A Comparative Analysis of the Partisan Targets of Media Fact-checking: Examining President Obama and the 113th Congress

Stephen J. Farnsworth, University of Mary Washington (sfarnswo@umw.edu)

S. Robert Lichter, George Mason University (lichterb@cmpa.com)

Abstract

An analysis of claims made by President Obama and by Democratic and Republican members of Congress selected for analysis by PolitiFact.com and *Washington Post* Fact Checker reveals that PolitiFact was more likely to find greater deceit in Republican rhetoric and that the Fact Checker was more negative in its assessments. Legislators who had more than one statement analyzed during the study period were disproportionally likely to be influential members of the House or Senate leadership or likely 2016 presidential candidates. The lawmakers selected for greater scrutiny were also more likely to be more ideologically extreme than the median members of their party caucuses.

Delivered at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, PA. September 2016

Acknowledgments

NOTE: Please direct all communications to the first-named author.

Introduction

Media fact-checking organizations have stepped into the political maelstrom of today's contentious politics, in effect trying to serve as umpires adjudicating disputes over the accuracy of political statements. These operations, first deployed extensively as the 2008 presidential campaign began in earnest, were outgrowths of the "ad watches" that had been commonly employed in previous election cycles to challenge the claims contained in campaign advertising (cf., Cunningham 2007; Frantzich 2002).

Two key pioneers in this real-time fact-checking effort were PolitiFact, developed by the parent company that owned both *Congressional Quarterly* and the *St. Petersburg Times*, and The Fact Checker, produced by the *Washington Post* (Cunningham 2007). In addition to extensive discussion of claims made during the presidential campaigns of 2008 and 2012 (and now the 2016 campaign), PolitiFact has engaged in extensive state-level campaign analysis in a number of states (Cassidy 2012). This project seeks to analyze the findings of these two fact-checking organizations in terms of their patterns of partisan evaluations. Our analysis looks the monitoring by these two organizations of statements by leading political figures during the first five months of President Obama's second term. (This paper does not examine Factcheck.org, a university-based organization which offers narrative commentary of statements but does not provide comparable ratings for the relative truthfulness and dishonesty of statements analyzed).

Evaluations of media fact-checking operations

For all their importance in contemporary political discourse, these fact-checking organizations have been subject to relatively little scholarly analysis as compared to political

news coverage generally. But the analyses that have been conducted have raised questions about the enterprise.

One key issue concerns possible selection bias: some fact-checking studies find that Republicans receive more critical notices, while others finds more even-handed assessments of claims across party lines.

A content analysis of 511 PolitiFact statements from January 2010 through January 2011 found that current and former Republican office-holders have been assigned harsher grades for their statements than Democrats were (Ostermeier 2011). "In total, 74 of the 98 statements by political figures judged 'false' or 'pants on fire' over the last 13 months were given to Republicans, or 76 percent, compared to just 22 statements for Democrats (22 percent)," the report concluded (Ostermeier 2011).

The disparity in these evaluations came despite roughly equally attention paid to statements made by representatives of the two parties: 50.4 percent for the GOP, versus 47.2 percent for the Democrats, with 2.4 percent attention paid to statements from independents (Ostermeier 2011).

These results might result from greater deceit on the part of Republicans, or from the items chosen for analysis by the fact-checkers. In his report, Ostermeier (2011) observed that the PolitiFact organization was not transparent about how the comments were selected for analysis and raised the possibility that the more negative evaluations of Republican comments might be the result of the specific comments selected for examination.

PolitiFact Editor Bill Adair responded to that study by noting: "We're accustomed to hearing strong reactions from people on both ends of the political spectrum. We are a news organization and we choose which facts to check based on news judgment. We check claims that

we believe readers are curious about, claims that would prompt them to wonder, 'Is that true?'" (quoted in Brauer 2011). In addition, PolitiFact focuses on claims that are newsworthy, verifiable, significant and likely to be questioned by readers and be repeated by others (Adair 2013).

Glenn Kessler, the Fact Checker columnist at the *Washington Post*, likewise argues the statements selected for analysis are based primarily on newsworthiness, not a partisan agenda. "While some readers in both parties are convinced we are either a liberal Democrat or a conservative Republican, depending on who we are dinging that day, the truth is that we pay little attention to party affiliation when evaluating a political statement" (Kessler 2012). Citizen input is an important factor, as Kessler estimates that roughly one-third of the assessments conducted are suggested by readers (quoted in Marietta, Barker and Bowser 2015). Kessler (2016) also notes: "we do not play gotcha, and so avoid scrutiny of obvious misstatements, particularly if a candidate admits an error."

