

Credibility Signals

[Document management note: This document is dynamically merged with a database of details about signals and then appears merged at <https://credweb.org/signals>. Edits here should appear there immediately. Contact sandro@w3.org for details.]

If you make or suggest any edits to this document, you are agreeing to the [W3C Community Contributor License Agreement](#) which has significant copyright and patent implications.

Please also read [1.9. Instructions for editing this document](#) before making any changes.

1. Introduction

1.1. Purpose

This document is intended to support an ecosystem of interoperable credibility tools. These software tools, which may be components of familiar existing systems, will gather, process, and use relevant data to help people more accurately decide what information they can trust online and protect themselves from being misled. We expect that an open data-sharing architecture will facilitate efficient research and development, as well as an overall system which is more visibly trustworthy.

The document has three primary audiences:

1. Software developers and computer science researchers wanting to build systems which work with credibility data. For them, the document aims to be a precise technical specification, stating what they need for their software to interoperate with any other software which conforms to this specification.
2. People who work in journalism and want to review and contribute to this technology sphere, to help make sure it is beneficial and practical.
3. Non-computer-science researchers, interested in helping develop and improve the science behind this work.

In general, we intend for this document to be:

- Welcoming for implementers of systems using credibility data
- Easy for non-tech folks to understand the proposed signals & contribute
- Practical to maintain by the editors
- Practical to contribute to, for a wide audience
- A source of accurate guidance about signal quality and adoption

1.2. Credibility Data

The document builds on concepts and terminology explained in [Technological Approaches to Improving Credibility Assessment on the Web](#). Our basic model is that an entity (human and/or machine) is attempting to make a credibility assessment — to predict whether something will mislead them or others — by carefully examining many different observable features of that thing and things connected with it, as well as information provided by various related or trusted sources.

To simplify and unify this complex situation, with its many different roles, we model the situation as a set of observers, each using imperfect instruments to learn about the situation and then recording their observations using simple declarative statements agreed upon in advance. Because those statements are inputs to a credibility assessment process, we call them **credibility signals**. (The term **credibility indicators** is sometimes also used.)

This document, then, is a guide to these signals. It states what each observer might say and exactly how to say it, along with other relevant information to help people choose among the possible signals and understand what it means when they are used.

Because this is a new and constantly-changing field, we do not simply state which signals should be used. Instead, we list possible signals that one might reasonably consider using, along with information we expect to be helpful in making the decision.

1.3. Example

[explain]

Assessing credibility of <https://news.example/article-1>

Looking at title

I consider it to be clickbait

It's clickbait because it's a cliffhanger

Looking at article

It cites scientific research

Looking at provider

Established in 1974

Owned domain since 2006

1.4. Factors in Selecting Signals

When building systems which use credibility signals and trying to decide which signals to use, there are different factors to weigh. This section is aspirational; we hope this document will in time provide guidance on all these factors.

1.4.1. Measurement Challenges

There are factors about how difficult it is to get an accurate value for the signal:

1. Do people independently observing it get approximately the same value?
2. Do observations vary with the culture, location, language, age, beliefs, etc, of the people doing the observation?
3. Would the same people make the same observation in future months or years?
4. How much time and effort does it take people to make the observation?
5. Do people need to be trained to make this specific observation?
6. What kind of general training do people need (eg a journalism degree) to do it?
7. How do machines compare to humans in making this observation, in terms of cost, quality, types of errors, and susceptibility to being tricked.

Many of these factors can be measured using inter-rater reliability (IRR) techniques. When studies have made such measurements, our intent is to include that data in this document.

Here is a table of the data we have. Excerpts are listed with the relevant signals.

Special: studies-table

1.4.2. Value in Credibility Assessment

Another important set of factors relates to how useful the measurement is in assessing credibility, assuming the observation itself is accurate.

1. Does the signal have a strong correlation to content accuracy, itself determined by consensus among experts?
2. Is it particularly indicative of credibility when used in combination with other signals? (For example, as part of computing the value of a latent variable.)
3. Is it conceptually easy for people to understand?
4. Do professionals in the field think it's likely to be a useful signal?

5. How dependent are these characteristics on the culture or time period being considered?
6. How dependent are these characteristics on the subject matter of the information being assessed for credibility?

1.4.3. Feedback Risks (“Gameability”)

One should also consider how the overall ecosystem of content producers and consumers might be changed by credibility tools adopting the signal. Once attackers see it’s being used, a signal that works well today might stop working, or even be used to make things worse. See [Feedback Risks](#).

1. Is it disproportionately useful for attackers (eg viral call to action) ? If so, making this a negative credibility signal should generally be beneficial
2. Is it disproportionately expensive for attackers (eg journalistic language) ? If so, making this a positive credibility signal should generally be beneficial.
3. Who might get impacted by “friendly fire”? Even if adopting a signal might — on average — harm attackers more than everyone else, certain individuals or communities who have done nothing wrong might be penalized. Tradeoffs must be carefully made, ideally in a consensus process with the impacted people.

1.4.4. Interoperability

The value of sharing signal data depends on how that signal is used by other systems.

1. Are others producing data using this signal?
2. Are there useful data sets available?
3. Are others consuming data, paying attention to reported observations of this signal?
4. Are there tools which work with it, eg running statistics?
5. Is the definition clear and unambiguous, so people using it mean the same thing?
6. Are there clear examples?
7. Is there an open history of commentary, with questions and answers, and issues being addressed by various implementers?
8. Is documentation available in multiple languages?
9. If the definition is under development, how can one participate?

10. If the definition could possibly change, who might change it, and under what circumstances?
11. Are there any intellectual property considerations? See [W3C Patent Policy](#).
12. Is there a test suite / validation system for helping confirm that an implementation is working properly?
13. Are there implementation reports, confirming that tools are functioning properly, according to the testing system? (For an example, see [ActivityPub](#)).

1.5. Publishing Credibility Data

TBD, basically follow schema.org technique using JSON-LD.

1.6. Consuming Credibility Data

TBD, point to some tools and the relevant specs. Basically JSON-LD.

1.7. Organization of this document

Section 1 (“Introduction”) provides instructions for how to use and help maintain this document, along with general background information.

The rest of this document, after the introduction, is a list of signals and information about them, as discussed in the introduction. The signals are organized into related groups, in hierarchical sections. At the lower levels of the hierarchy are the signals themselves, while the higher levels provide grouping of the signals, to help people understand them.

One important level of the hierarchy identifies the **subject type** of the signal. This is the conceptual entity being examined, considered, or inspected, when one makes the observation being recorded in the signal data. This could be imagined in different ways: when you are observing a claim made in the 3rd paragraph of an article published in some newspaper, are you observing the claim, the paragraph, the article, the newspaper, or even the author of the article? In general, we aim for the smallest [granularity](#) that makes sense, which in this case would probably be the claim.

