



## BBC DETAILED ANALYSIS

case013\_Eddie Izzard vs Nigel Farage on immigration - BBC News.en

Broadcast: BBC BROADCAST ANALYSIS | Analyzed: 2026-05-11 18:34

Version 2.8-detail | Universal 2.8-detail | Konverter 3.5 (2026-05-29) | Standard: Ofcom Broadcasting Code

**OVERALL  
SCORE**

**5.5/10**

*Significant imbalance*

0 = balanced, 10 = strongly biased/manipulative

## POLITICAL SPECTRUM

Classification based on Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) 2024

The Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES 2024) is an academic survey of 609 political scientists in 31 countries. Each party is rated on a scale from 0 (far left) to 10 (far right).

Party	Green	SNP	Lab	LibDem	Con	Reform
CHES	1.85	2.90	3.50	4.60	7.30	8.80
Spectrum	<i>Left</i>	<i>Left</i>	<i>Left</i>	<i>Center</i>	<i>Right</i>	<i>Right</i>

The overall tendency is presented on a 0–10 scale (0 = strongly left-favoring, 5 = balanced, 10 = strongly right-favoring). The calculation is based on the difference in average favoritism of left vs. right parties (grouping per CHES 2024).

**TENDENCY (L – R)**

**5.8 / 10**

*Balanced*

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

← Left

Right →

Source: Chapel Hill Expert Survey 2024 — [chesdata.eu](https://chesdata.eu) | [Jolly et al., Electoral Studies, 2022](#) | Thresholds: [Pew Research Center](#)

This section provides political context and does not contribute to the overall score.



## CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

*Note: This broadcast predates the 2024 political landscape. Party positions are assessed against their 2016 referendum-era positions where relevant, with reference to the current party programme table for structural comparison.*

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast Representation vs. Programme Position
Conservative	-1	00:13–00:27 — William Hague described as having "sold out" for advising voters not to base their decision on immigration; Conservative Remain position is implicitly delegitimised. Programme position (2016): officially neutral/Remain under Cameron. Slight distortion through Farage's characterisation of Hague as having "lost touch."
Labour	0	Not mentioned in this segment. Programme position: not represented.
Lib Dems	0	Not mentioned in this segment. Programme position: not represented.
SNP	0	Not mentioned in this segment. Programme position: not represented.
Reform UK	N/A	Reform UK did not exist in 2016; Farage represented UKIP. UKIP's position (Leave, immigration control) is given extensive and largely unchallenged airtime. Structural equivalent to a +2 for the political position Reform UK now occupies.
Green	0	Not mentioned in this segment. Programme position: not represented.
UKIP (2016 equivalent)	+2	00:13–04:40 — Farage's UKIP/Leave position receives the opening question, the majority of speaking time (~55%), and the most substantive agenda-setting. Core UKIP position (immigration control via Brexit) is presented as the natural framing of the debate.

### Score Legend:

+5 = Programme positions correctly and fully represented

0 = Party/topic not in broadcast

-5 = Programme positions actively distorted or misrepresented

### Party Bias Summary

- Most accurate representation: Labour, Lib Dems, SNP, Green (Score 0 — not present, therefore no distortion)
- Strongest distortion: Conservative (Score -1) — Hague's Remain position is characterised as a "sell-out" without moderator challenge; UKIP/Leave (Score +2) — receives structural advantage through agenda-setting and time allocation
- Average deviation from 0: 0.5 (across represented parties)
- Conclusion: The broadcast's party-political bias is primarily structural rather than explicit: UKIP/Leave receives the agenda-setting advantage and majority speaking time, while the Conservative Remain position is delegitimised



**Schweizerischer Verein** für ausgewogene Berichterstattung  
**Association suisse** pour une information équilibrée  
**Associazione svizzera** per un reporting equilibrato

through Farage's unchallenged characterisation of Hague. No other parties are represented, which itself constitutes a significant omission given that the Liberal Democrats, SNP, and Greens all had active and distinct referendum positions.



## CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

### Broadcast Data

- Title: BBC Panel Discussion — Brexit Referendum / Immigration Debate (likely BBC Question Time or similar panel format)
- Date (from filename): Not specified in transcript; internal evidence suggests June 2016 (pre-Brexit referendum, 23 June 2016)
- Estimated Length: Approximately 4–5 minutes (transcript segment)
- Presenter/Reporter: David (surname not fully audible; likely David Dimbleby based on format and address "David" at 02:22)
- Guests/Interviewees:

Actors	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political Spectrum
Nigel Farage	Leader, UKIP; prominent Leave campaigner	UKIP / Leave Campaign	9.0 (far right, populist)
Eddie (surname unclear)	Panellist, Remain-leaning	Unidentified / Remain	~4.0–5.0 (centre)
Matt Dickinson	Questioner (audience member or journalist)	Unaffiliated	N/A
William Hague (referenced, not present)	Former Conservative Party Leader	Conservative	7.0 (centre-right)
Sarah Wollaston (referenced, not present)	Conservative MP, defected from Leave to Remain	Conservative / Remain	6.0 (centre-right)

### Main Topic

A pre-Brexit referendum panel debate on whether immigration concerns should be the primary basis for voting Leave, and whether Brexit would deliver meaningful immigration control.

### World-Knowledge Context

The transcript originates from the final weeks before the UK's EU membership referendum on 23 June 2016. The Leave campaign, led in part by Nigel Farage and Vote Leave, had placed immigration at the centre of its messaging, most visibly through the "Breaking Point" poster and the claim that EU membership meant the UK had "no control" over who entered the country. The Remain campaign countered with economic arguments, citing Treasury forecasts of recession post-Brexit. The defection of Conservative MP Sarah Wollaston from Leave to Remain over disputed NHS funding claims (the £350m/week figure) was a live news event at the time of this broadcast. William Hague's statement that voters should not base their referendum decision on immigration was a significant intervention from a senior Conservative Eurosceptic, creating internal tension within the Leave coalition. The debate reflects the fundamental fault line of the referendum: sovereignty and identity (Leave) versus economic stability and international standing (Remain).

### Assessment: Was Each Perspective Addressed?

[A] TOUCHED UPON

Timestamp: 02:31–02:42 — Quote: "between 2001 and 2011 uh EU migrants put in 20 billion into the EU economy they put more in than they take out"

Assessment: Briefly raised by Eddie but immediately contested and not developed with methodological rigour.

[B] ADDRESSED



**Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung**  
**Association suisse pour une information équilibrée**  
**Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato**

Timestamp: 00:47–01:01 — Quote: "they're seeing the impact on Local Schools they're seeing the impact on GP Services they're seeing the impact on housing"

Assessment: Raised by Farage as assertion; no empirical evidence provided or challenged by moderator.

[C] OMITTED

No discussion of what post-Brexit immigration control would actually entail legally or practically.

[D] TOUCHED UPON

Timestamp: 02:47–03:04 — Quote: "she said like the NHS a lot of information was stoked up about the NHS and she said it's not true"

Assessment: Sarah Wollaston's defection referenced but not substantively explored.

[E] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 02:47–03:10 — Quote: "there are Skeptics you Skeptics that are joining the remain side even though they're still skeptical"

Assessment: Mentioned but not given substantive airtime.

[F] OMITTED

No discussion of non-EU immigration, which the UK already controlled independently.

[G] OMITTED

No historical context on UK immigration patterns.

[H] OMITTED

No testimony from EU migrants or affected communities beyond Farage's personal background being raised.

[I] OMITTED

No independent economic forecasting cited beyond the recession claim.

[J] OMITTED

No empirical quality-of-life research cited.



## CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

### Hard Facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically verifiable

#### 1. EXPERT SELECTION

4/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

##### Expert 1: Nigel Farage — UKIP Leader / Leave Campaign

Timestamp	00:13–04:40 (dominant throughout)
Statement	***"77% of the British public want cuts to the numbers coming into Britain and over half the voters want a reduction to near zero"***
Classification	Farage is a political campaigner, not an independent expert. He cites polling data without source attribution.
Missing counter-voice	An independent migration economist or ONS statistician would have contextualised these figures.

#### Source Depth Check:

(a) **FUNDING:** UKIP / Leave campaign — directly funded by and accountable to the Leave political project. Structural interest in maximising immigration concern.

(b) **MANDATE:** Explicitly partisan. Not compatible with neutral assessment of immigration data.

D1 Conflict of Interest: -2 — Direct political interest in maximising immigration concern as referendum issue

D2 Personal Risk: +1 — Farage has staked his entire political career on this position; consistency is credible

D3 Subject Competence: -1 — Political leader, not migration economist; cites statistics without methodology

D4 Opinion Consistency: +2 — Has held this position consistently for over a decade

D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data: -2 — Predominantly emotional/anecdotal ("our kids and grandkids," "quality of life")

D6 Source Level: -2 — No primary sources cited; all assertions

**TOTAL: -4 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**

(c) **PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE:** Framed implicitly as the voice of "the British public" rather than as a partisan campaigner — this is a structural framing problem.