Kessler, who routinely does his own over-time analysis of his Fact Checker findings, concludes that specific events, like the GOP presidential primaries of early 2012, impact the results to a considerable degree. During the first six months of 2012, for example, "we had 80 Fact Checker columns that rated Republican statements, for an average rating of 2.5 Pinocchios, compared to 56 that rated statements of Democrats, for an average rating of 2.11. For the last half of the six month period, after the GOP primary contest was decided, the number of columns rating Democrats and Republicans was about the same -- 31 columns focused on Democrats, and 34 on Republicans. In that period, the average ratings were 2.13 and 2.47, respectively" (Kessler 2012). The most important finding, he observed, was that "both parties will twist the facts if they believe it will advance their political interests" (Kessler 2012).

Preliminary analysis of Fact Checker columns during the 2016 presidential primaries found Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump frequently disregarded the truth, far more often than any other major political figure subjected to a Fact Checker evaluation. "The ratio of Trump's Four Pinocchios ratings is sky high. In fact, nearly 85 percent of Trump's claims that we vetted were false or mostly false," wrote Kessler (2016).

Apart from presidential campaigns, a study of PolitiFact assessments during the early months of the 2009 debate over President Obama's health care initiative found that Republican claims were scored more negatively than Democratic ones and that Obama's statements were scored more positively than statements by other Democrats (Sides 2009). These results were consistent with those of Ostermeier (2011). Using Ostermeier's report, some conservatives have alleged an ideological bias on the part of PolitiFact (Cassidy 2012). In particular, many conservatives argue that much of the assessments and commentary about the material being studied is itself opinionated, with selective inclusion and exclusion of information. As a result, they view with suspicion PolitiFact's claim of unbiased adjudication (Cassidy 2012).

The consequences of these media umpires upon the larger political discourse are likely to be real but relatively modest, research indicates. Some politicians may tailor their remarks to reduce the number of "Pinocchios" or avoid PolitiFact's dreaded "pants on fire" rating (cf., Nyhan and Reifler 2015). After all, lawmakers are quite concerned about matters that undermine their electoral success (Mayhew 1974).

Some news consumers may also be affected by these evaluations, becoming more critical of politicians earning negative evaluations for truthfulness (Fridkin, Kenney, and Wintersieck 2015; Pingree, Brossard, and McLeod 2014). But most news consumers are likely to weigh these fact checking efforts in light of their own personal ideological and partisan preferences,

discounting the criticisms of their ideologically favored representatives (Iyengar and Hahn 2009; Meirick 2013; Nyhan and Reifler 2012).

Furthermore, selective news exposure by consumers may limit the impact of these evaluations on the general public. The first and/or most significant exposure some viewers and readers receive relating to the fact-checkers may have come from the partisan media sources criticizing those issue adjudicators (cf., Feldman 2011; Iyengar and Hahn 2009; Nir 2011; Stroud 2008; Taber and Lodge 2006). Elected officials and candidates may also be able to discount the sources of negative evaluations by attacking the attackers (Corn 2012). Or politicians may take a calculated risk that financially struggling news organizations will be unlikely to monitor their comments closely (Cunningham 2003; Jamieson and Waldman 2002).

Scholarly research has also raised significant questions about the utility of fact-checking organizations for news consumers. Clear differences among the evaluators in terms of the questions asked, the methodology employed and the answers offered may limit their usefulness to voters (Marietta, Barker and Bowser 2015; Uscinski 2015; Uscinski and Ryden 2013).

In recent years researchers have found considerable public disagreement over factual matters, ranging from whether President Obama is a Muslim to the objective state of the economy (Gerber and Huber 2010; Pew 2009, 2010). Given the persistence of factually incorrect views among significant portions of public opinion on such questions, and the fact that political figures frequently offer false statements, it appears that fact-checking is likely to remain an important part of media discourse for the foreseeable future (Spivak 2011).

This project aims to advance the growing scholarly literature relating to this latest media project of adjudicating politicians' factual claims and assertions.. As a kind of "natural experiment" in assessing the reliability of fact-checking conclusions, we conducted a

comparative analysis of the two leading fact-checking organizations. If these two outlets independently produce the same or similar results, this would counter complaints that their results are too subjective to be trustworthy or useful to voters.

