

---

Subject: Re: An Objective Look at Media Bias  
Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Mon, 27 Feb 2006 01:11:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Sun, 26 February 2006 11:35An objective report on the bias of guests on Sunday morning talk shows.

How is this study objective?

[http://mediamatters.org/about\\_us/](http://mediamatters.org/about_us/)

Quote:Media Matters for America is a Web-based, not-for-profit, 501(c)(3) progressive research and information center dedicated to comprehensively monitoring, analyzing, and correcting conservative misinformation in the U.S. media.

Launched in May 2004, Media Matters for America put in place, for the first time, the means to systematically monitor a cross section of print, broadcast, cable, radio, and Internet media outlets for conservative misinformation — news or commentary that is not accurate, reliable, or credible and that forwards the conservative agenda — every day, in real time.

Using the website [www.mediamatters.org](http://www.mediamatters.org) as the principal vehicle for disseminating research and information, Media Matters posts rapid-response items as well as longer research and analytic reports documenting conservative misinformation throughout the media. Additionally, Media Matters works daily to notify activists, journalists, pundits, and the general public about instances of misinformation, providing them with the resources to rebut false claims and to take direct action against offending media institutions.

They don't make any claims to being objective at all. They are looking for any instance they can find of "conservative misinformation" while ignoring any "progressive misinformation".

Personally, I don't agree with who they fit into the "red" and "blue" categories. John McCain may be republican, but he's a moderate. I might make the same consideration for Joe Lieberman as well, he tends to be more moderate than liberal. Chuck Hagel seems to make the news whenever he's against Bush, so I'm not sure he should be in the "red" column either.

I think what's really missing from here is what were the guests there to talk about? Just getting labeled as one side or the other doesn't really say anything. It's more about what was being discussed on the particular show that day. Several of the guests they list often oppose what the majority of their party is doing, so it isn't fair to say they are representing their party that day. Not only does this study take a small, unrepresentative sample of guests, it leaves out the individual issues, who was supporting what on which day or how often, and how much time they actually had to present their views. Then you might also have to compile statistics on the views of the reporters/journalists running these shows. How were things presented, were the topics stated from a neutral stand point or a biased one, etc.

---