
Subject: An Objective Look at Media Bias
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 26 Feb 2006 16:35:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

An objective report on the bias of guests on Sunday morning talk shows.

By the way, before you try to refute this study, read this because attempted right wing smears of this study are listed so you don't have to look too stupid.

Subject: Re: An Objective Look at Media Bias
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 26 Feb 2006 18:37:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

After reading some of that, I have come to the conclusion that the reasoning behind it is that people don't want to listen to people from the left or because they are so freaking crazy networks don't to risk their stupidity on live television.

Subject: Re: An Objective Look at Media Bias
Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Sun, 26 Feb 2006 21:59:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Regardless of whether the media is "biased" or not, it doesn't matter, because the bias is not severe enough to actually change peoples' opinions. People only allow the media to reinforce their beliefs, not change them.

Subject: Re: An Objective Look at Media Bias
Posted by [runewood](#) on Sun, 26 Feb 2006 22:10:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Maybe the Democrats just don't want to be on TV.

Subject: Re: An Objective Look at Media Bias
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 26 Feb 2006 23:21:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So, the fact that a couple talk shows that only a few people watch on one part of one day of the week feature conservative guests more often than not is significant how? I wonder how many of my tax dollars went to this useless study.

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/

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 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.

Subject: Re: An Objective Look at Media Bias

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Mon, 27 Feb 2006 02:40:41 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Sun, 26 February 2006 10:35An objective report on the bias of guests on Sunday morning talk shows.

By the way, before you try to refute this study, read this because attempted right wing smears of this study are listed so you don't have to look too stupid.

Who cares? I for one would actually relish more liberal icons on television. It's just a shame they're too afraid to make public appearances on such quality programming as the O-Reilly Factor.

Subject: Re: An Objective Look at Media Bias
Posted by [msgtpain](#) on Mon, 27 Feb 2006 04:39:31 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.

By the way, before you try to refute this study, read this because attempted right wing smears of this study are listed so you don't have to look too stupid.

Some of your posts are "amusing" at best, and then there are those which are outright laughable.. Before we try to "refute" this, make sure we don't look stupid by reading "why we shouldn't try and refute this" written by the same people we're going to attempt to refute. (lol)

Can I cut and paste something for you?.. here goes

Quote:Our goal in designing the methodology for this study was to ensure that the classifications would be as unambiguous and defensible as possible, even to those who profoundly disagree with the goals of our organization.

Readers should be clear on what we did not do: These classifications do not represent an analysis of what each person actually said when she/he appeared on a show on a given date. Coding each guest's comments for their ideological slant would have introduced enormous difficulties and opportunities for subjectivity. Instead, we simply classified each guest based on her/his general partisan or ideological orientation.

Furthermore, these classifications do not represent whether or not the guests were ridiculed, belittled, cut off mid-sentence or simply made to look like fools. If you want to show that a Republican stance is stupid, would you invite a bunch of democrats to the show to agree with you? or would you try and get some Republicans on the show who you can argue with and get the last word in over before you cut them off and go to commercial?

Subject: Re: An Objective Look at Media Bias
Posted by [PointlessAmbler](#) on Tue, 28 Feb 2006 04:21:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

msgtpain wrote on Sun, 26 February 2006 23:39...or would you try and get some Republicans on the show who you can argue with and get the last word in over before you cut them off and go to commercial?

Republicans are just as guilty of this as Democrats. O'Reilly does it all the time.

Subject: Re: An Objective Look at Media Bias
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 28 Feb 2006 12:43:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

O'Reilly isn't a Republican.

Subject: Re: An Objective Look at Media Bias
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 28 Feb 2006 21:56:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

For a while he certainly was. Bill O'Reilly has claimed that this was both a clerical error and he didn't have the option to register for Independent after being caught as a registered Republican, both arguments of course being ridiculous.

CrimsonSo, the fact that a couple talk shows that only a few people watch on one part of one day of the week feature conservative guests more often than not is significant how? I wonder how many of my tax dollars went to this useless study.

The point of this survey is that it's the first quantified evidence, at least that I've seen, on even a moderate scale demonstrating a bias in the news media, or testing for one. Anyone can say, "Well, the media is biased this way or that" without backing it up with evidence [Something I've seen more than once on these forums] but this study actually shows something.

NeoSaber...

An organization being biased does not mean that they can conduct an unbiased survey.

The Methodology From The Survey You Might (Should) Have ReadOur goal in designing the methodology for this study was to ensure that the classifications would be as unambiguous and defensible as possible, even to those who profoundly disagree with the goals of our organization.