The analysis also provides additional information on claims of partisan bias in fact-checking, which have come mainly from conservatives. Previous research on PolitiFact assessments during an earlier period (cf., Ostermeier 2011) found consistently more negative evaluations of Republicans than Democrats If the results here show that evaluations of claims by Democrats are more negative than those made by Republicans the paper would provide empirical evidence that undermines conservative charges of a consistently liberal bias. If the results reinforce previous findings that Republican claims are evaluated more negatively, they would increase the possibility that either the fact-checking organizations are biased or that Republicans are in fact consistently more deceitful than Democrats.

In addition to this comparison of the evaluation organizations, we are also interested in comparative evaluations of different messengers. Do Democratic members of Congress receive greater criticism than does a Democratic president? (We might expect so given the more extensive policy research and political communication operations in the modern White House). And how do presidents and Democratic legislators compare to Republican lawmakers in assessments of their truthfulness during the same period?

Data and Results

The study analyzes 212 fact-checks available online that were produced by PolitiFact and the *Washington Post* Fact Checker during roughly the first five months of Obama's second term, from January 20 through June 26, 2013. A majority (128 or 60 percent) were produced by

PolitiFact, with the remaining 84 produced by the Fact Checker. President Obama was the subject of 39 of the evaluations, roughly 18 percent of the total, while other Democratic officials were the subject of 49 assessments. Representatives of Democratic-aligned groups, like labor unions, were the subject of nine assessments. Republicans in Congress received 86 assessments, with another 23 directed at Republican aligned organizations, like the National Rifle Association.

Taken together, all Democrats and Democratic loyalists were the subject of 97 assessments as compared to 109 directed at Republicans and Republican loyalists. Another six assessments were directed at nonpartisan voices – like the Chair of the Federal Reserve Board – and are dropped from the partisan portion of this analysis.

We compare the analysis systems of the Fact Checker and PolitiFact in the manner suggested by Kessler (2016): A zero Pinocchio (also known as a "Geppetto Checkmark") corresponds to True, one Pinocchio corresponds to Mostly True, two Pinocchios as Half True, three Pinocchios as Mostly False, Four Pinocchios corresponds to False (which in the PolitiFact system includes both the False and "Pants on Fire" categories). This comparative analysis system has been used in previous research to compare these two organizations (Marietta, Barker and Bowser 2015).

While time and funding constraints prohibit the content analyzing of all executive and legislative branch statements during the study period, we do employ the DW-Nominate scores for the 113th Congress to see how the partisan commentators selected for analysis differ from the other members of their chambers. This is not an ideal measure, as senators and members of Congress who plan to run for president in the next election cycle are likely to be especially vocal and to be of particular interest to fact-checkers. But the DW-Nominate scores do at least allow

for some measure of the representativeness of the elected officials within each party selected for analysis.

Most fact-checks involved fleeting controversies, but some topics did receive sustained attention from the two research organizations. For example, nine fact checks related to the Benghazi controversy. Republicans have long alleged that the Obama administration -- and particularly then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton -- did not do everything possible to protect the US Ambassador who died in an assault on a US compound in Libya (Schmitt 2016). Similarly, eight fact-checks during the study period related to a long-running scandal involving the Internal Revenue Service, where Republicans alleged that the Obama administration discriminated against conservative organizations in approving requests for tax exempt status (Rein 2016).

(Table 1 about here)

In Table 1, we examine basic differences in the ratings released by the two organizations. As noted above, PolitiFact conducted significantly more evaluations. The PolitiFact evaluations overall were significantly more positive than assessments by the Fact Checker (chi-square significance .045). More than half of the items selected for analysis by the Fact Checker received ratings of either three or four Pinocchios, equivalent to "mostly false," "false," or "pants on fire" under the PolitiFact grading system. In contrast, roughly 40 percent of the PolitiFact ratings were in these most negative assessment categories.

These differences may reflect differing selection choices (the two organizations rarely evaluated the exact same statement), different rating criteria or both. As Kessler (2016) notes: "We also do not assess obviously true statements, but prefer to focus on claims that are surprisingly true."

(Table 2 about here)

Table 2 shows PolitiFact's assessments of political leaders. We compare the percentage of statements judged for President Obama, other Democrats, and Republicans. A total of 66 Republican statements were evaluated, as compared to 36 for other Democrats and 22 percent for President Obama. There were significantly more "true" ratings for Obama and other Democrats than there were for Republicans. Far more Republican statements were found in the False category (which includes "pants on fire" assessments) than there were for either Obama or the other Democrats. Only 24 percent of Republican statements were rated True or Mostly True, while 30 percent were rated False. A total of 53 percent of Republican statements were rated either false or mostly false, compared to 22.7 percent of statements by Obama and. 30.5 percent of those by other Democrats.