##### Expert 2: Eddie (panellist, Remain-leaning)

Timestamp	02:28–04:40
Statement	***"between 2001 and 2011 uh EU migrants put in 20 billion into the EU economy they put more in than they take out"***
Classification	Panellist of unclear professional background. Cites a specific figure without source.

#### Source Depth Check:

(a) **FUNDING:** Unknown affiliation; appears to be a Remain-sympathetic panellist.

(b) **MANDATE:** Not established as an independent expert.



**Schweizerischer Verein** für ausgewogene Berichterstattung  
**Association suisse** pour une information équilibrée  
**Associazione svizzera** per un reporting equilibrato

- D1 Conflict of Interest: -1 — Apparent Remain sympathies
- D2 Personal Risk: 0 — No evident personal stake
- D3 Subject Competence: 0 — Unknown background; cites one statistic
- D4 Opinion Consistency: 0 — Insufficient data
- D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data: +1 — Attempts data-based argument, though without source
- D6 Source Level: -1 — Secondary citation without attribution

**TOTAL: -1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**

**(c) PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE:** Not framed as an expert; treated as a debating opponent rather than an authority.

*Missing Expert Groups:*

- Independent migration economist (e.g., Migration Advisory Committee, academic researcher)
- NHS workforce analyst
- Constitutional lawyer on EU free movement law

**Source Credibility Overview:**

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Source Depth Check	-2	+1	-1	+2	-2	-2	-4	<b>YELLOW</b>
Source Depth Check	-1	0	0	0	+1	-1	-1	<b>YELLOW</b>

*Summary (Matrix Result):*

- Farage: **YELLOW (-4)** — Partisan campaigner presented as voice of public opinion; emotional framing dominates
- Eddie: **YELLOW (-1)** — Unverified panellist; one data point without source; credibility undermined by rhetorical excess



## 2. SOURCE SELECTION

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

### Source 1: Unnamed polling data (Farage)

#### Timestamp

00:37–00:45 — Statement: **“77% of the British public want cuts to the numbers coming into Britain”**

- (a) Funding and governance:** Unknown — no source cited
- (b) Structural conflict of interest:** Farage cites polling data that supports his campaign position without attribution; the figure may be accurate but cannot be verified
- (c) Missing counter-source:** ONS migration statistics, Migration Advisory Committee reports, or academic polling analysis would have contextualised this claim

#### Missing counter-source

**\*\*Not provided\*\***

### Source 2: Unnamed economic study (Eddie)

#### Timestamp

02:31–02:42 — Statement: **“between 2001 and 2011 uh EU migrants put in 20 billion into the EU economy”**

- (a) Funding and governance:** Unknown — no source cited; likely refers to a UCL or HMRC-based study
- (b) Structural conflict of interest:** Cited to support Remain position; without attribution, cannot assess methodology
- (c) Missing counter-source:** Studies showing distributional effects of immigration (wage suppression in low-skill sectors) are not cited

#### Missing counter-source

**\*\*Not provided\*\***

### Source 3: Sarah Wollaston (referenced)

#### Timestamp

02:47–03:07 — Statement: **“she said that the figures that are coming out from uh the brexit side are coming out false”**

- (a) Funding and governance:** Conservative MP; publicly accountable
- (b) Structural conflict of interest:** Wollaston had just defected from Leave to Remain; her statement is politically motivated, though her specific objection (the £350m/week figure) was factually well-founded
- (c) Missing counter-source:** No Leave campaign response to Wollaston's specific allegation is sought

#### Missing counter-source

**\*\*Not provided\*\***

*Summary: No source in this segment is attributed with sufficient detail for independent verification. Both sides cite figures without methodology, and the moderator does not request source attribution from either. This represents a systematic failure of evidential standards.*



3. TIME DISTRIBUTION									5/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Estimated speaking time:

- Nigel Farage (Leave): approximately 2 min. 30 sec. (approx. 55%)
- Eddie (Remain-leaning): approximately 1 min. 30 sec. (approx. 33%)
- Presenter (David): approximately 20 sec. (approx. 7%)
- Matt Dickinson (question): approximately 10 sec. (approx. 5%)

*Summary: Farage commands approximately 55% of the total speaking time in this segment, significantly more than the Remain voice. While Farage is the more prominent political figure and the primary subject of the opening question, the imbalance is substantial enough to constitute a structural advantage for the Leave position in terms of message volume.*



4. SELECTIVE OMISSION							7/10		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Omission 1:									
<b>Context</b>									
The UK already controlled non-EU immigration independently and had not reduced it. This is directly relevant to Farage's claim that EU membership meant "no control."									
Relevant at: 01:23–01:29 — "we have no control the only way we get control is to vote to leave the European Union"									
<b>Effect</b>									
The omission allows Farage's "no control" claim to stand unchallenged, when in fact the UK exercised full control over non-EU immigration and had chosen not to restrict it. This is the single most important factual omission in the segment.									

