* 1. Codebook

## Codes

| Name | Description |
| --- | --- |
| Claim or content type checked | The type of claim or content checked by the fact-checker |
| Comparative claims | Claims that make comparisons or identify similarities and differences between different things |
| Qualitative Comparisons | Claims that make qualitative comparisons (e.g. A was treated differently than B) |
| Quantitative Comparisons | Claims that make numerical comparisons (e.g. A had more x than B). Includes quantitative rankings (e.g. the highest level of X of all time). Includes claims about record levels of something. |
| Content | Video, image and audio content, as well as social media posts and websites that are misleading in various ways |
| Deceptive content | Content that misleads about its producer (e.g. fake news) |
| Fabricated and manipulated content | Content that has been fabricated or manipulated/altered (e.g. deepfakes, digitally edited content, fake subtitles) |
| Mislabelled content | Explicitly mislabelled or miscaptioned content (i.e. real footage of something other than what is claimed), as well as content with misleading implications/omissions (e.g. old footage implicitly presented as contemporary, video game/film footage presented as real, etc.) |
| Counterfactual claims | Claims about whether something would have happened in a counterfactual scenario |
| Empirical claims | Claims about empirical reality |
| Claims about characteristics, attributes, capacities of something | Often associated with adjectives. |
| Claims about effects | Impacts or outcomes resulting from a cause. The emphasis of the claim is on what happened, but it is presented as an outcome, impact or result rather than a mere occurrence or happening |
| Claims about quantities or amounts of something | Claims about how many or much of something there was or is. Include changes in the amount, rate, proportion, etc. of something |
| Claims about what an actor has said or a document says | Specific types of communicative acts, whether spoken or written |
| Claims about what an actor plans or intends to do | Where the plan or intention has been explicitly stated |
| Claims about whether an actor did or is doing something | Acts committed by specified agents (not just humans, actors with the capacity to act) |
| Claims about whether something happened or is happening | Discreet events without particular agents specified |
| Explanatory claims | Claims that explain acts, occurrences and states |
| Claims about causes | Reasons that explain or agents that produce occurrences and states. The emphasis of the claim is on why something happened |
| Claims about how something happened or was done | The method through which or way in which something occurred or was done |
| Claims about whether two things are linked | Implicit causal links |
| Claims about why an actor did or plans to do something | Why a specific agent acted as they did |
| Claims about why something happened or is the case | Explaining why something happened or why a state exists (non-causal) |
| Inferences | Claims about the implications of something. Includes claims about how something can or should be interpretated, what can be read into something, or what can be concluded on the basis of something. |
| Normative claims | Claims about whether actions were acceptable or justified - e.g. safety, risk/benefit |
| Ontological claims | Claims about what something is. Includes claims about the definition, categorisation, identity or nature of something. |
| Predictive claims | Claims about the future |
| Claims about future effects or what will happen | Predicting impacts or outcomes resulting from a cause, claims about what will happen in the future |
| Claims about what an actor will do | Predicting an act by a specified agent |
| Regulatory claims | Claims about rules and what they do or don’t permit or require. Includes claims about the penalties for breaking rules and who is eligible for something |
| Issue identified | The epistemic issues that fact-checkers identify with the claims they assess |
| Fake or misleading content | Content is not genuine, it has been fabricated, altered, mislabelled, or taken out of context |
| Fake, fabricated or manipulated content | Deceptive about its author/producer (imposter), fabricated, manipulated (e.g. digitally edited/altered). Fake news, hoaxes, scams, false endorsements |
| Mislabelled or out of context content | Content may be genuine, unaltered, but it is explicitly or implicitly claimed that is depicts something that it does not; content that misleads due to inaccurate labelling; satire, pranks or fiction shared without making that clear; misleading headlines, links or claims about what content says |
| Ignorance of rules | Claims that are contradicted or undermined by relevant rules, claims that misunderstand or are ignorant of rules, their applicability, or their implications (e.g. for responsibility) |