One might expect that a second-term president, with a large staff or researchers and no need to run for office again, might be less tempted to engage in hyperbole and falsehood than Democratic legislators, some of who would face the voters in two years. But PolitiFact found that the plurality of Obama's statements were rated Half True, while a plurality of other Democratic statements were Mostly True. Of course both Obama and the other Democrats received more positive assessments than Republicans, who received more statements rated False than any other category.

The differences among the three groups were statistically significant (chi-square significance .027). A separate comparison (results not shown) that combined the Democrats and Obama and compared the all Democratic group to the Republican group was statistically significant as well (chi-square significance .011).

(Table 3 about here)

Table 3 shows the corresponding results for assessments made by the *Washington Post* Fact Checker. These include assessments of 42 statements made by Republicans, 17 made by President Obama, and 21 made by other Democrats (a total of 38 Democratic statements). Once again, a large proportion of the most negative assessments were directed at Republicans. Nearly 62 percent of the assessments of Republican statements earned three or four Pinocchios, the mostly false and false categories. For the Democrats other than Obama, 57 percent of the statements fell into the two most negative categories, a modest difference from the Republican assessments. In sharp contrast, less than 20 percent of President Obama's assertions were placed in the two most negative categories.

As was the case in the assessments by PolitiFact, the Fact Checker placed a plurality of Obama's statements for the middle category (2 Pinocchios, which is equivalent to Politifact's Half True category). The sharpest contrasts between the two assessments were found for the other Democrats, which were assessed notably more negatively by the Fact Checker than by PolitiFact. For Republicans, in contrast, the findings were relatively negative in both evaluations, and Obama fared relatively well with both the Fact Checker and PolitiFact.

Overall, the differences among Obama, other Democrats and Republicans in assessments by the Fact Checker were not statistically significant (chi-square n.s.). A separate analysis that combined Obama and other Democrats and compared that group with the Republicans was also not significant.

(Table 4 about here)

In Table 4, we offer an examination of possible selection bias by the two fact-checkers. Table 4 lists every member of Congress who received at least two evaluations during the study

period (10 senators and six representatives), together with the party ID of the lawmaker and whether they served in the House or Senate. Subsequent columns identify the number of evaluations made by PolitiFact (PF) and the Fact Checker (FC) and the number of evaluations that were in the worst categories (4 Pinocchios, False, and Pants on Fire). Finally we include the widely used DW-Nominate scores (cf., Poole and Rosenthal 1985) for each lawmaker who received at least two evaluations. The DW-Nominate rankings range from 1 for the most liberal Senator to 104 for the most conservative one. (Because the rankings cover the two years of the entire 113th Congress, there were a total of 104 senators who served at least part of the session.) The comparable numbers for the House range from 1 to 443, again a number larger than the 435 members of the lower chamber because of mid-session special elections to fill vacancies.

Turning first to the Senate, seven of the ten lawmakers with multiple assessments were Republicans. Sen. Rand Paul (R-Ky.) ranked first in the number of evaluations with ten, five from each organizations Paul, who would go on to run for president in 2016, had two assessments in the worst category. DW-Nominate rankings mark Paul as the second most conservative senator in the 113th Congress (103 out of 104).

Not surprisingly, senators who plan to run for president (or are generally expected to do so), get a lot of attention from fact-checkers. Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Tex.), another 2016 hopeful, received five assessments (with one rated in the worst category). Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), also received five assessments, but none in the worst category. Expected presidential candidates may receive additional scrutiny, and the candidates may stretch the truth to make dramatic assertions that get noticed by the media or by partisan voters seeking a champion. The results here do not allow us to rate the relative importance of these two factors. The three candidates all had conservative records (Rubio ranked 95 and Cruz 101, just ahead of Paul), but they might as

easily have been selected for their national aspirations rather than their highly conservative voting records.

The other Republican among the four most evaluated members of the Senate was Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.), then the Senate's Minority Leader. He received five evaluations, with one of them in the worst category. His DW-Nominate ranking places him roughly in the middle of the Republican senators who served in the 113th Congress. Four of the five assessments of McConnell were by the Fact Checker.