Readers should be clear on what we did not do: These classifications do not represent an analysis of what each person actually said when she/he appeared on a show on a given date. Coding each guest's comments for their ideological slant would have introduced enormous difficulties and opportunities for subjectivity. Instead, we simply classified each guest based on her/his general partisan or ideological orientation. Of course, in a few instances, these decisions were not easy to make. While the vast majority of guests are clearly identifiable by party or ideology (or as having none), there are a few whose public stances make such classification

more difficult. We therefore constructed rules that could be applied as strictly as possible. The fact that we were dealing with one four-year term under a Republican president and one under a Democratic president (plus additional analysis on 2005) meant that certain types of rules, even if imperfect, are unlikely to skew the data in any meaningful way. For instance, we decided that all administration officials would be coded as representing the party in power. One might reasonably argue that some departments of the executive branch are more "political" than others and that therefore, for instance, the secretary of state represents the administration's views in a way that the director of the National Institutes of Health does not. But making that distinction would require drawing the line somewhere between "political" and "non-political" departments, something we felt was nearly impossible to do objectively. Consequently, we decided not to draw the line at all and instead to apply the rule equally at all times. We understand that because we are a progressive organization, some on the right will seek to undercut the credibility of our findings, perhaps charging that we have stacked the deck by classifying too many guests as conservative. Partly for that reason, when a guest's ideology or partisan affiliation was ambiguous, we erred on the side of identifying a guest to the left. Consequently, one can assume that, if anything, our figures underestimate the conservative slant to the Sunday shows. In any large-scale content-analysis project, the strict application of coding rules will, on some rare occasions, result in a particular unit being coded in a way that some might find inaccurate. This is an inevitable hazard of content analysis, and anyone who reviews the thousands of guests included in this study might find one or two they would code differently. Nonetheless, objective coding requires the use of rules that are applied the same way by any and all coders in order to eliminate the bias a particular coder might bring.

gbullWho cares? I for one would actually relish more liberal icons on television. It's just a shame they're too afraid to make public appearances on such quality programming as the O'Reilly Factor.

O'Reilly's show consists of him agreeing with conservatives and getting into shouting matches with people whose positions he can't argue against.

msgtpain...

How would you conduct such a survey? Mediamatter's point with all this was to attempt the utmost impartiality in this survey. Carrying out a survey based on such subjective issues would result in something ridiculous enough to be heralded on the O'Reilly Factor.

P.S. Slander makes you look like a fool. Or O'Reilly.

Subject: Re: An Objective Look at Media Bias
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Tue, 28 Feb 2006 22:04:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

[quote]P.S. Slander makes you look like a fool. Or O'Reilly./quote]

2 entries found for contradict.
con-tra-dict P Pronunciation Key (kntr-dkt)
v. con-tra-dict-ed, con-tra-dict-ing, con-tra-dicts

v. tr.

To assert or express the opposite of (a statement).

To deny the statement of. See Synonyms at deny.

To be contrary to; be inconsistent with.

v. intr.

To utter a contradictory statement.

Subject: Re: An Objective Look at Media Bias

Posted by [msgtpain](#) on Thu, 02 Mar 2006 03:18:34 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Tue, 28 February 2006 16:56

msgtpain...

How would you conduct such a survey? Mediamatter's point with all this was to attempt the utmost impartiality in this survey. Carrying out a survey based on such subjective issues would result in something ridiculous enough to be heralded on the O'Reilly Factor.

My point was, this "survey", in my opinion, is completely meaningless... If I could pull statistics to "prove" to you that universities taught liberal ideology because 80% of the professors were liberals, would you agree? or would you insist that I prove that their "political affiliation" influenced what they actually said in their classrooms?

This scenario is no different... You can have 100 Republicans on your show, but if you tell everyone of them that you simply can't believe what they are trying to do, and try to get them to "see your point", then the actual view of that show isn't really Republican, is it?.. Without the content, this survey is meaningless.

Subject: Re: An Objective Look at Media Bias

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 02 Mar 2006 04:31:16 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, actually they are different. College professors teaching material are going to be less influenced by political affiliation than political operatives. Your hypothetical situation is a poor one.

Let me ask you a question... How would you propose to study partisanship through guest representation on the media in an unbiased way? Are you suggesting it's impossible, or there's a way better than strictly adhering to party lines? The point of this study was to be as unbiased as possible, doubtlessly if mediamatters had grouped individuals based on what they said you'd be saying their categorizations are obviously too biased to be meaningful. Again, this is the only real numerical quantification of a bias in the media. I challenge you to create a better method.

Subject: Re: An Objective Look at Media Bias
Posted by [msgtpain](#) on Thu, 02 Mar 2006 14:57:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Wed, 01 March 2006 23:31 College professors teaching material are going to be less influenced by political affiliation than political operatives.