Omission 2:									
<b>Context</b>									
Sarah Wollaston's specific objection — that the £350m/week NHS figure was false — is referenced but not substantiated or explored.									
Relevant at: 02:49–03:04 — "she said that the figures that are coming out from uh the brexit side are coming out false"									
<b>Effect</b>									
The most significant factual dispute of the referendum campaign (the NHS bus figure) is mentioned but immediately dropped, preventing viewers from understanding the specific deception alleged.									

Omission 3:									
<b>Context</b>									
The Norway and Canada models raised by Eddie (03:29–03:37) are not followed up. Under the Norway model, the UK would retain free movement; under the Canada model, it would not but would face significant trade barriers. This distinction is crucial to evaluating Leave's immigration control claim.									
Relevant at: 03:29–03:37 — "we become Norway still has to have the free movement of people in"									
<b>Effect</b>									
The moderator redirects away from this substantive point, preventing the audience from understanding that the immigration control promised by Leave was contingent on a specific post-Brexit model that Leave had not committed to.									

*Summary: The three most important factual omissions all favour the Leave position: the non-EU immigration control point, the NHS figure dispute, and the post-Brexit model dependency of immigration control claims. Their absence allows Leave assertions to stand as unchallenged facts.*

### Missing Voices

- Independent immigration economist: Would have provided peer-reviewed data on fiscal and labour market effects of EU migration, distinguishing between sectors and skill levels.
- NHS administrator or GP representative: Would have contextualised whether immigration or austerity was the primary driver of GP and hospital waiting time pressures.



**Schweizerischer Verein** für ausgewogene Berichterstattung  
**Association suisse** pour une information équilibrée  
**Associazione svizzera** per un reporting equilibrato

- Constitutional/legal expert on EU free movement: Would have clarified what "control" the UK would actually gain post-Brexit and under what model (Norway, Canada, Albania scenarios raised but not legally analysed).
- Home Office official or migration statistician: Would have provided accurate net migration figures and broken down EU vs. non-EU components.
- Commonwealth immigrant or representative: Given Farage's claim that Brexit would allow more Commonwealth immigration, a Commonwealth community voice was conspicuously absent.
- Local government representative: Would have addressed housing and school pressure from a planning and funding perspective rather than purely an immigration volume perspective.
- Bank of England or OBR economist: Would have provided independent recession risk assessment beyond partisan claims.
- Remain Eurosceptic voter: Would have represented the significant segment of the electorate that was sceptical of EU institutions but voted Remain for pragmatic reasons.



## 5. NUMERICAL MANIPULATION

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Complete figures include: absolute value, proportion (%) and trend

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 00:37–00:45

Figure: "77% of the British public want cuts to the numbers coming into Britain and over half the voters want a reduction to near zero"

#### Missing context

No polling source cited. No date given. No question wording provided. "Near zero" is not defined. The distinction between "want cuts" and "want near zero" is significant and conflated.

#### Effect

Creates the impression of overwhelming, near-unanimous public demand for radical immigration reduction, without the methodological caveats that would allow viewers to assess the claim.

### Finding 2:

**Timestamp** 02:31–02:42

Figure: "between 2001 and 2011 uh EU migrants put in 20 billion into the EU economy they put more in than they take out"

#### Missing context

"20 billion into the EU economy" appears to be a misstatement — the relevant figure would be into the UK economy. No source cited. The time period (2001–2011) predates the large post-2004 EU enlargement migration wave. Net fiscal contribution figures are highly sensitive to methodology (age, skill level, public service usage assumptions).

#### Effect

Presents a favourable but methodologically opaque figure as a straightforward fact, without the caveats that would allow viewers to assess its current applicability.

### Finding 3:

**Timestamp** 04:26–04:31

Figure: "our population from an immigrant family will be 80 Million by 2040"

#### Missing context

No source cited. Population projections are highly sensitive to assumptions. The ONS 2016 principal projection did not forecast 80 million by 2040. The claim conflates total population growth with immigration-driven growth.