At times, it may not be obvious to which subject type a signal belongs, or it could sensibly belong with several different ones. In this case, it might be moved to a different section in the document as people come to understand it better. When it’s not clear, there should be links from the places a signal could reasonably be to the place it actually is.

This may require discussion, and might remain open for debate. When a signal or group of signals makes sense in two places, consider linking it from the places it isn’t, to help people find it.

In many cases, a signal could be seen as a set of similar signals which are not strictly identical. This can be handled by adding additional signal headings with the finer distinction, when necessary. In this case, template statements might appear under more than one signal.

Note that sections may be moved and renumbered. Do not rely on section numbers remaining the same. For linking to a part of the document, consider using the gdocs h.xxxxxx fragment ids, provided by the Table of Contents; those should remain stable. Also, whenever changing a heading, especially a signal heading, if someone might be referring to it by name, please move the old text into a paragraph starting “Also called:”.

1.8. Template Statements

The most important thing about a signal definition is to be clear what observation the signal data is recording. If the signal heading is “Article length”, does that mean length in words or bytes or characters or some other metric? Does it include the title? For each signal, we want an easy way to communicate its definition that is short but clear, while being as detailed as necessary.

The technique we use here is to express the semantics of the signal using plain and simple sentences in natural language which convey the same knowledge as the signal data. If you imagine people using credibility software exchanging these statements (perhaps in text messages or on Twitter), you should get the right semantics. You can assume metadata, like who sent it and when it was sent is available, so the statements can include terms like “I” and “now”.

For machine-to-machine data Interoperability, these template sentences and the signal heading are turned into a data schema, after which the JSON-LD/schema.org/semantic web/linked data technology stack can be used.

The statements we use are **templates** because they abstract over a variety of similar sentences which differ in specific limited ways. For example, these statements:

1. I have examined the article at <https://example.com/alice> and find it highly credible
2. I have examined the article at <https://example.com/brian> and find it highly credible
3. I have examined the article at <https://example.com/casey> and find it highly credible

are all the same, except in the URL. We convey this using a template statement, which has a **variable** portion in square brackets, like:

- I have examined the article at [subject] and find it highly credible

Tech note	If we (automatically or manually) map this template to a property with the pname :iHaveExaminedHighlyCredible, then the sentence number 2 above would be encoded in turtle as • { <https://example.com/brian> :iHaveExaminedHighlyCredible true }. Alternatively, we could make it a class, but boolean valued properties may be better, so that all signals remain as properties..
-----------	---

The bracketed template expression “[subject]” is required in every template, to indicate what entity is being observed. Additional bracket expressions can be used when there are other elements of the statement to make variable. In particular, [string] (for text in quotes) and [number].

(For now, try to just use those three. Software and documentation is being developed to allow more features. If you find this too restrictive, go ahead and write something else inside the square brackets and we'll deal with it later, but include a question mark so it's clear you knew you were making it up.)

An example needing multiple variables:

1. https://example.com/alice took 4.75 seconds to load, just now.
2. https://example.com/brian took 5.9 seconds to load, just now.

could be matched by:

- [subject] took [number] seconds to load, just now.

1.9. Instructions for editing this document

As an experiment, this document is currently set so everyone can edit it, like Wikipedia. It is the [Google docs version](#) that is editable. We suggest you change the “Editing Mode” to “Suggesting” (using the pencil icon in the upper-right) until you are quite familiar with this document. You may also comment using the usual Google Docs commenting features.

If you make or suggest any edits to this document, you are agreeing to the [W3C Community Contributor License Agreement](#) which has significant copyright and patent implications.

The subsections below give some advice for how to make edits which are helpful.

1.9.1. Expand discussion

Each section should begin with a short introduction written with a neutral point of view, reflecting consensus about why the signal might be useful and what the risks might be. To enable

consensus among a broad community, the intent is for this text to be developed iteratively, with each contributor adding their perspective while respecting what is already present.

Questions and minor concerns should generally be added as annotations using the “Add a Comment” function, without editing the document. If they become issues requiring back-and-forth discussion, they should be turned into github issues and linked from the most relevant place in this document with a paragraph starting “Issue:”

These discussion sections are intended to be nonnormative. That is, they do not say how software using the signal is required to behave for interoperability. The normative content of this specification is the template statements and the mapping of the statements to RDF.

1.9.2. Add new template statements

If you are confident you understand what a signal is intended to measure, and think you can provide a template statement which expresses it more clearly and simply, with little ambiguity, please add a new row to the bottom of the “Proposed template statements” table and add your entry. Please also put the next higher number in the **Key** field for reference, and your name in the **By** field. This “by” field is optional; it is intended to help simplify discussion, telling people who to talk to, and to give some credit. Listing the name of a large group in this field is not particularly useful.

After adding an entry, for a short time (perhaps a few hours, guided by any comments on it) it’s okay to edit it if you change your mind. After that, please leave it, and just add a new row for the new version. You can put new versions in the middle of the table and use keys like 1a.

1.9.3. Add new signals

Once you’re familiar with the structure of this document and all the signals in your area of interest, you may add new signal sections (with a title starting “Signal:” or even new group sections. (For heading numbering, you can use the “Table of contents” add-on from LumApps to number the headers. Or just leave the numbering for someone else using the add-on.)

When you add a new signal, please copy this table to the new section, and then fill in at least one row to clarify what the signal data conveys.

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By

1.10. Contributors

Folks who add content to this document are encouraged to add themselves in this section, potentially with some affiliation & credential information. This also allows the “By” column to stay short, as people can use short forms of names (eg only first or last name, if unique in this doc).

- Entries marked as by “Credibility Coalition” are **prior work** by members of the [Credibility Coalition](#). At the time, individual authorship information was not maintained. Moving forward, specific authorship detail is welcome.
- (add yourself here...)

1.11. Sources

This document is assembled from multiple data sources. They provide both the overall structure of this document and the details about each signal, include definitions, example data, and implementation status. These sources are fetched started with a source list, which appears as the first entry below. In general, text in this document links back to its source with a link-out icon.

The sources used for this current view were:

Special: list-of-sources

2. Subject type: Claim

This section is for signals about claims.

A claim is “an assertion that is open to disagreement; equivalently, a meaningful declarative sentence which is logically either true or false (to some degree); equivalently, a proposition in [propositional logic](#).” [[credweb report](#)]

Claims can be stated (with various decree of clarity) in some content or implied by the content (even non-textual content, like a photograph).

Claims are usually the smallest practical granularity. Credibility data about claims is largely focussed on what other sources have said about that claim, as in fact checking, but could also involve relationships between claims and textual analysis of claim text.