How many years of college have you been to so far? I've been through 5, and in those 5 years, I can safely say that most of my professors did not simply teach out of the textbooks they were provided. It was blatantly obvious what their political ideology was through classroom conversations, newspaper articles they provided, the periodicals they chose to have in their room, etc. College professors do teach a core curriculum, through their own experiences and beliefs.

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Wed, 01 March 2006 23:31 Again, this is the only real numerical quantification of a bias in the media.

You're right.. you have shown us all by finding this obviously unquestionable study. I'm not going to argue with you that their findings proved more Republicans were on those shows than Democrats. But what you really lack is that silver tongue that party pushers like you win people over with. People twist words, omit important facts, etc, in an attempt to get people to believe them. They rely on the simple fact that humans typically take what others say at face value without putting any real thought in to it. You're one of those people, you just really suck at it. Does this study prove there is a bias in the media? Sure.. I'll give you that. It proves that more Republicans have been on Sunday morning talk shows than Democrats. Beyond that, I challenge you to show me what "bias" they have proved. Cause, when most people use the term "media bias" they are talking about the content of the news. Not the idiot who spewed it. Thanks to mediamatters survey, you can now go around with that half-truthed, silver tongue and tell everyone you can prove there is a bias in the media. And as long as they are a stupid, unquestioning human being, they may believe you and you can go to sleep better that night knowing you "sort of" fooled someone in to agreeing with your beliefs. Congratulations.

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Wed, 01 March 2006 23:31

I challenge you to create a better method.

If I gave two shits about disproving a study which was created to misrepresent the true nature of "media bias" I would.. but since I don't I'll just go about my day like usual.

Subject: Re: An Objective Look at Media Bias
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 02 Mar 2006 21:38:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

What an amazingly poor argument. But then again, that all stems from your intentions, really. You didn't come to this thread to actually interpret something I said, you came to prove it wrong. This is quite obvious in the evolution of your partisanly motivated "argument"...

msgtpainSome of your posts are "amusing" at best, and then there are those which are outright laughable..

I'm not even sure why you said this, or at least I wouldn't be sure if I trusted you to take a more objective standpoint.

Then, in the face of actual reasoning, you try to define your argument to the point where it almost is a genuine, though ridiculous, stance.

msgtpainMy point was, this "survey", in my opinion, is completely meaningless...

This statement being backed up by a poor connection to a different situation and a second hypothetical scenario that is quite unlikely.

Now, by your third post you actually concede that logic is, to at least an extent, on my side.

msgtpain I'm not going to argue with you that their findings proved more Republicans were on those shows than Democrats.

Now, it took you three posts to concede such an incredibly apparent fact.

But not, of course, without proceeding to undermine its' relevance. Like I've said, this is the first actual quantization of a bias in the media. The sample is not from an unimportant set, and the tested variable is not unimportant. The difference between a Republican and Democratic voice on the air is not a small one. I'm not suggesting this is the end-all of proof of a bias in the media. But it does give me more of a right to say the media is biased conservatively than you have to say otherwise.

And as one last pointer to the partisanship you try to work into every argument...

msgtpainIf I gave two shits about disproving a study which was created to misrepresent the true nature of "media bias" I would..

I didn't ask you to disprove the study, I asked how you would create an unbiased study of bias in the news media. Politics isn't a fight between right and wrong, which is something you so apparently fail to grasp. Politics is about promoting a better government. "Party lines" are the most detractive of possibly all factors to this process, since it makes people want to fight each other instead of objectively assess things together.

Party lines are something you'll have to get over if you ever want to be a promoter of the good in politics. Quite frankly, I'm surprised you're in college and you haven't figured that out by now.

By the way, do a little research into who the guy who runs mediamatters used to be. His name is David Brock.

Subject: Re: An Objective Look at Media Bias

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Thu, 02 Mar 2006 22:27:22 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Tue, 28 February 2006 16:56NeoSaber...

An organization being biased does not mean that they can conduct an unbiased survey.

I agree, an organization being biased doesn't mean they can be unbiased.

I assume you actually meant to write they "does not mean that they can't conduct an unbiased survey".

To which I have to ask, then what was the point of the survey? If people who are biased can give us objective information, then who cares if there is a media bias? If there are more republicans than democrats on Sunday morning talk shows, what prevents them from being as objective in their analysis as you claim this group to be? The republican party is an organization, despite having certain views on issues, so they can be objective too.