Four senators had three evaluations each, divided equally between Democrats and Republicans. The Republicans were again among the most conservative representatives of the chamber, while the two Democratic senators in the group were both more conservative than the Democratic average. One Republican and one Democratic senator had one "worst" rating from this group.

Overall, five of the seven Republican senators subject to more than one evaluation ranked among the chamber's 20 most conservative members; no Democrat ranked among the chamber's 20 most liberal members. However, this excludes Sen. Bernie Sanders, a Vermont independent who caucuses with the Democrats and ran for the Democratic presidential nomination in 2016. Sanders ranked as the third most liberal member of the Senate during the 113th Congress – but he had no "worst" ratings.

Turning to the House, three Democrats and three Republicans received at least two evaluations. Among representatives, Rep. Michelle Bachmann (R-Minn.) was in a class by herself. She had nine evaluations from these two groups and eight "worst" rankings. No other House member – Democrat or Republicans – with at least two evaluations had a single "worst" rating.

A variety of reasons might explain the unusual attention given to Bachmann. She was one of the more conservative members of the 113th Congress – she ranked 377 out of the 443 individuals who served at some point. She was briefly a Republican presidential candidate in 2012 and has long been a focus of media attention for sometimes extreme statements (Wemple 2011).

Beyond Bachmann, one's political standing is particularly important to determining which members of the House get the most attention from the fact-checkers. Given his role as the Republican vice presidential nominee in 2012 and as chair of the House Budget Committee in 2013, one might expect Rep. Paul Ryan (R-Wisc.) to appear on this list, and he does with two evaluations (neither of them in the worst category). However, he is also one of the more conservative members of the House, with a DW-Nominate ranking of 360 out of 443 in the 113th Congress. Rep. Mike Rogers (R-Mich.) was head of the House Intelligence Committee during the 113th Congress and received three evaluations, none in the most critical category. (Then-House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, does not appear on the list because he had only one evaluation, which was rated False, during the study period.)

For the Democrats, three members received two evaluations each: House Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.), Debbie Wasserman-Schultz (D-Fla.,) who was then chair of the Democratic National Committee, and Rep. Barbara Lee (D-Calif.), a senior member of Congress active in anti-poverty and anti-war efforts. Lee was identified as the most liberal member of the House in the DW-Nominate ratings for the 113th Congress, while Pelosi ranked 34th, which was notably more liberal than the Democratic caucus as a whole. Wasserman-Schultz was closer to the median Democratic member, identified as the 92nd most liberal in the DW-Nominate rankings.

Thus, it appears that the two fact-checking groups differentially targeted comments by members of Congress who were ideologically relatively extreme. This was true for both Republican and Democratic members, particularly in the House of Representatives. However, the same members shared another characteristic. Many held important institutional positions or were regarded as potential presidential candidates. Their institutional or public prominence would make their assertions more newsworthy regardless of their ideological placement.

In the Senate, for example, the conservative Republicans subject to the most scrutiny (Paul, Cruz and Rubio) in early 2013 were already readying 2016 presidential campaigns. Other conservative Republicans selected repeatedly – such as Sessions and Coburn -- were prominent in the Senate organization as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee and as the ranking member of the Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee respectively.

Conclusion

This analysis of two prominent fact-checking organizations found that PolitiFact's selection process resulted in findings that were more critical of Republicans to a statistically significant degree. The *Washington Post* Fact Checker was also more critical of Republicans than Democrats, but the differences did not reach the level of statistical significance. This pattern is consistent with earlier studies that found the Fact Checker the more balanced of the two (Farnsworth and Lichter 2015). Previous studies of PolitiFact found that Republicans have received lower marks in a variety of policy and campaign contexts (Ostermeier 2011; Sides 2009).

We also found some differences between the two fact-checkers. The *Post*'s Fact-Checker was more likely to conclude that politicians' assertions were false, and somewhat less likely to fault Republicans than was PolitiFact. Finally, a case-by-case examination found that members of Congress who were subject to fact-checking were more ideologically extreme than those who were not. Even so, fact-checked senators and representatives whose comments were selected for analysis frequently had prominent positions in their respective parties. Thus, it may well be that these lawmakers were targeted simply because their prominence made their comments more newsworthy or deserving of heightened scrutiny.

In sum, our study supports previous findings (and complaints by conservatives) that Republicans are generally targeted more often by fact-checkers than are Democrats. News consumers who faithfully followed fact-checking newspaper articles might well conclude that the GOP is more deceitful than the Democratic Party. However, this is not to say that such differences result from the partisan predispositions of the fact-checkers. They may reflect the political reality that leading Republican politicians are more likely to deceive the public than their Democratic counterparts. Our study cannot resolve that question.

