

# Fact Checking websites serving as public evidence-monitoring services: Some sources

## Description

[Tweet](#)

These services seem to be getting more attention lately, so I thought it would be worthwhile compiling a list of some of the kinds of fact checking websites that exist, and how they work.

Fact checkers have the potential to influence policies at all stages of the policy development and implementation process, not by promoting particular policy positions based on evidence, but by policing the boundaries of what should be considered as acceptable as factual evidence. They are responsive rather than pro-active.

### International

- [International Fact-Checking Network \(IFCN\)](#) is covering
  - Research trends and formats in fact-checking worldwide
  - Provide online and offline training resources for fact-checkers
  - Occasionally lead collaborative efforts in international fact checking, such as the [“Relay-Check”](#) on refugees in the European Union.
  - And the host Poynter.org says it will investigate
    - Using technology to turbo-power fact-checking.
    - Measuring the impact of fact-checkers
    - Funding fact-checking.
    - The ethics of fact-checking
  - [Duke Reporters Lab](#) keeps a count of [active and inactive fact checking services here](#)
  - Aggregators:
    - [FACT CHECK CENTRAL](#)

### American websites

- [PolitiFact](#) PolitiFact is a fact-checking website that rates the accuracy of claims by elected officials and others who speak up in American politics.
- [Fact Check](#) They monitor the factual accuracy of what is said by major U.S. political players in the form of TV ads, debates, speeches, interviews and news releases.
- [Media Bias / Fact Check](#) claims to be the most comprehensive media bias resource on the internet, but content is mainly American

### Australia

- [ABC TV Fact Check](#)
- [The Conversation Fact Check](#)
  - [How it works](#) [Rick Davies comment: This looks like an example of good practice]
  - [Accreditation](#) by International Fact-Checking Network at Poynter (March 21, 2017)

- [FactCheck One Nation](#): Focuses on the statements of one political party in Australia (June 2016). This looks like an example of bad practice, since its selectivity does not suggest impartiality

United Kingdom

- [Full Fact](#)
- [Channel 4 FactCheck](#)

Discussions of the role of fact checkers

- Vox: [Fact-checking groups are about to become Facebook's fake news cops. That won't be easy.](#) (Dec 2016)
- Forbes: [The Daily Mail Snopes Story And Fact Checking The Fact Checkers](#) (Dec 2016)
- Daily Kos: [Fact Checking Websites: Pros and Cons](#) (Dec 2016)
- [366 links to understand fact-checking in 2016](#) (Dec 2016)
- [Google introduces fact checking feature intended to help people see whether news is actually true](#) (Oct? 2016)

A related item, just seen?

- [This site is taking the edge off rant mode](#) by making readers pass a factual knowledge quiz before commenting. If everyone can agree that this is what the article says, then they have a much better basis for commenting on it.

**Update 20/03/2017:** Read Tim Harford's blog posting on [The Problem With Facts](#) ([pdf copy here](#)), and communication value of eliciting curiosity

## Category

1. Website

## Date

30/04/2026

## Date Created

02/03/2017

## Author

admin