| Misunderstand or exaggerate an actor's power, authority or responsibility | Claim misunderstands or is contradicted by rules that set out an actor’s power, authority, responsibility; claim misassigns fault or blame on the basis of such misunderstanding (distinct from misassignments of blame/responsibility because an actor did not do something, which belong in misassignments category) |
| Misunderstand rules and their applicability | Incorrect claims about rules; claims proven incorrect or rendered unlikely due to relevant rules |
| Improbable claims | Claims that are unlikely. Either quantitatively improbable or unlikely based on evidence (that falls short of falsification, technically possible, but not likely) |
| Incoherent claims | Claims that are vague, confused, pointless |
| Don't say anything meaningful, relevant or insightful | Fundamentally misconceived – e.g. counting or comparing things in ways that offer no insight |
| Relate to something that doesn't exist | A key entity referred to by the claim has no basis in reality, is fictitious |
| Unclearly stated | Claims that are badly or vaguely articulated, not clear exactly what is being claimed or what the claim is referring to; exact timescale or location may be unclear; not clear what concepts or figures/measures are being referred to |
| Incomplete claims | Claims that omit important information |
| Omit important context | Omits wider context that could change how something is seen; the setting for an event, statement, or idea that allow it to be fully or properly understood |
| Omit important detail | Omits specific details that alter the story or situation |
| Omit important factors or conditions | Omits conditions according to which something is applicable or allowable (i.e. the circumstances under which something would occur, something that is dependent on certain requirements being met); omits factors that also contributed to the occurrence or state in question, or that affect the accuracy of the claim in question |
| Incorrect empirical claims | Basic errors of fact (i.e. about what happened or is the case) |
| Contradicted by empirical evidence | Contradicted or falsified by compelling empirical evidence (qualitative, records, documents, video footage, etc.) |
| Contradicted by expert or official testimony | Contradicted or challenged by testimony, rather than statistical or empirical evidence; statements given directly to the fact-checkers, or statements published more generally. Emphasis on an expert or official source’s statement contradicting a claim. Relies on authoritative expertise |
| Contradicted by statistical or experimental evidence | Inaccurate numerical claims, claims that exaggerate or undercount figures, imprecise figures. Claims about states that are contradicted by official primary statistical evidence or statistical analysis of experimental data |
| Impossible claims, collectively accepted claims, labelled as false without evidence | Cannot be true (by deduction). No need to even point to evidence or expert opinion. Claims merely stated to be false. |
| Incorrect details | Claims that get details about what happened or what was done wrong, or get the details of a plan or policy wrong; focus is on specific details rather than claims about occurrences that are generally or entirely false |
| Misquote, misattribute or invent statements | Getting a quote wrong – specific elements of what was said or written; incorrectly attribute what was said or written; completely invent a statement |
| Incorrect or questionable comparisons | Claims that overlook, minimise, invent or exaggerate similarities and differences; claims that mis-rank things on some basis; false claims about records; false claims about relative quantities or rates of something |
| Incorrect or questionable explanations | Wrong or implausible claims about how or why something happened or is the case |
| Incorrect causal claims | Incorrect causal claims |
| Misunderstand or misrepresent how something works | Wrong, implausible or questionable explanations regarding the method through which or way in which something occurred or was done. Not including incorrect empirical (or other) claims on the basis of ignorance of rules. Faulty explanations about how something happened or was done on the basis of ignorance of how something works. |
| Misunderstand or misrepresent why something happened, was done or is the case | Wrong, implausible or questionable explanations regarding reasons, motivations, etc. Faulty non-causal explanations - intentional, formal, normative, or metaphysical explanations. |
| Overstated causal claims | Not straightforwardly incorrect, but not proven/uncertain causal claims stated with unwarranted certainty that the evidence does not support; claims that exaggerate the impact of one cause relative to other causes |
| Issues with evidence | There are problems with the evidence presented (or not) to support a claim |
| Claimant offers no supporting evidence | Claimant does not offer evidence for their claim. Source may be unclear |