2.1. Claim Review

The “ClaimReview” model developed at schema.org grows out of the tradition of independent, external fact-checking, as in [PolitiFact](#). With this model, a fact-checker reviews a claim, typically made by a public figure, and then publishes a review of that claim, a “claim review”. Within schema.org, this parallels other reviews, like restaurant reviews.

[Can we fit claimreview neatly into this observer/signal model? It’s a bit of a stretch. TBD.]

2.1.1. Signal: Fact-check status of claim

From Section [7.7.1. Signal: Article has a central claim](#), claims in articles according to Credibility Coalition WebConf2018 and more recent studies includes the following values for fact-check results at the time of the study: false, true, unclear, mixed; not finding a fact-check is equivalent to an empty statement.

Interoperability with ClaimReview: This signal seems to relate to <https://schema.org/reviewRating> and bestValue of <https://schema.org/ClaimReview>, with bestValue in this case equal to VERIFIED; further discussion is needed with members of schema.org to confirm.

2.1.2. Signal: Fact-check status of claim — VERIFIED

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The fact-check result by [Venue] of claim [Claim] is that it is TRUE.	CredCo
2	An IFCN signatory did a fact-check and verified claim [Claim].	

2.1.3. Signal: Fact-check status of claim — REFUTED

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The fact-check result by [Venue] of claim [Claim] is that it is FALSE.	CredCo
2	An IFCN signatory did a fact-check and refuted claim [Claim].	CredCo

2.1.4. Signal: Fact-check status of claim — UNCLEAR

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The fact-check result by [Venue] of [Claim] is UNCLEAR.	CredCo

2.1.5. Signal: Fact-check status of claim — MIXED

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The fact-check result by [Venue] of [Claim] is that the claim contains elements that are TRUE and FALSE.	CredCo

2.1.6. Signal: Claim - Risk of Harm

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Claim] is a claim that asserts a risk of harm.	CredCo

Developed for CredCo Political Indicators Study 2018-19. Can be used in connection with [7.2.3. Signal: Generalization/Characterization of Group](#).

2.1.7. Signal: Claim - Coded Meaning

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[ClaimA] is a claim that equals another claim, [ClaimB].	CredCo

Developed for CredCo Political Indicators Study 2018-19. Original example question: “Are there claims that contain phrases, words, or coded language that have taken on a special loaded meaning, in the understanding of the speaker and audience?”, with an example of "go to work," used as code for killing during the Rwandan genocide.

Can be used in connection with [7.2.3. Signal: Generalization/Characterization of Group](#).

2.2. Fact-checking Organization

Signals below [[2.2.1. Signal: Fact-checking Organization commitments — member of the IFCN](#), [2.2.2. Signal: Fact-checking Organization commitments — accuracy and professionalism](#), and [2.2.3. Signal: Fact-checking Organization commitments — unknown](#)] were developed in combination with those under [7.8. Claims in Articles](#), and originally expressed as a question:

If the publication is from a fact-checking organization, what are its commitments to accuracy and other standards?

- A) IFCN Signatory
- B) Not IFCN signatory but organization/institution with similar standards and commitments
- C) Unknown, not discernable

2.2.1. Signal: Fact-checking Organization commitments — member of the IFCN

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
-----	-----------------------------	----

1	[Organization] which published fact-check [Webpage] is a member of the International Fact-Checking Network at Poynter (IFCN). on [date] .	CredCo
---	--	--------

2.2.2. Signal: Fact-checking Organization commitments — accuracy and professionalism

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Organization] has expressed commitments to accuracy and other fact-checking professional standards similar to IFCN organizations.	CredCo
2	[Organization] has expressed commitments to accuracy and other fact-checking professional standards.	CredCo

2.2.3. Signal: Fact-checking Organization commitments — unknown

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Organization]'s commitments to accuracy and other professional standards are unknown.	CredCo

2.3. Explicitly Unverified Claims

From CredCo Political Indicators Study 2018-2019: in some cases, articles may reference claims or pieces of information that do not contain citations or references. In some cases, within an article, an author can make **explicit** reference to a claim that has not been verified, using language that specifies that the claim has not been validated or proven to be true. This includes language in an article explicitly referencing that a claim has not yet been verified to date - but the claim is being mentioned in the article nonetheless.

This is used in connection with [7.7.2. Signal: Article has a claim.](#)

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
-----	-----------------------------	----

1	[Claim] is explicitly unverified, containing language such as “charges have not been proven true.”	CredCo
---	--	--------

3. Subject type: Text

Includes: phrase, sentence, paragraph, document, document fragment

A text, in this sense, is a sequence of words, with the usual punctuation, and sometimes embedded multimedia content or meaningful layout, like tables. That is, it's a document or portion of a document. As examples, a phrase, sentence, paragraph, document section, book chapter, book, and complete book series would typically each count as a text.

Signals here concern properties of the text, itself, separate from how it might be published (eg on a [Web Page](#), on a billboard, spoken at a rally) or where it might be published (in some [Venue](#)). The text should be considered immutable: a text (in this sense) doesn't change. If you take a text and change it, you are making a new text, which needs to be reexamined, to see which observations (and thus which signal data) applies to this other, new text.

Issue: (tech) How to represent texts in RDF? Options include annotation URL with secure hash, annotation object URL with secure hash, data: URI, etc.

3.1. Formality

Texts adopt a tone to appeal to their audience and/or attempt to convey how the text should be used. For instance, an academic study is written in formal, verbose and grammatically correct language, while a listicle is short, informal and often humorous. The academic study uses these characteristics to convey authority, while the listicle is intentionally unauthoritative.

3.1.1. Signal: Formal tone

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Text of [subject article] has a formal tone.	Samantha Sunne

3.1.1.1. Signal: Correct Spelling

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Text of [subject article] has a formal tone, as measured by correct spelling.	Samantha Sunne

3.1.1.2. Signal: Correct Grammar

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Text of [subject article] has a formal tone, as measured by correct grammar.	Samantha Sunne

3.1.2. Signal: Informal tone

Incorrect or colloquial grammar, slang, and humor are some indications of informal tone.

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Text of [subject article] has an informal tone.	Samantha Sunne

3.1.2.1. Signal: Slang

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Text of [subject article] has an informal tone, as measured by slang.	Samantha Sunne

Example sentence: "In this moment we all learned that Johnny Depp isn't a teen and has no clue what "Bae" means." ([Source](#))

3.1.2.2. Signal: Informal grammar

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Text of [subject article] has an informal tone, as measured by incorrect, casual or colloquial grammar.	Samantha Sunne
2	Text of [subject article] has consecutive exclamation points.	Yemile Bucay
3	Text of [subject article] has consecutive question points.	Yemile Bucay
4	Text of [subject article] has ALL CAPS words for emphasis.	Yemile Bucay

Example sentence: "If you're a Friends fan, you probably know that Ross and Rachel's relationship was...kind of a disaster 95% of the time." ([Source](#))

3.2. References or citations

3.2.1. Signal: Uses standardized references or citations

These standards are required and enforced by professions that demand accuracy, and are typically found in highly researched, and therefore more authoritative, texts. Examples: Legal, academic, or scientific citations, e.g., MLA, APA.

