1
Estimated to pay for 2019; not for 2017 and 2018	1
EU; not Ukraine	1
Event with Andrew Cuomo	1
Evidence is growing	1
Exaggeration	1
Experts say concept is sound	1
Experts say it's credible	1
Experts: Study is narrow	1
Fair summary	1
Filibuster; racism intertwined	1
First wave not over for many	1
Floated having someone run	1
Follows 1946 law	1
Foreign ties are unusual	1
Found guilty by jury	1
Frequent attack needs context	1
Future uncertain	1
Generally accurate	1
GOP never kicked out	1
Had seat at table	1
Handled by lower-level attorneys	1
Hard to confirm	1
Hasn't said why	1
He advised Trump campaign	1
He can't; experts say	1
He gave to GOPers	1
He heard from Mueller	1
Heavily disputed	1
High estimate	1
Hunter lacked expertise	1
Ignores Biden's current stance	1
Ignores big spending bills	1
Ignores military aid given	1
Ignores new distribution plan	1
In the ballpark	1
Inaccurate	1
It depends	1
It helps and hurts	1
Judge rejected bias claims	1
Key checks continue	1
Key metrics back it up	1
Lacks solid numbers	1
Largely right; needs details	1
Law doesn't say that	1
Leaves out key details	1
Legal experts agreed	1
Legal experts divided	1

textualRating	n
Legal for Riot Control	1
Legal rules unclear	1
Less than totally candid	1
Lincoln's motivations unclear	1
Link goes back before Civil War	1
Linkage isn't perfect	1
Loaded language confuses issue	1
Lots more than that	1
Lots of context needed	1
Majority are adults	1
Many experts would disagree	1
Many guns still allowed	1
Many wanted Shokin fired	1
Matches CDC statements	1
Metering affects border crossers	1
Minor issues so far	1
Misleading on two counts	1
Misleads in several ways	1
Misrepresents his remarks	1
Misses a key point	1
Misses the full story	1
Missing context	1
More adding paper based	1
More like three	1
More like true estimates	1
More words than action	1
Most not considered permanent	1
Mostly right	1
Mueller probe not baseless	1
Multiple figures confirm it	1
Narrowly accurate	1
Nearly 400;000 in FY2018	1
Needs full context	1
New data says so	1
News accounts confirm it	1
No contact	1
No direct link	1
No he didn't	1
No legal status granted	1
No proof of fraud	1
Not conclusive	1
Not everyone is gaining	1
Not fact witness' job	1
Not fully accurate	1
Not locked out	1
Not many; but some	1
Not provable	1
Not proven	1
Not settled among experts	1
Not settled science	1
Not the best example	1
Not the only reading	1

textualRating	n
not the only reason	1
Not the whole story	1
Not What Volker Said	1
Numbers miss key details	1
Obama Called in 2012	1
Offered meeting; military aid	1
Omits key caveats	1
Only for reported crimes	1
Only true for men	1
Open legal question	1
Opposed war after start	1
Others also got cuts	1
Outdated number	1
Pandemic not in rear-view mirror	1
Partially accurate	1
Plausible pledge; experts say	1
Politico offers no support	1
Possible; but no legal slam dunk	1
Probe had wider scope	1
Proposed cuts were reversed	1
Puerto Rico loses most	1
Quickly corrected slip-up	1
Reality is complex	1
Record is mixed	1
Reflects what reports say	1
Reports heavily disputed	1
Revenues might fall short	1
Right on jobs	1
Roughly right	1
Said someone should try	1
Schiff's evidence is weak	1
Selective examples	1
Shaky details	1
She has	1
She told law schools	1
Slow gains; but gains	1
Some evidence to support	1
Some reduced staff	1
Sondland cites names	1
Spinning who gets credit	1
State Police were prepared	1
Sterling presented multiple pieces of evidence to refute President Donald Trump's claims	1
Strain; but checks continue	1
Study backs it up	1
Stunt ad makes false claim	1
Suspicious; no final proof	1
Tests sent; not given	1
Thanks to 'extra' doses in vial	1
That's part of the story	1
That's wrong	1
The accuracy is mixed	1
The law is broad	1

textualRating	n
They didn't decertify.	1
This is accurate.	1
This is exaggerated.	1
This is true	1
This is True	1
This is unproven	1
This is wrong	1
This needs context	1
This needs context.	1
Timeline doesn't match	1
Tough promise to keep	1
True based on available data	1
True but didn't coin	1
True for total vote counts	1
True; but needs context	1
Trump has raised idea	1
Trump role emerged later	1
Trump shifts stances	1
Trump tweeted about Trudeau	1
Trump was wrong	1
Twisted history	1
U.S. depends on Russia	1
U.S. does fare worse	1
U.S. ranks near bottom	1
Unable to verify	1
Unclear	1
Unproven speculation; no evidence	1
Unproven with state data	1
Up; not that much	1
Virus now only trails Civil War in deaths	1
Wages have risen modestly	1
We track ethics reversal	1
Wine cave event occurred	1
Words are in booklet	1
Would face legal challenges	1
Wrong meeting	1
Wrong wording	1
Wrong; he misspoke	1
Yes; but general comments	1
Yes; nine schools cut	1
Yes; they flip- flopped	1

Table 2: PF Claims with Truth-O-Meter Ratings

textualRating	n
Pants on Fire	133
False	477
Mostly False	499
Half True	555
Mostly True	533

textualRating	n
True	329

```
v9_pf %>%
  group_by(claimant) %>%
  count() %>%
  arrange(desc(n))

## # A tibble: 723 x 2
## # Groups:   claimant [723]
##   claimant      n
##   <chr>      <int>
## 1 Joe Biden    113
## 2 Hillary Clinton 104
## 3 Bernie Sanders  58
## 4 Mike Pence   56
## 5 Newt Gingrich  45
## 6 Ted Cruz     42
## 7 Marco Rubio   39
## 8 Ron Johnson   32
## 9 Barack Obama  31
## 10 Andrew Cuomo  30
## # ... with 713 more rows
```