| Insufficient evidence | Evidence insufficient to support claim, evidence may be mixed, or situation may be uncertain |
| Misinterpret or misrepresent evidence | Clams that make unsubstantiated inferences; claims about the (usually nefarious) implications of a piece of evidence that are unsubstantiated; jumping to (often conspiratorial) conclusions; claims that misunderstand or misinterpret figures (e.g. misunderstanding the baseline). Cited evidence is misrepresented, it does not say what is claimed or support the claim in question. Claims may misrepresent the balance of evidence (emphasising an outlier whilst ignoring the dominant or consensus view). |
| No evidence for claim | There is no evidence for a claim (not that no evidence is offered) |
| Questionable sources or evidence | Dubious sources that have a track record of spreading misinformation, fake or faulty evidence, studies with obvious limitations |
| Misassignments | Claims that incorrectly, questionably, or unfairly assign something to an actor, e.g. credit, blame, responsibility (emphasis on misassignments of credit, blame, responsibility, rather than ignorance of rules, misattribution of quotes or misidentifying who committed an act) |
| Mischaracterisations | Claims that mischaracterise something. Not about the basic facts of what happened or what is the case (e.g. whether someone has supported a particular position), about whether the way they are described or presented is misleading (includes mischaracterising an actor’s position in general, i.e. not relating specifically to what an actor has said). Includes statements that exaggerate or downplay something (not inaccurate numerical claims, but more general descriptions, e.g. downplaying the threat a disease). Can’t be straightforwardly verified/falsified – an issue of whether a description of a situation is justified or misleading. Misleading descriptions of an actor’s plans. |
| Misinterpretations | Issues of interpretation not fact |
| Misinterpret or misrepresent what an actor meant | Questionable interpretations of an actor’s meaning |
| Misinterpret or misrepresent someone's intentions | Questionable claims about an actor’s intentions (not including inaccurate claims about an actor’s plans, where those plans are a matter of public record) |
| Ontological errors | Errors relating to the identity, categorisation, definition or nature of an entity |
| Miscategorisations | Misclassify something; quantitative claims that are based on misleading categorisations (e.g. making a claim about a general type based on a statistic that relates only to a more specific sub-type), claims that misunderstand or mislead about what is and isn’t counted by a figure. About the categories or sub-types of something that are or are not referred to by a claim. Claim may be narrowly true, but only on the bases of a potentially misleading categorisation of what is counted by a statistic or figure. Misunderstands what is being counted or referred to. |
| Misdefine or misunderstand the nature of something | Claims that provide or are based on an incorrect or questionable definition of the entity to which they refer, incorrect or questionable claims about the nature of something. Misunderstands what something is. |
| Misidentifications | Claims that confuse something with another thing. Includes but not limited to referring to the wrong person or actor. |
| Overgeneralisations or overspecifications | Claims that present something that only applies in specific cases or circumstances as applying more generally; claims that present something that applies more generally as only applying in specific cases or circumstances. Focus not on the categories of something that a claim relates to, but presenting something that is specific as general, or general as specific |
| Questionable predictions | Questionable claims about what an actor will do, or what the impact of something will be (e.g. the effect of a new law) |
| Temporal errors | Claims that our outdated or misapply timescales |
| Misapply timescales | The timing or sequence of events undermines or contradicts the claim; the claim gets the timing or sequence of events wrong; the claim itself or a key figure may relate to an incorrect time period |
| Outdated | Claims that may have once been true, but are no longer true due to change |
| Task of justification undertaken | All instances of a fact-checker presenting arguments and evidence in support of their assessment of a claim, represents the argumentative and evidentiary work undertaken by a fact-checker in a fact-check article. Categorised by the specific epistemic task that the fact-checker is seeking to achieve (i.e. what they are seeking to argue and justify) |
| Confirm rules | Confirm the rules, their applicability and their implications for what is and isn’t allowed and who is eligible for something. |
| Contest misinterpretations and mischaracterisations | Argue that something has been misinterpreted and/or mischaracterised (hard to tell which due to intent - i.e. honest misinterpretations vs. knowing mischaracterisations) Something has been described or labeled in an inaccurate or misleading way. An entity, statement or situation has been misunderstood or misinterpreted. |
