How do we rate?

What is a “factcheck”?

Factcheck means verifying the truth of politicians’ factual statements. We only analyze verbal claims of politicians, i.e. based on facts in various forms, be it momentary information, actions of the given person during his speech, statements, etc., on internal events.

How do we select content to verify?

We generally verify two types of content:

- Discussions, speeches, interviews and their parts, which includes a number of factual statements;
- Individual statements usually found on social networks, Twitter, Facebook or Instagram.

When we verify a longer article, e.g. a segment in a policy debate, we select from it all factual statements made by politicians in addition to readable subsections and obvious things. Therefore, we do not only select statements that we consider important, and among the verified statements will also be those that some readers will consider biased, however, we do not exclude them from verification in order to assure impartiality and objectivity even in the selection of statements.

In the publication, we also include a selection of controversial claims, which are considered factual (based on facts), but to which it was not possible to find any public source that would confirm or negate the given claim (or more details, see from us elsewhere).

When we select individual statements from social networks for verification, and also when we choose which discussion, speech or interview in which part of them we will focus on, we proceed according to the following principles:

- **relevance**: we try to identify approximately equal importance in all parliamentary parties and movements, or at least the similar importance of candidates with significant support. We make no exception for government parties and leaders, which we verify very often due to their higher level of responsibility.

- **relevance of content**: in this case, we focus on the most interesting political topics published in the selected final form. So we do not follow the general topics of the states, including topics that are specific to individual parties. We don't verify discussions on topics that don't have political supervision, or are relevant at the time of publication, and focus on topics relevant at the moment of publication.

- **verifiability of content**: here we have an interesting discussion with representatives of parties that we have not covered in long term, it may still happen that there will be no verifiable content from party lists. However, debates take place annually at all levels of politics, and they do not lead themselves to verification.

Our selection of statements to verify ultimately depends on the availability and quality of the content, and thus will never be perfect. Therefore, we welcome recommendations and criticism for evaluation and selection.

What does the Demagog.cz project not evaluate?

1. Optimistic political statements and evaluative judgments that are not based on clear and verifiable facts. It is up to the listener to decide whether the statements agree with them.
2. Predictions of the future, e.g. government's actions in that it will cut employment growth. We consider predictions only if the goal is to assess their reliability (or unreliability), and such forecasts cannot be assessed before the predicted event (which is not clear).
3. Banalities (“I have ideas for this position,” generally known facts) or the Czech Republic is a member of the EU” and similar. Everyone in the Czech Republic knows who, why and when the country joined the EU.

How do we evaluate statements?

For the final evaluation of the statement, we use six basic categories:

- **Falsity**: These claims are not consistent with publicly available numbers or information about any actor or action. These claims can also be based on the analysis of statements of the given indicator category, but the number or statement in question is not confirmed by any of these sources.

- **Truth**: The claim is based on statements that are not falsifiable. If the statement is not false, it is not a claim on a logical level. The fact that the statement is not falsifiable, and the statement itself is not shown to be false or falsifiable.

- **Wordiness**: The statement is not clear and does not contain the necessary information to make a judgement about the claim. The statement is wordy, using words that do not add value to the claim.

- **Accuracy**: The statement is not based on facts. The statement is factual, and the facts are not based on reliable sources or are not factually accurate.

- **Verifiability**: The statement is based on a reliable source, and the source is verifiable. The statement is based on a reliable source, but the source is not verifiable.

- **Stability**: The statement is not supported by evidence. The statement is not supported by evidence, and the evidence is not reliable.

In such cases, the statement would already be evaluated on falsity, even if it were within the 15% threshold, since the speaker here is misleading someone else, and the statement cannot be refuted as an acceptable statement.

When evaluating, we take into account whether the speaker’s statement is formulated in a way that makes the statement false or unclear. The implementation of this criterion ensures that the claim is not based on clear and verifiable facts, and that the claim is not based on facts. The implementation of this criterion ensures that the claim is not based on clear and verifiable facts, and that the claim is not based on facts. The implementation of this criterion ensures that the claim is not based on clear and verifiable facts, and that the claim is not based on facts.