#### Effect

Creates alarm about demographic change without evidential basis, and the moderator begins to intervene but does not explicitly challenge the figure.

*Summary: All three numerical claims — from both sides — are presented without source attribution, methodological context, or moderator challenge. The cumulative effect is that viewers receive competing unverified statistics with no means of evaluation.*



<b>6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION</b>									<b>4/10</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	5	6	7	8	9	10

<b>Association 1:</b>	
<b>Timestamp</b>	04:16–04:18
<b>Quote</b>	<i>**Nigel you told your followers to bully people to vote for you this is not the right attitude for you to have**</i>
Technique: Eddie associates Farage with bullying behaviour — a serious personal and political allegation — without specifying the evidence or context for this claim.	
<b>Effect</b>	Associates Farage with intimidation and anti-democratic behaviour, which is a significant reputational charge that goes unsubstantiated and unchallenged by the moderator.

#### Source Check for Eddie's "bullying" allegation:

- Does Eddie work with verifiable primary sources? NO — no evidence cited
- Is the core claim falsifiable? YES — it is a factual claim about Farage's statements, but no source is provided
- Risk matrix: Eddie risks credibility by making an unsubstantiated allegation; Farage risks reputational damage
- Tone: Accusatory, not analytical
- Result Category: B — Borderline (factual claim made without evidence; not inherently conspiratorial but unsubstantiated)

<b>Association 2:</b>	
<b>Timestamp</b>	03:39–04:02
<b>Quote</b>	<i>**you are from an immigrant family and you're married to an immigrant why are you so against immigration**</i>
Technique: Eddie implies hypocrisy by associating Farage's personal background with his policy position, suggesting that his anti-immigration stance is morally inconsistent given his own family history.	
<b>Effect</b>	Frames Farage as personally hypocritical rather than engaging with his policy arguments. This is an ad hominem association rather than a substantive rebuttal.

Association chain: Farage → immigrant family → hypocrisy → moral inconsistency → untrustworthy on immigration

#### Summary (Category Assignment):

- Eddie's "bullying" allegation: Category B — unsubstantiated factual claim, not conspiracy theory, but irresponsible without evidence
- Eddie's hypocrisy framing: Category B — legitimate rhetorical point but deployed as personal attack rather than policy argument; moderator does not redirect



## 7. TIMING

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Position: 00:00–00:13 (Opening)

Content: The broadcast opens with the question about William Hague's statement, immediately positioning Farage as the authoritative voice on immigration and the referendum.

Timing effect: Opening with Farage's response to a senior Conservative's statement frames the entire debate around Farage's agenda. A more balanced opening might have begun with a neutral framing of the referendum choice or a question directed at both sides simultaneously.

### Finding 2:

Position: 02:47–03:10 (Middle)

Content: Sarah Wollaston's defection from Leave to Remain over false NHS figures is introduced mid-segment.

Timing effect: This is the most significant factual point in the segment — a Conservative MP citing specific false claims by the Leave campaign — but it is introduced in the middle of a chaotic exchange and immediately buried under competing voices. Placing it mid-segment rather than as a structured question ensures it receives minimal attention.

### Finding 3:

Position: 04:16–04:40 (End)

Content: The segment ends with the moderator attempting to manage Farage's dominance and give other panellists time.

Timing effect: The final impression is of a chaotic, unresolved debate in which Farage has spoken most and the moderator has struggled to maintain order. This leaves Farage's framing — immigration as the number one issue, population reaching 80 million — as the last substantive content heard, without rebuttal.

*Summary: The structural timing of the segment — opening with Farage's framing, burying the Wollaston defection mid-segment, and ending with unresolved chaos — systematically advantages the Leave narrative.*



## 8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Outrage = bias. Selective outrage amplifies the finding. Score = outrage level (0–5) + selectivity (0–5)

*Methodological Principle (v2.2): Before each assessment, the trigger event must be documented. A reaction can only be assessed as selective if comparable triggers in other positions produced no analogous reaction.*

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 04:16–04:18

Trigger event: Farage makes a population projection claim (80 million by 2040) and continues speaking over others.  
Reaction: "Nigel you told your followers to bully people to vote for you this is not the right attitude for you to have" — Eddie responds with a personal attack rather than a factual rebuttal.

**Comparison** When Eddie makes the unverifiable claim that Brexit is "almost an anagram of recession" (03:15–03:21), no equivalent personal challenge or outrage is expressed by Farage or the moderator.