| Contest predictions | Challenge or offer predictions about futures states and occurrences |
| Argue that something won't necessarily have a particular effect | Challenge overly-strident predictions, point to incertitude/contingency |
| Contest conterfactuals | Contest hypothetical claims about what would have happened in an alternative scenario (i.e. not about the future) |
| Explain the factors that will affect or determine something | Explain the factors that will shape future states and occurrences |
| Predict the effect of something or what will happen | Predict what will or won’t happen |
| Correct empirical claims | Correcting basic errors of fact; falsifying empirical claims |
| Confirm or detail an occurance or event | Evidence confirming that an occurrence did or did not occur (without a specified agent). Describe an occurrence or a series of occurrences |
| Confirm the level, rate, scale, prevelance, proportion, amount or quantity of something | Usually quantitative claims, link to authoritative statistical sources |
| Confirm what an actor did or is doing | Get the actor themselves to confirm, or point to other sources (records, media reporting, etc.). Includes what an actor didn’t or doesn’t do; a group of actors; actor defined broadly as an agent with the capacity to act (not necessarily an individual). Focus is on an act by an agent |
| Confirm what an actor intends or plans to do | Confirm an actor’s plans or intentions (e.g. prior statements about their plans and intentions, later clarifications). Not a prediction of what they will do, confirming evidence for a plan or intention |
| Confirm what an actor said, who said something, or the contents of a document | Relating specifically to communicative acts, point to primary sources, documents themselves, ask the actor in question |
| Confirm what is or is not the case | Evidence confirming whether a claim about characteristics or properties of something specific is correct |
| Correct misassignments of responsibility, blame, credit or power | Demonstrate that an actor does not possess the authority or power to be held responsible or blamed for something; demonstrate that blame, credit or responsibility for something has been misassigned; clarify or explain the authority, power or responsibility of an actor. |
| Correct ontological errors | Confirming or clarifying the entity that a claim relates to; confirming, clarifying or questioning the identity, nature, definition or categorisation of the entity that a claim relates to |
| Confirm the nature, identity or definition of someone or something | Clarifying the nature, identity or definition of an entity that a claim relates to; confirm or question whether a claim properly identifies, defines or characterises the entity it relates to (e.g. are new EV regs a ban?; was the attacker a particular individual); confirming cases of mistaken identity. Confirm the identity of something or what it is |
| Explain or clarify the categories that a claim relates to | Clarify the categories of something that are or are not counted within figures/statistical evidence; clarify the entities or types included within or excluded by the figure. Confirm the categories or sub-types of something that are or are not referred to by a claim; confirm what is or isn’t being counted or referred to |
| Explain why a particular categorisation or definition is problematic or preferrable | Where multiple ways to define or categorise entities exist (and therefore ways of counting the entity), identifying reasons for favouring a particular approach |
| Correct or contest comparisons | Demonstrate similarities and differences, confirm how things rank relative to one another; criticise incorrect or questionable rankings, comparisons and distinctions |
| Contest qualitative comparisons | Demonstrate whether two or more things are similar or different to one another. Qualitative comparisons. Includes rankings based on qualities rather than quantities (e.g. strictness of gun laws) |
| Correct quantitative comparisons | Confirm how things rank relative to other things on some quantitative basis. Quantitative comparisons - whether the amount of one thing is bigger than the amount of another thing. Is there more of A than B, is A growing at a higher rate than B. Includes statements about records - i.e. this is the biggest example of something ever/within a certain timeframe (which compares the example against all over examples) |
| Correct or provide explanations | Demonstrate why or how something happened or is the case, explain the effect of something, the factors that determine or affect something |
| Confirm how something works, happened, or was done | Not including rules (separate category). Incl how something would work. How a process or system works; how a technology works; how physical, biological, and chemical processes work…Demonstrate the method through which or way in which something occurred or was done |