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Text of [subject article] uses standardized references or citations.	Samantha Sunne

Example sentence: "Changes in body temperature have long been used as an indicator of injury, inflammation or infection in veterinary medicine (George et al., 2014), however, the use of temperature devices such as rectal thermometers and thermal microchips can be both invasive and time consuming (Johnson et al., 2011)." ([Source](#))

3.2.2. Signal: Uses formal but not standardized references or citations

Examples: Journalism, nonfiction or explanatory material

Some texts use references extensively, even if they are not written according to a rigid structure. These texts tend to be authoritative but not as authoritative as the texts using the rigidly structured citations. The content of the references is also extremely influential.

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Text of [subject article] uses references or citations that are not recorded according to professional standards.	Samantha Sunne

Example sentence: "Families that receive benefits are now over \$2,600 worse off every year, according to an analysis by the Child Poverty Action Group, an advocacy group." ([Source](#))

3.2.3. Signal: Few to zero references or citations

A text with no references to other materials is original content, which often means it is opinion, personal experience, or even fiction. These tend to be less authoritative than texts with references.

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Text of [subject article] has few or no references or citations.	Samantha Sunne

One exception is a first-hand account, which can become a primary document for later research. These personal accounts, however, should be vetted and cross-referenced with other sources to evaluate its accuracy.

Example sentence: "The shrine is the work of SUNY Purchase sophomore Phillip Hosang, who, like a lot of students at the school, had long heard rumors about a secret room in a men's bathroom somewhere in the visual arts building." ([Source](#))

3.3. Pronouns

3.3.1. Signal: Many or multiple instances of the pronouns "I" or "you"

Texts that use the pronouns "I" or "you" are typically opinion, correspondence or personal account. These texts are usually not trying to be authoritative or explanatory, however, they sometimes form a primary document that is used in secondary research.

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Text of [subject article] has many instances of the words "I" or "you."	Samantha Sunne

Example sentence: "After paying close attention to many of your campaigns, I believe you are united by a desire to get things done to help a lot of people who've been left behind." ([Source](#))

3.3.2. Signal: Few or no instances of "I" or "you"

Texts that do not use first or second person are less likely to be opinion content. However, this is no indication of credibility.

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Text of [subject article] has few or no instances of the words "I" or "you."	Samantha Sunne

"President Trump said he would not overrule his acting attorney general, Matthew G. Whitaker, if he decides to curtail the special counsel probe being led by Robert S. Mueller III into Russian interference in the 2016 election campaign." ([Source](#))

3.4. Signal: Vocabulary or reading level

Texts with a wide and varied vocabulary, which may include jargon or uncommon words, is an indicator of formal tone.

3.5. Incivility and impoliteness

3.5.1. Signal: Incivility

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Text of [subject article] contains verbalized threat to democracy, such as a proposal to overthrow democratic government by force or	Tamar Willner

	undemocratic way (e.g. “Obama is a Muslim Agent with Brotherhood Ties. American people must take him down.”)	
2	Text of [subject article] contains stereotypes, such as calling a person a “faggot,” “terrorist,” or “backward” (e.g. “Muslims are terrorist sympathizers”)	Tamar Wilner
3	Text of [subject article] contains threats to people’s individual rights, such as freedom of speech or personal freedom (e.g. “You foolish Republicans better shut up”)	Tamar Wilner

Source: Oz, M., Zheng, P., Chen, G. M., & Park, R. H. (2018). Twitter versus Facebook: Comparing incivility, impoliteness, and deliberative attributes. *New Media & Society*, 20(9), 3400–3419. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1461444817749516>

3.5.2. Signal: Impoliteness

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Text of [subject article] contains words in all capital letters (e.g. “Who flew the planes into the towers on 9/11? ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS!”)	Tamar Willner
2	Text of [subject article] contains profanity (e.g. “hell” and “damn”)	Tamar Wilner
3	Text of [subject article] contain insults or name-calling (e.g. “stupid” or “moron”)	Tamar Wilner

Source: Oz, M., Zheng, P., Chen, G. M., & Park, R. H. (2018). Twitter versus Facebook: Comparing incivility, impoliteness, and deliberative attributes. *New Media & Society*, 20(9), 3400–3419. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1461444817749516>

3.6. Text type

Editor note: This should probably be abstracted to all different types of contents.

3.6.1. Signal: Text type is news

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Text] appears to be news.	Bill Skeet

3.6.2. Signal: Text type is opinion

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Text] appears to be an opinion piece	Bill Skeet
2	[subject article] is self-labeled opinion	Bill Skeet
3	[subject article] URL contains directory name or file name indicating opinion	Bill Skeet

Examples: #2: Opinion, Perspective, Editorial, Commentary, etc.

#3: <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/02/28/opinion/alexandria-ocasio-cortez-cohen-hearing.html>

3.6.3. Signal: Text type is satire

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Text] appears to be a satire piece	Bill Skeet
2	[subject article] is self-labeled satire	Bill Skeet

3	[subject article] URL contains directory name or file name indicating satire	Bill Skeet
4	[source] is self-described satire site	Bill Skeet

Examples: #2: Satire, humor, etc.

#3:

<https://www.newyorker.com/humor/borowitz-report/mueller-says-he-has-obtained-trumps-sat-sc-ores>

#4: <http://www.thedailyrash.com/about> "The Daily Rash is satire! Merely a parody of the life that we watch around us daily. We spoof the famous and not so famous people who fill our lives with beauty and who bring us so much joy. Any similarities between our stories and real life are coincidental. Nothing here is very true."

4. Subject type: Image

Includes: Picture, Photograph, Drawing, Illustration

4.1. Implied association or tone

When pictures of people are used, there are often choices about which image to use, and how to manipulate it, to make the person look better/worse or associate them with some positive or negative concept. Some people have pointed out how media gets to choose, when someone is arrested, whether to use flattering photos provided by supporters or a mug shot provided by the police.

4.1.1. Signal: Flattering image

4.1.2. Signal: Unflattering image

4.2. Originality of Photo Used in an Article

These signals are designed with the assumption that the image is used in the broader context of a journalistic article.