According to that, we don't even need to listen to democrats or progressives. Any republican or conservative can give us an unbiased, objective analysis of a situation. If an organization that represents a left/right bias of 100/0 can be objective, then certainly a media that offers a 40/60 bias can be objective as well. It doesn't matter if "Sunday is conservative", it can be just as objective if it was "Sunday is 50/50", or "Sunday is progressive".

Based on the objective nature of this study conducted by a biased organization, I modestly propose that only republicans who agree with Bush be allowed to appear on talk shows. Also the journalists running these shows should also be republicans who support Bush. This will allow us to remain objective, while getting rid of the annoying shouting matches that often occur when people of opposing parties are debating each other. It'll allow us to get an unbiased perspective and avoid the noise. This will result in an even wider dissemination of objective facts, as more people can be heard in less time. Everybody wins.

Subject: Re: An Objective Look at Media Bias

Posted by [msgtpain](#) on Fri, 03 Mar 2006 03:11:12 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Thu, 02 March 2006 16:38 Politics isn't a fight between right and wrong, which is something you so apparently fail to grasp. Politics is about promoting a better government. "Party lines" are the most detractive of possibly all factors to this process, since it makes people want to fight each other instead of objectively assess things together.

Party lines are something you'll have to get over if you ever want to be a promoter of the good in politics.

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Sun, 26 February 2006 11:35

By the way, before you try to refute this study, read this because attempted right wing smears of this study are listed so you don't have to look too stupid.

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Tue, 28 February 2006 16:56 Bill O'Reilly has claimed that this was both a clerical error and he didn't have the option to register for Independent after being caught as a registered Republican, both arguments of course being ridiculous.

O'Reilly's show consists of him agreeing with conservatives and getting into shouting matches with people whose positions he can't argue against.

P.S. Slander makes you look like a fool. Or O'Reilly.

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Tue, 28 June 2005 23:02 Doubtlessly most of you haven't heard of the Downing Street Memos, because a majority of you don't know anything.

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Wed, 29 June 2005 12:31

So, you think a Republican Congress will pass a resolution of inquiry on this? Of course not. But it would be nice if we had a real government.

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Wed, 15 June 2005 18:56 Because about 5 FOX readers were actually interested in reading about the autopsy. They know their readers aren't going to try to educate themselves, so they can do that all they want

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Thu, 16 June 2005 00:20

Is the mainstream media still fair after it tries to cover up for loudmouth Republicans?

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Mon, 23 May 2005 22:24 Good thing we have such morally strong Republicans ready to break any institution, no matter how old.

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Tue, 24 May 2005 18:54 The Republicans almost broke the Senate by invoking cloture. 'Nuff said.

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Thu, 17 November 2005 20:05. What you used to contribute to forum discussions in generally felt political concepts has shriveled and blackened to a feeling of duty to protect what is Republican in the world. Where I can't be convinced that Republicans are doing good in the world, you can't be convinced that they aren't.

I can no longer post any source that is not trumpeted by the right of this forum, you central among them, as being biased against the President.

Not surprisingly, the first thing that crossed your mind, along with the rest of the Renforums right's minds when you saw this topic was "How could this be wrong?"

A common republican talking point, one I fear you partake in, is that a wartime President should not be criticized. No one should be foolish enough to be duped by this incredible, nigh-treasonous nonsense.

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Tue, 14 June 2005 18:29 I saw the impossible today. A Republican

Texas Representative [Ron Paul] taking an anti-war stance on C-SPAN. Guess his mind drugs wore off.

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Tue, 14 June 2005 03:43

Species aren't under their endangered list because there are more ethical reasons against eating them rather than other animals. It's so the species can be rehabilitated from Republican hunters killing animals to the point of extinction.

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Fri, 15 April 2005 07:40 You really missed the meaning of that quote? Well, I suppose you are a Renforums conservative.

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Thu, 07 April 2005 16:52 The current neo-conservatives are radically anti-liberal, but they don't exactly follow conservative policies. Just like fascism. The only area they retain "traditional" values is in things such as condemning homos and bombing abortion clinics.

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Mon, 20 December 2004 22:48 And here we go again with your Republican "Americans are more important than other races..." talk. I can't stand it.

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Tue, 21 December 2004 14:48

This blind "patriotism", if you can call it that, emanating from the Republican party disgusts me.

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Mon, 20 December 2004 21:47 Americans are not somehow more "godly" or more deserving to live than non-Americans. We're all people. Get it through your conservative skull.

Subject: Re: An Objective Look at Media Bias

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Fri, 03 Mar 2006 04:08:06 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Does SFE have Ted Kennedy type his posts for him.

Subject: Re: An Objective Look at Media Bias

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Fri, 03 Mar 2006 04:45:43 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ted Kennedy can type? I thought he hired people to do that for him...