| Confirm the effect of something | Demonstrate whether something did or didn’t have a particular effect |
| Confirm the relationship between two things | Including that there is no relationship. Demonstrate that there is no causal relationship between two things. Demonstrate whether one thing correlates with higher or lower rates of another thing |
| Explain the factors that did or do determine or affect something | Identify factors that affected or determined something. Not including criteria that determine someone’s eligibility for something (belongs in ‘confirm rules’ cat). Focus on complicating overly simplistic causal claims that overlook or exaggerate the role play by certain factors, as opposed to stating whether something did or didn’t cause an outcome |
| Explain why an actor did, is doing or plans to do something | Clarify the intent, motivation, aim, rationale, reasoning etc. behind an act or plan, usually by referring to the actor in question’s own words |
| Explain why something happened or is the case, what caused something | Demonstrate what did or didn’t cause something; critique an implausible or dubious causal claim; confirming or explaining what did or didn’t cause something |
| Correct temporal errors | Demonstrate errors relating to time – claims that are outdated and that misapply or are contradicted by timescales |
| Confirm that a claim is outdated | Identify and present up to date info or data; highlight when the claim was applicable or stopped being applicable or stopped being applicable; demonstrate the claim is based on old evidence. Demonstrate the claim is based on out of date information, subsequent developments have changed the situation, the claim presents old events/info as current |
| Explain or confirm that the timescale doesn't fit | Identify and clarify the timescale of events, demonstrate the contradiction with the claim. E.g. If X occurred before Y, then Y can’t have caused X. Demonstrate that the time period that a statistic or figure applies to has been misunderstood or misrepresented. Demonstrate that the claim is wrong about when an event occurred. |
| Explain why a particular timescale is preferrable | E.g. for a statistic. Timescale used may be misleading, alternative timescale may be fairer, more accurate. Not what should be counted, but when it should be counted. |
| Demonstrate imprecision | Small errors about the amount of something. Minor inaccuracies, arguably within boundaries of permissible rounding. |
| Demonstrate improbability | Arguing that and explaining why a claim is unlikely, implausible or improbable. Highlighting evidence that makes a claim unlikely. Argue how likely an occurrence or explanation is based on historical or other similar cases |
| Demonstrate incoherence | Explaining why a claim doesn’t mean anything significant or anything at all |
| Confirming that something doesn't exist | Demonstrate that an entity that a claim relates to is made up, doesn’t exist |
| Explain why a claim isn't meaningful or insightful | Demonstrate that a claim doesn’t make sense or is insignificant. E.g. misreading significance into some unmeaningful detail, comparing apples with oranges, counting unmeaningful categories |
| Demonstrate specificity or generality | Demonstrate that a claim has been expressed too specifically or generally. Clarify how generally or specifically a claim applies. |
| Demonstrate overgeneralisation | Demonstrate that a claim only applies in limited circumstances or to particular types of things, rather than generally; clarify what the claim does and does not apply to; highlight the circumstances that the claim does not apply in or things that the claim does not apply to |
| Demonstrate overspecification | Demonstrate that a claim applies generally, rather than in particular circumstances or to particular types of things. Or at least applies more generally than the claim suggests |
| Demonstrate that content is fake or misleading | Demonstrate or argue that content is fabricated, manipulated, mislabelled, inauthentic, satire or fiction |
| Argue or confirm that content has been altered or fabricated | Establishing that content has been altered or fabricated through expert testimony or tell-tale signs of fakeness or manipulation; highlight elements of content that indicate it is misinfo. Includes confirming fake news, hoxes, scams, fake subtitles, false endorsements. Confirmation from organisation being mimicked; compare to real media story/authentic content; identify dubious details of hoaxes, scams, or fake endorsements; identify fake journalists. Identify and link to original video, image, audio or webpage content, identify differences; identify and link to v. similar content that depicts the same events, identify differences |