4.2.1. Originality Types

4.2.1.1. Signal: Most Likely Original

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Photo] is mostly likely original.	Megan Duncan

4.2.1.2. Signal: Appears to be a Copy, with Some Modifications

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Photo] appears to be a copy of one or more image, with some portions modified or photoshopped	Megan Duncan

Draft typology of modifications

- Cropping
- Changing the lighting
 - Adding contrast
- Change the colors
- Color saturation
- Merging images
- Object or image has been removed or obscured

4.2.1.3. Signal: Is a copy of a previously published image

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Photo][has been previously published by another source and its origins are not attributed.	Megan Duncan

4.2.1.4. Signal: Is extensively modified from a previously published image

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Photo] has been extensively altered from its original form in a way that changes the meaning.	Megan Duncan

4.2.2. Attribution of Non-Original Photo

- Contains a hashtag
-

5. Subject type: Audio

Also called: Audio Clip, Sound Clip, Audio Recording

5.1. Audio type

Editor note: This should probably be abstracted to all different types of contents.

5.1.1. Signal: Audio type is news

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Audio] appears to be news.	Tamar Wilner

5.1.2. Signal: Audio type is opinion

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Audio] appears to be an opinion piece	Tamar Wilner

5.1.3. Signal: Audio type is advertising or marketing.

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Audio] appears to be advertising or marketing.	Tamar Wilner

5.1.4. Signal: Audio roles - host

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Audio] has an in-studio host.	Tamar Wilner

5.1.5. Signal: Audio roles - reporter

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Audio] has a reporter.	Tamar Wilner

5.1.6. Signal: Audio roles - members of the public

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Audio] has interviews with members of the public.	Tamar Wilner

5.1.7. Signal: Audio roles - experts and/or officials

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Audio] has interviews with expert and/or official sources	Yemile Bucay and Tamar Wilner

5.1.8. Signal: Studio conversation

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Audio] has conversation between host and interviewee who is not a reporter.	Yemile Bucay and Tamar Wilner

5.1.9. Signal: Call-ins

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Audio] has call-ins from members of the public.	Yemile Bucay and Tamar Wilner

5.1.10. Signal: Studio

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Audio] sounds like it was at least partially recorded in a studio.	Yemile Bucay and Tamar Wilner

5.1.11. Signal: Outside

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Audio] sounds like it was at least partially recorded outdoors.	Yemile Bucay and Tamar Wilner

5.2. Signal: Station/company identification

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Station or company that produced the [audio] is identified.	Tamar Wilner

5.3. Signal: Host/reporter identification

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Host of [audio] identifies themselves.	Tamar Wilner
2	Reporter of [audio] identifies themselves	Tamar Wilner

5.4. Signal: Quoted individuals are identified.

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Individuals quoted in [audio] are identified by name.	Tamar Wilner
2	Individuals quoted in [audio] are identified by affiliation, if being quoted in a professional capacity.	Tamar Wilner

5.5. Signal: Attribution

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Audio] does not include attribution for the claims made.	Tamar Wilner

5.6. Rhetoric

5.6.1. Signal: Proportional rhetoric

Editor: These should go to some category that includes both text and audio and video.
Linguistic content.

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The rhetoric used in [audio] is proportional to the event or situation described.	Tamar Wilner, adapting Credibility Coalition

5.6.2. Signal: Extreme Exaggerating Rhetoric

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The rhetoric used in [audio] is an extreme exaggeration of the event or situation described.	Tamar Wilner, adapting Credibility Coalition

5.6.3. Signal: Extreme Minimizing Rhetoric

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The rhetoric used in [audio] is an extreme minimization of the event or situation described.	Tamar Wilner, adapting Credibility Coalition

5.7. Emotional valence

5.7.1. Signal: Extremely negative valence

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The language of the reporter or main speaker in the [audio] is extremely negative.	Tamar Wilner, adapting Credibility Coalition

5.7.2. Signal: Extremely positive valence

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The language of the reporter or main speaker in the [audio] is extremely positive.	Tamar Wilner, adapting Credibility Coalition

5.7.3. Signal: Neutral valence

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The language of the reporter or main speaker in the [audio] is neutral.	Tamar Wilner, adapting Credibility Coalition

5.8. Sound quality

5.8.1. Signal: Clear speech

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	There is audio distortion making speech in the [audio] difficult to understand.	Yemile Bucay and Tamar Wilner

5.9. Music

5.9.1. Signal: Emotional music

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The [audio] contains music that appears designed to manipulate listener emotions.	Yemile Bucay and Tamar Wilner

5.9.2. Signal: Loud music

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The [audio] contains music loud enough to make speech difficult to hear.	Tamar Wilner

6. Subject type: Video

Also called: Video Clip, Video Recording, Movie

6.1. Signal: Video type is news

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Video] appears to be news.	Tamar Wilner

6.1.1. Signal: Video type is opinion

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Video] appears to be an opinion piece	Tamar Wilner

6.1.2. Signal: Video type is advertising or marketing.

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Video] appears to be advertising or marketing.	Tamar Wilner

6.2. Signal: Station/company identification

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Station or company that produced the [video] is identified.	Tamar Wilner

6.3. Signal: Host/reporter identification

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
-----	-----------------------------	----

1	Host of [video] identifies themselves.	Tamar Wilner
2	Reporter of [video] identifies themselves	Tamar Wilner

6.4. Signal: Quoted individuals are identified.

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Individuals quoted in [video] are identified by name.	Tamar Wilner
2	Individuals quoted in [video] are identified by affiliation, if being quoted in a professional capacity.	Tamar Wilner

6.5. Signal: Attribution

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Video] does not include attribution.	Tamar Wilner

6.6. Rhetoric

6.6.1. Signal: Proportional rhetoric

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The rhetoric used in [video] is proportional to the event or situation described.	Tamar Wilner, adapting Credibility

		Coalition
--	--	-----------

6.6.2. Signal: Extreme Exaggerating Rhetoric

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The rhetoric used in [video] is an extreme exaggeration of the event or situation described.	Tamar Wilner, adapting Credibility Coalition

6.6.3. Signal: Extreme Minimizing Rhetoric

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The rhetoric used in [video] is an extreme minimization of the event or situation described.	Tamar Wilner, adapting Credibility Coalition

6.7. Emotional valence

6.7.1. Signal: Extremely negative valence

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The language of the reporter or main speaker in the [video] is extremely negative.	Tamar Wilner, adapting Credibility Coalition

6.7.2. Signal: Extremely positive valence

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The language of the reporter or main speaker in the [video] is extremely positive.	Tamar Wilner, adapting Credibility Coalition

6.7.3. Signal: Neutral valence

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The language of the reporter or main speaker in the [video] is neutral.	Tamar Wilner, adapting Credibility Coalition

6.8. On-screen text

Relates to all on-screen text including chyrons, attributions...?

Signals for identification of quoted individuals; rhetoric; valence; what else?

