

New York Times Analysis

After the initial data cleaning, there were 180 fact-checks published by the New York Times between January 1st 2016 and June 30th, 2021. The dataset only includes fact-checks by Republican or Democratic political figures, excluding Donald Trump.

We began with some exploratory data analysis to understand the specifics of the data we were working with. We analyzed the `textualRating` category.

Table 1: Distribution of Textual Rating Assignments

textualRating	n
This is exaggerated.	23
This is misleading.	20
False.	13
FALSE	8
This lacks evidence.	4
True.	4
Maybe.	3
Wishful thinking.	3
Half-right; half-wrong.	2
This is misleading	2
A negative spin on things.	1
A newspaper story suggests otherwise.	1
A step too far.	1
Accurate; but misleading.	1
Accurate.	1
Actually the opposite.	1
An exaggeration.	1
Both choked.	1
Check the transcript.	1
Contradicts Past Remarks	1
Deeply in dispute.	1
Don't blame CNN.	1
Estimates vary.	1
Exaggeration.	1
Fact and omission.	1
Hard to say absent Mr. Trump's tax returns.	1
Hardly reliable.	1
He did once hold those views.	1
He donated; over and over.	1
He had called it 'a step forward.'	1
He inherited a lot; but not that amount.	1
He released them; but after the election.	1
He said he was robbed.	1
He said this in 2005.	1
He spreads money around.	1
He tried and failed.	1

textualRating	n
He voted ‘yea’	1
He wasn’t there for the close.	1
He’s no Trump; but he bites; too.	1
Her stance hasn’t been that clear-cut.	1
His praise had caveats.	1
In the long term.	1
It could.	1
Just not true.	1
Misleading.	1
Missing the point.	1
More or less.	1
Most authorities call it torture.	1
Mostly false	1
Mostly right.	1
Mostly true	1
Needs context	1
No data to back it up.	1
No fine; but he did settle a lawsuit for an undisclosed sum.	1
Not all; but nearly.	1
Not anymore.	1
Not by her account.	1
Not completely wonderful.	1
Not even close.	1
Not exactly Clinton’s fault.	1
Not exactly.	1
Not for many single parents.	1
Not her policies.	1
Not necessarily from racquet sports.	1
Not quite fair.	1
Not quite so simple	1
Not quite; but close.	1
Not quite.	1
Not so fast.	1
Not that many.	1
Not that much.	1
Not the only one	1
Not true.	1
On target.	1
Only in the short term.	1
Overstated and outdated.	1
Probably not.	1
Prove it.	1
Reports suggest it’s right.	1
Republican justices do drift left.	1
Right on target.	1
She can back it up.	1
She didn’t make any promises.	1
She is mostly right.	1
Some do; some don’t.	1
Some of them do.	1
That’s the right number.	1
That’s an overstatement.	1

textualRating	n
That's one estimate.	1
The data backs him up.	1
The floodgates opened.	1
The majority are suicides.	1
The numbers add up.	1
The numbers back him up.	1
There is evidence.	1
There's a reason.	1
They did.	1
They got the money.	1
This is disputed.	1
This requires context.	1
Too far.	1
True; but misleading	1
True; but...	1
Unproven	1
Well; that's three times three.	1
Where's the evidence?	1
Wrong timing.	1
You can't take it back.	1

As shown, the New York Times has no published methodology for how they select or rate fact-checks. They use text based ratings that fall do not fall on a discernible scale. All ratings can be considered anomaly ratings and we had no way to compare between them, so we ended our analysis of the New York Times here.