The lack of transparency from the organizations regarding their selection procedures, and the practical difficulties of content analyzing every controversial statement by every lawmaker, make it difficult to untangle the central question of whether partisan differences in fact-checking reflect the values of the fact-checkers or the behavior of their targets. In addition, greater transparency would allow us to come closer to answering such questions. If we knew what possible items were considered for evaluation but excluded from consideration, for example, we might have a clearer sense of the impact that internal procedures of these fact-checkers have on topic selection, and therefore on outcomes (cf., Uscinski and Ryden 2013).

As it is now, researchers cannot determine the extent to which the findings of these fact-checking organizations reflect primarily a larger political reality or are largely the result of the factors employed in the selection and evaluation process. In the absence of more compelling evidence for one conclusion or the other, there can be little doubt that many conservatives will attribute the differential focus on Republican politicians to media bias, while liberals will read the same findings as proof that the GOP is the party of deceit.

Table 1

Assessment Scores of Truthfulness by Outlet

	PolitiFact	Fact Checker
0P/True	20	8
	15.6%	9.8%
1P/Mostly True	29	8
	22.7%	9.8%
2P/Half True	28	23
	21.9%	28.0%
3P/Mostly False	24	25
	18.8%	30.5%
4P/False & Pants-On-Fire	27	18
	21.1%	22.0%
Total	128	82
Chi-Square significance (2-sided):	.045	

Source: CMPA

Note: Some percentages may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 2

PolitiFact Evaluation of Statements from Political Figures

	Obama	Other Democrats	Republicans
True	4	7	7
	18.2%	19.4%	10.6%
Mostly True	6	14	9
	27.3%	38.9%	13.6%
Half True	7	4	15
	31.8%	11.1%	22.7%
Mostly False	2	7	15
	9.1%	19.4%	22.7%
False/Pants-On-Fire	3	4	20
	13.6%	11.1%	30.3%
Total	22	36	66

Chi-Square significance (2-sided): .027

Source: CMPA

Note: Some percentages may not add to 100 percent because of rounding

Table 3

Fact Checker Evaluation of Statements from Political Figures

	Obama	Other Democrats	Republicans
0 Pinocchio	4	1	3
	23.5%	4.8%	7.1%
1 Pinocchio	3	2	3
	17.6%	9.5%	7.1%
2 Pinocchio	7	6	10
	41.2%	28.6%	23.8%
3 Pinocchio	1	8	15
	5.9%	38.1%	35.7%
4 Pinocchio	2	4	11
	11.8%	19.0%	26.2%
Total	17	21	42

Chi-Square significance (2-sided):   n.s.

Source: CMPA

Note: Some percentages may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 4

Politifact Versus the Fact Checker: Selection of Congressional Voices for Analysis

Total	Elected Official	Party	H/S	PF	FC	Worst	DW-Nominate Rank
10	Paul	R	S	5	5	2	103 (of 104)
5	Cruz	R	S	2	3	1	101
5	McConnell	R	S	1	4	1	78
5	Rubio	R	S	4	1	0	95
3	Coburn	R	S	1	2	1	100
3	Feinstein	D	S	3	0	1	39
3	Gillibrand	D	S	3	0	0	35
3	Sessions	R	S	1	2	0	91
2	Grassley	R	S	1	1	1	66
2	Sanders	I	S	2	0	0	3
9	Bachmann	R	H	5	4	8	377 (of 443)
3	Rogers , Mike	R	H	2	1	0	284
2	Lee, Barbara	D	H	1	1	0	1
2	Pelosi	D	H	2	0	0	34
2	Ryan, Paul	R	H	1	1	0	360
2	Wasserman-Schultz	D	H	1	1	0	92

Notes: Only members of Congress with more than one evaluation are included. DW-Nominate ranks cover the entire 113th Congress, from January 2013 through January 2015. The higher the score, the more conservative the member compared to his or her colleagues. Senate ranks range from 1 to 104 and House ranks range from 1 to 443 to take account of all members who served during that Congress. Worst refers to the total number of False, Pants on Fire or Four Pinocchio ratings.

References

Adair, Bill. 2013. "Principles of PolitiFact and the Truth-O-Meter." PolitiFact.com. Statement dated November 1.