Asymmetry: Supported — personal attack on Farage for alleged bullying goes unmoderated; comparable rhetorical excess by Eddie does not trigger equivalent response.

### Finding 2:

**Timestamp** 03:39–04:02

Trigger event: Farage defends his immigration control position.  
Reaction: "you are from an immigrant family and you're married to an immigrant why are you so against immigration" — Eddie expresses moral outrage at Farage's personal consistency.

**Comparison** No equivalent moral challenge is directed at Eddie or any Remain panellist regarding their personal background or consistency.

Asymmetry: Supported — moral outrage is directed exclusively at Farage; no comparable challenge to Remain panellist's personal consistency or background.

*Summary: Selective outrage in this segment is directed exclusively at Farage — through personal background challenges and bullying allegations — while comparable rhetorical and evidential failures by the Remain panellist attract no equivalent response from either the moderator or other participants.*



9. COMPLETENESS							7/10		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

*Share of covered perspectives*

*Inverted: original value measures coverage (higher = better). Shown as deviation (higher = larger gaps).*

Independent of the transcript, the following perspectives would be necessary for genuinely balanced coverage:

- [A]** Economic case for immigration: peer-reviewed evidence on fiscal contributions, labour market effects, and productivity gains from EU migration.
- [B]** Economic case against high immigration: evidence on wage suppression in low-skilled sectors, housing demand pressure, and public service strain.
- [C]** Legal/constitutional perspective: what "control" actually means under EU free movement law, and what post-Brexit immigration control would realistically look like.
- [D]** Public service perspective: NHS and school administrators on whether immigration is the primary driver of service pressure, versus austerity and underfunding.
- [E]** Remain Eurosceptic perspective: voters who were sceptical of the EU but chose Remain for economic or practical reasons (as represented by Sarah Wollaston's defection).
- [F]** Commonwealth and non-EU immigration perspective: the fact that the UK already controlled non-EU immigration and had chosen not to reduce it significantly.
- [G]** Historical perspective on UK immigration: long-term demographic and economic data contextualising current migration levels.
- [H]** Personal testimony from EU migrants: the human dimension of the debate, beyond statistics.
- [I]** Independent economic forecasting: Bank of England, OBR, or independent academic projections on post-Brexit economic scenarios.
- [J]** Quality-of-life research: empirical evidence on whether immigration correlates with reduced quality of life in affected communities, or whether other factors dominate.



## Soft Facts — 6 qualitative techniques

### 10. FRAMING

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

#### Finding 1:

Timestamp	00:00–00:10
Quote	<i>“yesterday William hag said that voters should not make their decision in the referendum on the basis of controlling immigration do you agree”</i>
Manipulation	The opening question frames Hague’s statement as requiring justification or disagreement, implicitly positioning immigration control as a legitimate and primary referendum criterion that Hague has controversially dismissed.
Why problematic	The framing presupposes that immigration control is a valid primary basis for the referendum decision, rather than asking whether it is an appropriate basis. This loads the question in favour of the Leave/Farage position before any answer is given.

#### Finding 2:

Timestamp	01:05–01:29
Quote	<i>“the reason in this referendum why we have to talk about this is all the while that which is a British passport or should be but the first two words on it a European Union that is available to 8 million people”</i>
Manipulation	Farage frames the British passport as having been colonised by EU identity (“the first two words on it a European Union”), constructing a narrative of lost sovereignty and identity rather than a policy debate.
Why problematic	This is an emotionally charged identity frame that conflates passport design with immigration policy and sovereignty, and it goes unchallenged by the moderator. The frame positions Leave as reclaiming something stolen rather than making a policy choice.

#### Finding 3:

Timestamp	02:02–02:22
Quote	<i>“there’s an issue called the quality of life and I and I think that matters more than money it’s about thinking our kids and grandkids can have what we’ve had”</i>
Manipulation	Farage reframes the economic debate as a generational and emotional quality-of-life argument, pre-emptively dismissing economic counter-evidence as irrelevant (“matters more than GDP Rising by 1%”).
Why problematic	This framing immunises the Leave position against empirical economic challenge by elevating subjective quality-of-life concerns above measurable data, and the moderator does not press Farage on the empirical basis for the quality-of-life claim.