CHYRON DISAGREEMENT WITH AUDIO

6.9. Images

6.9.1. Moving images

Video or film.

Signals for valence, what else?

6.9.2. Data graphics

6.9.2.1. Signal: Attribution

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Video] data graphic does not include attribution.	Tamar Wilner

6.9.2.2. Signal: Graph Y-axis does not start at zero.

Issue: Should graphic display of data get their own subject-category? Charts? Cf Tufte

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Video] data graphic y-axis starts at a number other than zero..	Tamar Wilner

6.9.3. Still photography

6.9.3.1. Signal: Attribution

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Video] still photography does not include attribution.	Tamar Wilner

6.9.4. Other graphics

Signals for rhetoric, valence, what else?

6.10. Music

Signals for valence and drama/exaggeration?

7. Subject type: Article

Includes: News Story, News Article, Scientific Paper, Blog Post

An article is a collection of information intended to convey some information, usually factual, usually created by one or more identifier people, and usually released at a specific point in time in some venue. It consists of elements like a body, a title, a publication date, and an author list. Unlike Texts, where any change makes it a different Text, an Article may be revised over time and still be considered the same Article (albeit a different version). Usually only minor changes are socially appropriate, however. Consumers of credibility data may need to be cautious of which version an observation applies to.

If an article appears on a web page, or in a portion of a web page, we can use its URL to identify the article.

Differentiation between Article and Text. Consider whether the signal data would be the same if the text were moved to a different article, perhaps published in a different venue, with a different title, at a different time, and with other text before or after it in some article. If the observation would be the same, then the signal is a property of the text, not the article. In that case it be in [3. Subject type: Text](#) not here.

7.1. Originality

7.1.1. Originality Types

7.1.1.1. Signal: Most Likely Original

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Text of [subject article] is mostly likely original.	Credibility Coalition

7.1.1.2. Signal: Appears to be a Copy, with Some Different Portions

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
-----	-----------------------------	----

1	Text of [subject article] appears to be a copy of one or more articles, with some portions different or remixed	Credibility Coalition
---	---	---------------------------------------

7.1.1.3. Signal: Quotes Extensively From Another Source

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Text of [subject article] quotes extensively from another source, with some original content	Credibility Coalition

7.1.1.4. Signal: Wholesale Duplicate

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Text of [subject article] is a wholesale duplicate of another article	Credibility Coalition

7.1.2. Attribution of Non-Original Content

These signals assume that the content has already been flagged as not original.

7.1.2.1. Signal: Attribution Given and Accurate

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[subject article] includes accurate attribution, pointing to the original.	Credibility Coalition

7.1.2.2. Signal: Attribution Given and Inaccurate

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[subject article] includes inaccurate attribution.	Credibility Coalition

7.1.2.3. Signal: Attribution Not Given

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[subject article] does not include attribution.	Credibility Coalition

7.1.2.4. Signal: Unclear Which is Original

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[subject article] is a copy, but it is unclear which is the original.	Credibility Coalition

7.1.3. Personal Perspective

These signals help parse author perspective on the content of the article.

7.1.3.1. Signal: Article contains personal perspective on lived experience

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[subject article] includes “I” statements AND recounts personal lived experience	Alex Shave

2	[subject article] includes “I” statements and does NOT recount personal lived experience	Alex Shave
---	--	------------

7.1.3.2. “I” statements can signal author conjecture or personal experience. The former may be more likely to contain misinformation while the latter is necessary to recount first-hand research.

7.2. Language and Rhetoric

To-do: Move Rhetoric to a different bucket, not Article.

7.2.1. Rhetorical Proportionality

7.2.1.1. Signal: Proportional Rhetoric

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The rhetoric used in [Text] is proportional to the event or situation described.	Credibility Coalition

7.2.1.2. Signal: Extreme Exaggerating Rhetoric

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The rhetoric used in [Text] is an extreme exaggeration of the event or situation described.	Credibility Coalition

7.2.1.3. Signal: Extreme Minimizing Rhetoric

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The rhetoric used in [Text] is an extreme exaggeration of the event or situation described.	Credibility Coalition

7.2.2. Signal: Emotional Valence

Could be measured by VADER (Valence Aware Dictionary and sEntiment Reasoner) Natural Language Processing library

7.2.2.1. Signal: Extremely Negative Valence

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The language in [Text] is extremely negative.	Credibility Coalition

7.2.2.2. Signal: Extremely Positive Valence

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The language in [Text] is extremely positive.	Credibility Coalition

7.2.2.3. Signal: Neutral Valence

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The language in [Text] is neutral.	Credibility Coalition

7.2.3. Signal: Polarizing Language

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
-----	-----------------------------	----

1	[Text] uses language such as “pro” and “anti,” signaling a division into two sharply contrasting groups or sets of opinions or beliefs.	Credibility Coalition
---	---	-----------------------

Developed for CredCo Political Indicators Study 2018-19. Taken from the [Oxford Living Dictionary’s definition of polarization](#) as the “division into two sharply contrasting groups or sets of opinions or beliefs.” Can be used in combination with [7.8. Claims in Articles](#).

7.2.4. Signal: Generalization/Characterization of Group

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Text] in [Content-Object] characterizes a group or groups of people along lines that explicitly differentiate them from others.	Credibility Coalition

Developed for CredCo Political Indicators Study 2018-19. This can apply to situations in which the author is associated with the defined group or defining an external group. Can be used in combination with [7.8. Claims in Articles](#) and other “Content-Objects.”

7.2.5. Signal: Dehumanization

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Text] equates a human individual or group(s) as insects, bacteria, despised animals, cancer — less than human beings.	Credibility Coalition

Developed for CredCo Political Indicators Study 2018-19. See <https://dangerousspeech.org/about-dangerous-speech/>.

7.2.6. Signal: Exhortation

This signal is meant to capture exhortations, or “[an address or communication emphatically urging someone to do something](#).”

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Text] is an address that exhorts, or urges someone to do something.	Credibility Coalition

7.2.7. Signal: Call to Violence

This signal is meant to capture a call to violence. Perhaps also expressed as part of 'Dangerous Speech': “ any form of expression (speech, text, or images) that can increase the risk that its audience will condone or participate in violence against members of another group” (see <https://dangerousspeech.org/about-dangerous-speech/>).

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Text] contains language that can be understood as a call to violence or seems harmful.	Credibility Coalition

Developed for CredCo Political Indicators Study 2018-19.

7.2.8. Signal: Call to Action (Political)

This signal is meant to capture a textual call to action, not to be confused with a marketing call to action [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Call_to_action_\(marketing\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Call_to_action_(marketing)). Sometimes, these calls to action are also associated with requests for enacting/executing an action as an expression of one's loyalty, identity, or affiliation.