| Confirm and detail what is actually depicted | Identify and demonstrate what content actually depicts (i.e. correcting mislabelling). Identify and link to original video, image, audio or webpage content, identify what it actually depicted; identify and link to v. similar content that depicts same events, identify what is actually depicted. Includes tracing content back to its original source that clearly states it is satire, fiction or art |
| Explain how content may have been fabricated or manipulated | Demonstrate that the tools/resources required to fabricate/manipulate are accessible/available; explain the method through which content was fabricated/manipulated |
| Explain significance | Concerns how an audience should interpret information, how they should feel about it, and whether it has significant implications |
| Demonstrate that something is ordinary or extraordinary | Demonstrate whether a situation is or isn’t out of the ordinary, cause for alarm, unusual or unexpected. Not about prevalence but ordinariness, expectedness, routineness, etc. |
| Demonstrate the scale of something | Size, extent, strength. Including relative to other things or effects, i.e. comparing effects with the effects of other things (e.g. vaccine side effects vs. effects of disease). Where significance is clarified by the (relative) size or prevalence of something (e.g. an effect). Not correcting empirical claims about scale/prevalence, establishing the significance of something by setting it in context. |
| Explain the implications of something | Explain whether something has more general/significant implications; explain how we should interpret a situation. |
| Highlight issues with evidence | State, argue or demonstrate that evidence is non-existent, insufficient, unreliable or misrepresented; focus is on supporting evidence on which claims are based, rather than claims themselves |
| Argue or demonstrate that there is no evidence to support a claim | Point out that the claimant offered no evidence for their claim; state or argue that there is no evidence for a claim; demonstrate that there are no news reports of something occurring (e.g. google search, Nexis database); present testimony stating that there is no or a lack of evidence for a claim |
| Argue that supporting evidence has been misinterpreted or misrepresented | Misunderstandings about what a statistic/figure counts or means. Evidence does not actually support the claim. Claimant suggests or implies their source says something it does not. Focus on evidence offered in support of a claim, rather than misinterpretations of something in general (belong in ‘correct misinterpretations’) |
| Argue that supporting evidence is insufficient | Explain why the evidence offered doesn't prove something; highlighting the difficulty of causal claims. Evidence may be mixed, or situation may be uncertain |
| Argue that supporting evidence is unreliable | Explain why supporting evidence is not reliable; critique the findings or methodology of a study; criticise a dubious piece of evidence; identify evidence as fake; flag evidence published in non-peer-reviewed/predatory/junk journals |
| Highlight or question the authority of actors and processes | Focuses on actors and processes associated with or related to a claim. Question the credibility of actors associated with a claim; demonstrate that a claim is contradicted by expert or regulatory advice; highlight the measures, processes, and authorities in place to prevent an issue |
| Demonstrate that a claim contradicts expert or official advice | Point to expert or regulatory advice that contradicts the claim. Existing expert/official advice, rather than new expert testimony |
| Highlight the measures, processes, and authorities in place to prevent an issue | Point to regulatory or other processes/measure/authorities in place to prevent the claimed occurrence or situation |
| Question the credibility of actors associated with the claim | Explain why actors associated with a claim are not trustworthy or credible; provide reasons to doubt the trustworthiness or credibility of actors making or associated with a claim; claimant or source of claim may have a track-record of sharing misinformation, lack credentials, or be biased in some way |
| Highlight previous fact-checks, clarifications and corrections | Highlight support for a verdict from previous fact-checks or other fact-checkers, or from clarifications and corrections from claim-makers or those closely associated with a claim |
| Link to claim maker acknowledging mistake or offering clarification/correction | Highlight that the claim-maker themselves or someone closely associated with the claim has acknowledged an issue with or clarified some aspect of the claim |
| Link to previous factcheck of same or v similar claim | Demonstrate that other fact-checkers have already checked the claim in question or a very similar claim and reached the same or a similar verdict; includes previous fact-checks published by same organisation |
| Provide important context or information | Provide wider context or significant detail to give a fuller, more accurate account of something |