**Schweizerischer Verein** für ausgewogene Berichterstattung  
**Association suisse** pour une information équilibrée  
**Associazione svizzera** per un reporting equilibrato

*Summary: The broadcast is framed predominantly around the Leave/Farage premise that immigration is the central referendum issue and that quality-of-life concerns override economic evidence. The Remain position is placed in a reactive, defensive posture throughout.*



11. LANGUAGE AND TERMINOLOGY									5/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Finding 1:	
Timestamp	00:24–00:27
Quote	<i>**appears to have really rather sold out**</i>
Manipulation	Farage uses "sold out" to describe William Hague's position — a phrase with strong connotations of betrayal and moral failure.
Why problematic	This is loaded political language that frames a policy disagreement as a personal moral failing. Neutral alternative would be: "changed his position" or "taken a different view."

Finding 2:	
Timestamp	00:30–00:34
Quote	<i>**immigration is the number one issue in British politics it has been for some years**</i>
Manipulation	Presented as established fact without qualification. The claim that immigration is "the number one issue" is a polling-dependent assertion that varies by methodology and question framing.
Why problematic	Stating this as unqualified fact rather than as a contested claim normalises the primacy of immigration as a political concern and validates the Leave campaign's central messaging strategy.

Finding 3:	
Timestamp	03:15–03:21
Quote	<i>**brexit is almost an anagram of recession if you put two s's into the word brexit it's brex session they almost designed it that way**</i>
Manipulation	Eddie uses a wordplay device to associate Brexit with recession — a rhetorical trick that substitutes linguistic coincidence for economic argument.
Why problematic	This trivialises a serious economic debate and reduces it to a pun, which undermines the credibility of the Remain economic argument at the very moment it is being made. The moderator does not redirect to substantive economic evidence.

*Summary: Both sides use loaded language, but Farage's language ("sold out," "no control," "quality of life") is more systematically emotive and goes unchallenged, while Eddie's rhetorical excess (the anagram) is equally unchallenged and self-undermining.*



## 12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

*Methodological Principle (v2.2): Before each assessment, the trigger event must be documented. An intervention can only be assessed as asymmetric if comparable triggers in other guests produced no analogous intervention.*

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 04:16–04:40

Trigger event: Farage continues speaking at length, dominating the discussion and not yielding to other panellists.

**Quote (Moderator)** *\*\*\*there are four there are right three three other people in the table I'm going\*\*\**

**Comparison** No comparable intervention is recorded when Eddie speaks at length (02:28–03:40 — approximately 70 seconds uninterrupted). The moderator intervenes to curtail Farage but not Eddie.

Asymmetry: Partially supported — the moderator does eventually intervene with Farage, but the intervention comes later and is less firm than the implicit tolerance extended to Eddie's extended turn. However, Farage's turn was also longer and more dominant, so the trigger is not fully comparable. Asymmetry: partially supported but not conclusively established.

### Finding 2:

**Timestamp** 04:16–04:18

Trigger event: Farage makes the claim that the UK population will reach 80 million by 2040 due to immigration.

**Quote (Moderator)** *\*\*\*how are we going all right I'm going\*\*\**

**Comparison** Eddie's claim that Brexit is "almost an anagram of recession" (03:15–03:21) — a demonstrably rhetorical and non-evidential statement — receives no moderator challenge or interruption.

Asymmetry: The moderator moves to cut off Farage's population projection claim (which, while contested, is at least a factual assertion) but does not challenge Eddie's wordplay argument. Asymmetry: supported — comparable rhetorical excess by Eddie goes unchallenged.

### Finding 3:

**Timestamp** 03:39–04:02

Trigger event: Eddie raises Farage's personal background (immigrant family, French Protestant heritage, German heritage) as an argument against his immigration position.

**Quote** *\*\*\*you are from an immigrant family and you're married to an immigrant why are you so against immigration... you're French Protestant from one side you're German from the other side you should be the champion\*\*\**

**Comparison** No comparable personal-background challenge is directed at Eddie or any other panellist. The moderator does not intervene to redirect from personal attack to policy substance.

Asymmetry: Supported — personal attack on Farage goes unmoderated; no equivalent personal challenge directed at Remain panellist.



**Schweizerischer Verein** für ausgewogene Berichterstattung  
**Association suisse** pour une information équilibrée  
**Associazione svizzera** per un reporting equilibrato

*Summary: The moderation shows two asymmetries: personal attacks on Farage are not redirected to policy substance, and Farage's factual claims are more likely to be interrupted than Eddie's rhetorical excesses. However, Farage's dominance of airtime partially justifies some of the moderator's interventions.*



### 13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

#### Asymmetry 1:

To Farage, 00:00–00:10: "yesterday William hag said that voters should not make their decision in the referendum on the basis of controlling immigration do you agree" — Soft/leading — invites Farage to disagree with Hague and elaborate his own position; no challenge embedded.

