COVERAGE ANALYSIS REPORT

Coverage Analysis: how the DHS employee data leak was covered

A structural reading of 14 articles from 14 outlets.

PREPARED BY

Frametra Software Inc

PREPARED FOR

Frametra Sample Report

DATE

November 8, 2026

Scoring by Frametra 3.9.34 · FC-MW81KNHA

At a glance

14 articles from 14 outlets, read by Frametra's on-device engine across six structural signals.

78
average structural score, range 61 to 91

8 of 14
articles with one charged word or none

33–100
range in source attribution scores

3 of 14
articles with full claim restraint

WHAT THE NUMBERS SHOW

1. **The tone stayed measured.** Neutral language averaged 93 out of 100, and the lowest article scored 74. 3 articles used none of the engine's charged words and 8 used one or none.
2. **Sourcing varied from article to article.** Source attribution ran from 33 to 100, averaging 72. 4 articles scored 80 or above and 2 scored below 50. Those below 50 are the pieces where a named source or a link is hardest to find.
3. **Length and sourcing.** The 4 articles of 600 words or more averaged 63 on sourcing, against 75 for the 10 shorter ones (lower for the longer pieces). The engine measures attribution relative to length, so part of any gap reflects how the measure works.
4. **Calibrated hedging was the weakest signal.** It averaged 64, against 99 for active voice, the strongest. Claim restraint averaged 67; 3 articles reached full restraint. The engine counts words such as "claims" and "alleges" against claim restraint, which is expected when articles report on allegations or court records.

How to read these scores. They describe how an article is built: its sourcing, wording and evidence. They do not say whether an article is accurate, fair or well-intentioned, and they are not a grade.

The six signals, across all 14 articles

Average score for each signal, out of 100. Weights show how much each signal counts toward the structural score.



BY ARTICLE LENGTH

	ARTICLES	AVG WORDS	SCORE	SOURCING	CLAIM RESTRAINT	EVIDENCE	CHARGED WORDS
Under 600 words	10	475	78	75	57	81	1.3
600 words or more	4	712	80	63	94	84	2.3

Sourcing = source attribution. Evidence = figures and direct quotations. Charged words = average per article.

Article by article

All 14 articles, grouped by outlet. Scores out of 100; values below 50 are shown in amber.

OUTLET	HEADLINE	WORDS	SCORE	SRC	LANG	CLM	HDG	EVD	ACT
canberratimes.com.au	Data on thousands of US Homeland Security staff leaked	652	71	33	96	88	57	71	99
cpomagazine.com	Hacktivists Publish Data on 41,000 Federal Employees, Includi…	499	61	56	90	8	55	92	98
cybernews.com	DHS employee data leak exposes 41,000 staff records	466	82	73	89	76	88	81	99
gizmodo.com	Data From More Than 41,000 DHS Workers Exposed in Massive Leak	390	70	97	74	4	96	71	98
govinfosecurity.com	DHS Strikes Back, Targeting 'Icepick' Leaks	419	89	100	100	71	59	86	99
graphic.com.gh	Details of thousands of US immigration agents leaked in major…	593	73	43	92	82	64	86	97
helpnetsecurity.com	Hacktivists leak 41,000 DHS staff records, revealing undercov…	661	91	93	96	100	51	88	98
ibtimes.co.uk	Over 40K US Homeland Security Employees' Data Reportedly Rele…	568	82	76	100	66	91	59	99
khaleejtimes.com	Leak website releases data on thousands of US Homeland Securi…	525	84	77	95	74	75	95	99
newsone.com	Hackers Leak Identifying Info Of 41,000 DHS Employees	710	81	58	89	100	59	98	99
npr.org	Hackers expose the identities of more than 40,000 DHS employe…	459	82	69	95	100	40	83	100
san.com	Shielded by DHS, immigration agents' identities exposed in ma…	825	78	66	88	86	49	80	99
staradvertiser.com	Data leak exposes details on more than 40,000 DHS employees |…	530	80	67	95	75	73	86	99
weartv.com	DHS working to 'swiftly' address potential breach impacting o…	302	73	96	100	14	40	74	97

Src = source attribution. Lang = neutral language. Clm = claim restraint. Hdg = calibrated hedging. Evd = evidence signals. Act = active voice.

What this report does not cover

This report uses Frametra's free on-device engine, which reads each article's wording. It cannot say **who was quoted**, whether sources were **anonymous**, which voices were missing (for example the people involved), or whether a claim is true. Those need a closer read of the individual articles.

METHOD AND LIMITS

Each article was read from its public web page by Frametra's engine, on the reader's own device, and scored on six signals: source attribution (28% of the structural score), neutral language (25%), claim restraint (20%), calibrated hedging (10%), evidence signals (10%) and active voice (7%). Structural scores run from 22 to 95. Scores depend on the page text the engine could read; paywalled, very short or heavily formatted pages may be read only in part. Article formats such as features, analysis and opinion score differently from wire news by design, and the engine counts words such as "claims" and "alleges" against claim restraint. The set of articles was chosen by the preparer and is not a random sample, so results describe this set only. All sentences in this report are generated from the numbers by fixed rules.