Subject: Re: An Objective Look at Media Bias

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 04 Mar 2006 04:24:53 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

NeoSaber wrote on Thu, 02 March 2006 17:27 SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Tue, 28 February 2006 16:56 NeoSaber...

An organization being biased does not mean that they can conduct an unbiased survey.

I agree, an organization being biased doesn't mean they can be unbiased.

I assume you actually meant to write they "does not mean that they can't conduct an unbiased survey".

My mistake. Thanks for the correction.

Neosaber To which I have to ask, then what was the point of the survey? If people who are biased can give us objective information, then who cares if there is a media bias? If there are more republicans than democrats on Sunday morning talk shows, what prevents them from being as objective in their analysis as you claim this group to be? The republican party is an organization, despite having certain views on issues, so they can be objective too.

The point isn't whether party affiliates can be objective, but whether they will be or not.

Neosaber According to that, we don't even need to listen to democrats or progressives. Any republican or conservative can give us an unbiased, objective analysis of a situation. If an organization that represents a left/right bias of 100/0 can be objective, then certainly a media that offers a 40/60 bias can be objective as well. It doesn't matter if "Sunday is conservative", it can be just as objective if it was "Sunday is 50/50", or "Sunday is progressive".

Again, just because there is a possibility that a slanted guest representation on the media can still deliver perfect objectivity doesn't mean that it's a chance worth relying on. The odds of such a situation are very, very small. And since there is such a consistency of a major slant in guests, I'm thinking that objectivity and balance isn't what the media networks have in mind. At least on Sunday.

msgtpain: You do know I wasn't always so sour, right? Those comments are in reaction to the cursing and slander emanating from my opposition on this forum towards myself. I didn't bring polar politics here. But when I'm faced with it in such astounding amounts, what would you do? Should I avoid the term Republican, or accurately typecast the majority on these forums? You think I'd be happier without that? Sure I would. But few here are willing to budge from party politics, which is more than a bit upsetting. I typecast individuals as a result of slander. There is no other meaningful way to talk to those who have no other political vocabulary. But I still think that this quote is pretty funny:

SuperFlyingEngil saw the impossible today. A Republican Texas Representative [Ron Paul] taking an anti-war stance on C-SPAN. Guess his mind drugs wore off.

And you, I can only assume, didn't look up who David Brock was (among other things)...

Subject: Re: An Objective Look at Media Bias
Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Sun, 05 Mar 2006 06:50:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Fri, 03 March 2006 23:24 Again, just because there is a possibility that a slanted guest representation on the media can still deliver perfect objectivity doesn't mean that it's a chance worth relying on. The odds of such a situation are very, very small. And since there is such a consistency of a major slant in guests, I'm thinking that objectivity and balance isn't what the media networks have in mind. At least on Sunday.

I agree it isn't a chance worth relying on, but the media basically had a 40/60 bias in this study. The study though is done by a group with a 100/0 bias. If we can overlook a 100/0 bias, why can't we overlook a 40/60 one?

Personally, I don't think we can overlook either. My crazy scenario was meant to point out the absurdity of ignoring a 100% bias. I tend to be very distrustful of the way things are presented in the media, regardless of who is doing it. This study is presented to say we can't trust a 40/60 bias, but the study itself is a 100/0 bias. So if we can't trust a smaller bias than this study contains, we can't trust the study either. It invalidated itself. Kind of a paradox. In order to be right, it has to be wrong.

Subject: Re: An Objective Look at Media Bias
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 05 Mar 2006 15:42:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

But politics talk show guests and this survey are based around fundamentally different concepts. While political guests are attempting to promote often-theoretical concepts of government policy, the mediamatters survey used a strict system to process the partisanship of media guests. This is often less than I can say for political guests.

Subject: Re: An Objective Look at Media Bias
Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Sun, 05 Mar 2006 21:22:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The basis of this study is to maintain objectivity by focusing on the political affiliations of people. It tried to avoid subjective criticism by ignoring subjective content. If we apply this same principle back to the study itself, which we should be able to do if it is an objective stand point, then we find the survey to be biased for being conducted primarily by people on one side of the political spectrum. The standard used for the survey requires us to ignore the individual intent and beliefs of the people who carried it out and focus only on their affiliations.

If we are to determine bias based on the ratio of political affiliation, then this study too must be considered biased for being overly represented by one side of the political spectrum. Since the study is only valid if it is objective, and by its own standards it can't be, then the study is invalid. No one has reason to accept its conclusions if it couldn't maintain its own standard of objectivity. For a person to evaluate the study objectively, they must disregard the conclusions because the

study is tainted by the same type of bias it claims to have found.