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Text] contains language that can be understood as a political call to action, which requests readers to follow-through with a particular task, or tells readers what to do such as: signing online petitions, joining a mailing list, giving donations, voting, protesting, boycotting.	Credibility Coalition

Developed for CredCo Political Indicators Study 2018-19.

7.3. Logic/Reasoning

7.3.1. Types of Bias

7.3.1.1. Signal: Confirmation Bias

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Text of [article title] contains examples of	text.

7.4. Outbound References

7.4.1. Source Types

7.4.1.1. Signal: No Source Type Cited

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	There is no source cited in [subject article].	Credibility Coalition

7.4.1.2. Signal: Domain Expert Cited

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	There is an expert cited in [subject article].	Credibility Coalition

7.4.1.3. Signal: Study Cited

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	There is a study cited in [subject article].	Credibility Coalition

7.4.1.4. Signal: Unaffiliated Expert Cited about Study

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	There is an unaffiliated expert cited about [study] in [subject article].	Stefan Luca

This I believe is the best practice in reporting on scientific studies.

7.4.1.5. Signal: Organization Cited

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	There is an organization cited in [subject article].	Credibility Coalition

7.4.1.6. Signal: Other Type of Source Cited

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	There is another type of sourced cited in [subject article].	Credibility Coalition

7.4.1.7. Signal: Anonymous Sources Cited

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	One or more anonymous sources are cited in [subject article].	Credibility Coalition

7.4.1.8. Signal: Single Anonymous Sources Materially Cited

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	A single anonymous source is materially cited in [subject article].	Credibility Coalition

Would the interpretation of the article be substantively different without the single anonymous source.

7.4.1.9. Signal: Anonymous Sources Materially Cited

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	One or more anonymous sources are materially cited in [subject article].	Credibility Coalition

7.4.1.10. Signal: Multiple Anonymous Sources Materially Cited

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	More than one anonymous sources are materially cited in [subject article].	Credibility Coalition

7.4.1.11. Signal: Multiple Anonymous Sources are Cited in Corroboration for Information

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	More than one anonymous sources are corroboratively cited in providing information for [subject article].	Credibility Coalition

Is more than one source cited for information?

7.4.1.12. Signal: Motivation of Anonymous Source Wanted Anonymity is Given

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The motivation of the anonymous sources to be anonymous is given in [subject article].	Credibility Coalition

7.4.1.13. Signal: Documents are Cited in the Article

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Documents are cited in [subject article].	Credibility Coalition

7.4.1.14. Signal: Documents Cited in the Article Are Made Available in Publication

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Documents cited in [subject article] are also made available in publication.	Credibility Coalition

7.4.2. Signal: Contains Link to Scientific Journals

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	There is a link provided in [subject article] to where the original content came from.	Credibility Coalition

7.4.3. Signal: Accuracy of representation of source article

Also called: Representative Citations

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[subject article] properly characterizes the methods and conclusions of the original source.	Credibility Coalition
2a	This article properly characterizes the methods and conclusions of the cited or quoted source (Source 1).	Zhang18 text
2b	This article properly characterizes the methods and conclusions of the cited or quoted source (Source 2).	Zhang18 alternate text
2c	This article properly characterizes the methods and conclusions of the cited or quoted source (Source 3).	Zhang18 alternate text

7.4.4. Signal: Academic Journal Impact Factor

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
-----	-----------------------------	----

1	The impact factor of the journal or conference cited is [number].	Credibility Coalition
---	---	-----------------------

7.4.4.1. Signal: Academic Journal Impact Factor Cannot Be Found

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The impact factor of the journal or conference cited cannot be found.	Credibility Coalition

7.7. Article/Site Metadata

7.7.1. Signal: Subhed/Dek

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	A “dek” is a subhed in journalism that appears below the headline of an article, usually in a smaller font (but in a larger font than the main body of the article). It typically summarizes the article or highlights a main point from the article.	George

7.8. Claims in Articles

Although there is a separate section for Claims [[2. Subject type: Claim](#)], this section deals with the case when the analysis of one or more claims within an article is made to signify something about the article itself. [Probably could use an introductory paragraph on different levels/objects once those are clarified, since this translation is taking place for a number of projects, consider articles to domains/publishers.]

In the following signals, an assumption is made on the existence of a central claim of the article that is recognizable.

7.8.1. Signal: Article has a central claim

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The central claim in [Article] is [Claim].	CredCo
2	There is a central claim in [Article].	CredCo

The first version of this signal was used in Credibility Coalition's WebConf2018 study in which it was expressed as a question with multiple choice answers as follows:

Has the central claim in this article been fact-checked by an IFCN Verified Signatory?

- A) Most likely not fact-checked by an IFCN Verified Signatory
- B) Most likely not fact-checked by an approved source
- C) Fact-checked and determined false
- D) Fact-checked and determined true
- E) Fact-checked with unclear results
- F) Fact-checked with mixed results

It was initially deprecated due to the recognition of a number of valuable fact-checking efforts that are not IFCN Signatories, but then has remained with a change to its options as follows:

Does the article rely on a claim that has been fact-checked by a member of the International Fact Checking Network (IFCN)? If so, has it been debunked?

- A) The article was fact-checked and determined false
- B) The article was fact-checked and determined true
- C) The article was fact-checked with unclear results
- D) The article was fact-checked with mixed results
- E) The article was most likely not fact-checked by an IFCN member

To express these questions as signals, combine with the signals related to fact-checking organization, see section [2.2. Fact-checking Organization](#) and [2.1. Claim Review](#) above.

7.8.2. Signal: Article has a claim

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	[Claim] is a claim in [Article].	CredCo

8. Subject type: Title

Also called: Headline

A Title is an immutable association of an Article and some short Text which is typically presented first. When a Title text changes, that's a different Title. An article may have many different titles at different points in time and in different contexts, although social practice is usually against this.

The same title text may used for many different articles, but those are considered different Titles here. For example, many of the signals about a Title with the text, “Local man dies”, will depend on which Article it's associated with.

8.1. Quality

These are general quality signals, not containing many details about why something might be high or low quality.

8.1.1. Clickbait

A measure of how much the title of the article conforms to a predetermined set of clickbait genres. See also specific signals below that might be considered kinds of clickbait, like “Listicle”.