Bernstein, David. 2013. "How to use Fact-checkers: ignore the conclusions." *Washington Post* May 29. URL: http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-partisan/wp/2013/05/29/how-to-use-fact-checkers-ignore-the-conclusions/ (accessed July 28, 2015).

Brauer, David. 2011. "PolitiFact responds to U researcher's anti-GOP bias claim." *MinnPost* URL: http://www.minnpost.com/braublog/2011/02/politifact-responds-u-researchers-anti-gop-bias-claim (accessed July 28, 2015).

Cassidy, Jon. 2012. "PolitiFact Bias: Does the GOP Tell Nine Times More Lies Than the Left? Really?" *Human Events* September 3: 20.

Chait, Jonathan. 2011. "The Trouble with PolitiFact." *New York*, December 11. URL: http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2011/12/trouble-with-politifact.html

Corn, David. 2012. "How to beat the fact checkers. Politicians have figured it out: When caught in a lie, attack the truth cops." *Mother Jones*, September/October. URL: http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2012/09/factcheck-politifact-lying-politicians

Cunningham, Brent. 2003. "Re-thinking Objectivity." *Columbia Journalism Review* 42(2): 24–32.

Cunningham, Brent. 2007. "The Rhetoric Beat." *Columbia Journalism Review* 46(4): 36-9.

DW-Nominate Scores for the US House in the 113th Congress. URL: http://voteview.com/HOUSE_SORT113.html , accessed July 12, 2016.

DW-Nominate Scores for the US Senate in the 113th Congress. URL: http://voteview.com/SENATE_SORT113.html , accessed July 12, 2016.

Farnsworth, Stephen J., and S. Robert Lichter. 2011. *The Nightly News Nightmare: Media Coverage of US Presidential Elections, 1988-2008*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield. Third Edition.

Farnsworth, Stephen J., and S. Robert Lichter. 2015. "Fact-Checking the Fact-Checkers: Analyzing PolitiFact.com and the *Washington Post* "Fact Checker" Assessments of 2012 Presidential Campaign Discourse." Paper delivered at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, San Francisco, Calif.

Feldman, Lauren. 2011. "The Opinion Factor: The Effects of Opinionated News on Information Processing and Attitude Change." *Political Communication* 28 (April): 163-81.

Frantzich, Stephen. 2002. "Watching the Watchers: The Nature and Content of Campaign Watches." *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics* 7(2): 34-58.

Fridkin, Kim, Patrick Kenney, and Amanda Wintersieck. 2015. "Liar, Liar, Pants on Fire: How Fact-checking Influences Reactions to Negative Advertising." *Political Communication* 32 (1): 127–151.

Gerber, Alan, and Gregory Huber. 2010. "Partisanship, Political Control, and Economic Assessments." *American Journal of Political Science* 54 (1): 153–173.

Graves, Lucas. 2013. "What we can learn from the fact-checkers ratings." *Columbia Journalism Review*, June 4. URL: http://www.cjr.org/united_states_project/what_we_can_learn_from_the_factcheckers_ratings.php

Iyengar, Shanto, and Kyu S. Hahn. 2009. "Red Media, Blue Media: Evidence of Ideological Selectivity in Media Use." *Journal of Communication* 59 (March): 19-39.

Jamieson, Kathleen Hall, and Paul Waldman. 2002. *The Press Effect: Politicians, Journalists, and the Stories That Shape the Political World*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kessler, Glenn. 2011. "One Year of Fact-checking – an accounting." *Washington Post*, December 30. URL: http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/fact-checker/post/one-year-of-fact-checking--an-accounting/2011/12/27/gIQAR1taOP_blog.html

Kessler, Glenn. 2012. "The First Six Months of 2012 – an accounting." Washington Post, July 5. URL: http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/fact-checker/post/the-first-six-months-of-2012-an-accounting/2012/07/03/gJQAozsbLW_blog.html

Kessler, Glenn. 2016. "Who has the Most Pinocchios: Trump or Clinton?" *Washington Post* July 17.

Marietta, Morgan, David C. Barker, and Todd Bowser. 2015. "Fact-Checking Polarized Politics: Does The Fact-Check Industry Provide Consistent Guidance on Disputed Realities?" *The Forum* 13(4): 577–596.

Mayhew, David R. 1974. *Congress: The Electoral Connection*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

McKinnon, Lori Melton, and Lynda Lee Kaid. 1999. "Exposing Negative Campaigning or Enhancing Advertising Effects: An Experimental Study of Ad Watch Effects on Voters' Evaluations of Candidates and Their Ads." *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 27(3): 217-36.