8.1.1.1. Signal: Listicle

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Title is a listicle (“6 Tips on ...”)	Credibility Coalition

8.1.1.2. Signal: Cliffhanger

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
-----	-----------------------------	----

1	Title is a cliffhanger (“You Won’t Believe What Happens Next”, “Man Divorces His Wife After Overhearing This Conversation”)	Credibility Coalition
---	---	-----------------------

8.1.1.3. Signal: Provoking emotions

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Title provokes emotions (“...Shocking Result”, “...Leave You in Tears”)	Credibility Coalition

8.1.1.4. Signal: Curiosity Gap (Hidden Secret or Trick)

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Title creates a curiosity gap through a hidden secret or trick (“Fitness Companies Hate Him...”, “Experts are Dying to Know Their Secret”, “You’ll never guess...”)	Credibility Coalition

8.1.1.5. Signal: Challenge to the Ego

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Title contains challenges to the ego (“Only People with IQ Above 160 Can Solve This”)	Credibility Coalition

8.1.1.6. Signal: Defying Convention

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
-----	-----------------------------	----

1	Title defies convention (“Think Orange Juice is Good for you? Think Again!”, “Here are 5 Foods You Never Thought Would Kill You”)	Credibility Coalition
---	---	-----------------------

8.1.1.7. Signal: Inducing Fear

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Title induces fear (“Is Your Boyfriend Cheating on You?”)	Credibility Coalition

8.2. Misleading about content

8.2.1. Signal: Title Representativeness

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Title is representative of the content of the article.	Credibility Coalition

See also specific signals below that encapsulate what might be considered unrepresentative.

8.2.1.1. Signal: Differs from body topic

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Title differs from the primary content of the article body.	Credibility Coalition

8.2.1.2. Signal: Emphasizes different information than the body topic

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Title emphasizes different information from the primary content of the article body.	Credibility Coalition

8.2.1.3. Signal: Carries little information about the body

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Title carries little information about the primary content of the article body.	Credibility Coalition

8.2.1.4. Signal: Takes a different stance than the body

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Title takes a different stance from the primary content of the article body.	Credibility Coalition

8.2.1.5. Signal: Overstates claims or conclusions in the body

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Title over states claims or conclusions from the primary content of the article body.	Credibility Coalition

8.2.1.6 Signal: Understates claims or conclusions in the body

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Title understates claims from the primary content of the article body.	Credibility Coalition

8.3. Misleading about the world

8.4. Non-misleading consumer manipulation

8.5. Title Characteristics

9. Subject type: Web Page

9.1. Layout

Issue: Should this be a Heading1 like Title? Probably no, because the statements naturally get phrased with the subject of the statements being a web page. Most people wouldn't conceptualize the page layout as its own entity.

9.1.1. Signal: Framed with navigation

Also called: topnav, sidenav, framenav

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
-----	-----------------------------	----

1	[subject] has obvious navigation elements at one or more edges of the content, providing a way to reach other content on the same website	Sandro Hawke (as example)
2	[subject] has a prominent top or side menu structure or buttons or links, taking user to other parts of site	Sandro Hawke (as example)

(Consensus discussion including benefits and risks goes here)

(External data from studies and implementation reports gets inserted here, matched by heading text, “also called” text, and the template text.)

9.1.2. Signal: Number of images accompanying story

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	Article page contains [number] of images to illustrate story	Jessica J

9.2. Typefaces

9.3. Metadata in transmission headers

9.4. Metadata in page head

9.5. Metadata inline in body

10. Subject type: Website

10.1. Markup

- Use of AMP, and other things that help SEO might be faster adopted by attackers

10.1.1. Signal: HTML Standard Version

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	As of [date], the domain has implemented HTML [version number].	Trust Metrics

10.2. Advertisements

10.2.1. Signal: Ads.txt Exists

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The domain contains an ads.txt file.	Credibility Coalition

10.2.2. Signal: Spam or Clickbait Advertisements

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The page of the article has spammy or clickbaity advertisements. This is limited to a subjective assessment at this time.	Credibility Coalition

10.2.3. Signal: Number of Advertisements

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
-----	-----------------------------	----

1	The number of ads that appear on [subject article] is [number]. This includes display ads, content recommendation engines, sponsored content and call for social sharing	Credibility Coalition
---	--	-----------------------

10.2.4. Signal: Aggressive Advertisements

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The page of the article has aggressive advertisements. This is limited to a subjective assessment at this time.	Credibility Coalition
2	The text of the article links to products.	Yemile Bucay

10.2.5. Signal: There is false advertising

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The domain contains advertisements for false products.	AXM - Testing/Demo

10.3. Identification

10.3.1. Signal: 'About Us' page exists

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The domain has a clear 'About Us' page with details and description about itself.	Trust Metrics

10.3.2. Signal: Contact information exists

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The domain has provided means to contact staff.	Trust Metrics

11. Subject type: Aggregation

Includes: news feed, content portal, site using syndicated content

An aggregation is a collection of content from other providers. As such, attribution and related trust issues require special consideration.

11.1. Signal: Provider Identified

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The provider of each content piece is clearly displayed.	Bitpress

11.1.1. Signal: Provider Bias Identified

Key	Proposed Template Statement	By
1	The aggregator displays an indicator of the provider's bias.	Bitpress

12. Subject type: Venue

A Venue is a branded content channel, which might be separable from the provider of that channel. For instance a particular newspaper's "Lifestyle" and "Sports" sections would typically

be considered distinct Venues with distinct reputations. In this case, they would be sub-Venues of the newspaper itself.

The distinction between Venue and Provider is not always clear in people's mind; it is essentially the distinction between a brand and the brand's owner. We try to make the distinction in order to be able to understand the impacts on reputation when, for example, one company sells a content brand to another company.

13. Subject type: Provider

14. Subject type: Creator

Also called: author, writer, reporter, byline

A Creator (in this context) is a Person is a person who creates content, such as by writing articles. All the signals which apply to a Person also apply to a Creator. Signals are listed here if they only really make sense for content creators. Even if every Person was a Creator, this grouping could still be convenient.

15. Subject type: Person

15.1. Good Faith

- [subject] acts in good faith in their online interactions

15.2. Self-Assessment

- [subject] accurately characterizes their confidence in what they post online
- Use of "ethos"

15.3. Domain Expertise

- Statements from [subject] about [topic] are true [percent] of the time.

15.4. Affiliation

-

15.5. History

Other

- This person uses logos
- This person uses pathos
- This person generally uses ethos in argument
- Is a recognized expert in the field of [...]

16. Subject type: Organization

17. Subject type: Testing

Using this section to help migrate over signals from other spaces.

18. To Be Categorized

- Comparative indicators (as per BitPress): “[article1] and [article2] describe the same event in a significantly different way”. Something like that. For example:
 - [article1] includes an important claim [claim] that [article2] omits when describing the same topic
- But that could be done as “[article1] describing event [event] makes claims [claim]”

Special: other-signals

Special: end-of-content

If you make or suggest any edits to this document, you are agreeing to the [W3C Community Contributor License Agreement](#) which has significant copyright and patent implications.

Please also read [1.9. Instructions for editing this document](#) before making any changes.