Meirick, Patrick C. 2013. "Motivated Misperception? Party, Education, Partisan News, and Belief in 'Death Panels.'" *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* 90(1): 39-57.

Mooney, Chris. 2012. "Reality Bites Republicans." *The Nation*, May 16. URL: http://www.thenation.com/article/reality-bites-republicans/

Nir, Lilach. 2011. "Motivated Reasoning and Public Opinion Perception." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 75 (September): 504-32.

Nyhan, Brendan. 2010. "Why the 'Death Panel' Myth Wouldn't Die: Misinformation in the Health Care Reform Debate." *The Forum* 8 (1): 1-24.

Nyhan, Brendan, and Jason Reifler. 2010. "When Corrections Fail: The Persistence of Political Misperceptions." *Political Behavior* 32 (2): 303–330.

Nyhan, Brendan, and Jason Reifler. 2012. "Misinformation and Fact-Checking: Research Findings from Social Science." New America Foundation Media Policy Initiative Research Paper.

Nyhan, Brendan, and Jason Reifler. 2015. "The Effects of Fact-checking on Elites: A Field Experiment on U.S. State Legislatures." *American Journal of Political Science* 59 (3): 628–640.

Ostermeier, Eric. 2011. "Selection Bias? PolitiFact Rates Republican Statements as False at 3 Times the Rate of Democrats." URL: http://editions.lib.umn.edu/smartpolitics/2011/02/10/selection-bias-politifact-rate/

Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. 2009. "Health Care Reform Closely Followed, Much Discussed." Release dated August 20. URL: http://people-press.org/reports/pdf/537

Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. 2010. "Growing Number of Americans Say Obama is a Muslim." Release dated August 18. URL: http://www.pewforum.org/2010/08/18/growing-number-of-americans-say-obama-is-a-muslim/

Pingree, Raymond James, Dominique Brossard, and Douglas McLeod. 2014. "Effects of Journalistic Adjudication on Factual Beliefs, News Evaluations, Information Seeking, and Epistemic Political Efficacy." *Mass Communication and Society* 17(5): 615–38.

Poole, Keith, and Howard Rosenthal. 1985. "A Spatial Model for Legislative Roll-call Analysis.*" American Journal of Political Science* 29(2): 357-84.

Rappeport, Alan. 2015. "First Draft: Latest CNN Poll has Trump at 24 percent." *New York Times* August 18. URL: http://www.nytimes.com/politics/first-draft/2015/08/18/latest-cnn-republican-poll-has-donald-trump-at-24-percent/

Rein, Lisa. 2016. "House Conservatives Try to Force Vote to Oust IRS Chief." *Washington Post*, July 14. URL: https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/powerpost/wp/2016/07/14/house-conservatives-try-to-force-vote-to-impeach-irs-chief/

Schmitt, Eric. 2016. "Fact checking the House Benghazi Committee's Findings." *New York Times*, June 28. URL: http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/29/us/benghazi-committee-report-hillary-clinton.html

Sides, John. 2009. "Scoring Truthfulness in the Health Care Debate." The Monkey Cage, August 14. URL: http://themonkeycage.org/2009/08/scoring_truthfulness_in_the_he/

Spivak, Cary. 2011. "The Fact-Checking Explosion." *American Journalism Review* January.

Stelter, Brian. 2013. "Palin Returns to Fox News, After a Brief Split." *New York Times* June 13.

Stroud, Natalie Jomini. 2008. "Media Use and Political Predispositions: Revisiting the Concept of Selective Exposure." *Political Behavior* 30(3): 341–66.

Taber, Charles S. and Milton Lodge. 2006. "Motivated Skepticism in the Evaluation of Political Beliefs." *American Journal of Political Science* 50(3):755–769.

Uscinski, Joseph. 2015. "The Epistemology of Fact Checking (Is Still Naïve): Rejoinder to Amazeen." *Critical Review* 27 (2): 243–252.

Uscinski, Joseph, and Ryden Butler. 2013. "The Epistemology of Fact Checking." *Critical Review* 25 (2): 162–180.

Wemple, Erik. 2011. "Bachmann and New Hampshire Staff: 100 percent Hypocritical." *Washington Post*, October 21. URL: https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/erik-wemple/post/bachmann-and-new-hampshire-staff-100-percent-hypocritical/2011/10/21/gIQAoNTE4L_blog.html