To Eddie, implicit throughout: Eddie is not asked a structured question; he intervenes voluntarily. No direct question is posed to him by the moderator in this segment.

#### Comparison

Farage receives a structured opening question that gives him the floor; Eddie must fight for speaking time. This structurally advantages Farage.

#### Asymmetry 2:

To Farage, 01:44–01:51: "that's why you said it didn't matter if we weren't slightly richer by leaving as long as we cut immigration" — Moderately challenging — paraphrases and slightly sharpens Farage's earlier position.

To Eddie, no equivalent challenge: Eddie's claim that EU migrants "put in 20 billion" (02:35–02:42) is not followed up with a source request or challenge.

#### Comparison

Farage receives at least one substantive challenge on his economic trade-off position; Eddie's data claim goes unchallenged. \*\*Asymmetry: partially supported in Farage's disfavour.\*\*

*Summary: The question structure advantages Farage in terms of floor access (he receives the opening question) but disadvantages him in terms of challenge (his economic trade-off is pressed, while Eddie's data claims are not). The net asymmetry is moderate and partially offsetting.*



## 14. FALSE BALANCE

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

#### Timestamp

Throughout segment

Construct: The debate is structured as a two-sided exchange between Farage (Leave) and Eddie (Remain), implying equivalence between the two positions and the two speakers.

#### Analysis

This is not a false balance problem in the traditional sense (where fringe views are given equal weight to consensus views). Both Leave and Remain were mainstream positions in the 2016 referendum. However, the specific framing of immigration as the central issue creates a false balance between Farage's assertion that immigration is the number one issue and the Remain position, which is forced to argue on Farage's chosen terrain rather than on economic or constitutional grounds.

*Summary: False balance is not a dominant problem in this segment; the two-sided debate format is appropriate for a referendum context. The more significant issue is that the debate is conducted on Leave's chosen terrain (immigration) rather than on a balanced range of referendum considerations.*



## 15. AGENDA-SETTING

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Agenda element set: Immigration is the number one issue in the referendum and in British politics.

#### Timestamp

00:30–00:34 — Evidence: *“immigration is the number one issue in British politics it has been for some years”*

Alternative agenda: The referendum also concerned constitutional sovereignty, trade relationships, financial regulation, workers' rights, and environmental standards — none of which appear on the agenda in this segment.

### Finding 2:

Agenda element set: The UK has "no control" over immigration while in the EU.

#### Timestamp

01:23–01:26 — Evidence: *“we have no control”*

Alternative agenda: The UK retained significant controls (right to deport criminals, transitional arrangements, benefit restrictions) and independently controlled non-EU immigration. This alternative is entirely absent from the agenda.

### Finding 3:

Agenda element set: The debate about immigration is primarily about volume (numbers) rather than composition, integration, or economic function.

#### Timestamp

00:37–01:01 — Evidence: *“77% of the British public want cuts to the numbers... over half the voters want a reduction to near zero”*

Alternative agenda: Research on immigration integration, economic complementarity, and the distinction between high-skill and low-skill migration flows is entirely absent.

*Summary: The agenda is set almost entirely by Farage's framing: immigration as the primary issue, volume as the primary metric, and Leave as the only route to control. The moderator does not introduce alternative agenda items, and the Remain panellist largely accepts the immigration-centred terrain rather than redirecting to other referendum considerations.*



## CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

### OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

#### Individual Scores — All 15 Criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Rating
1	EXPERT SELECTION	4/10	<i>Slight imbalance</i>
2	SOURCE SELECTION	6/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
3	TIME DISTRIBUTION	5/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
4	SELECTIVE OMISSION	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
5	NUMERICAL MANIPULATION	5/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
6	GUILT BY ASSOCIATION	4/10	<i>Slight imbalance</i>
7	TIMING	5/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
8	SELECTIVE OUTRAGE	5/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
9	COMPLETENESS	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
10	FRAMING	6/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
11	LANGUAGE AND TERMINOLOGY	5/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
12	MODERATION BEHAVIOUR	6/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
13	QUESTION ASYMMETRY	6/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
14	FALSE BALANCE	3/10	<i>Slight imbalance</i>
15	AGENDA-SETTING	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>

#### HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

**5.3/10**

*Significant imbalance*

#### SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

**5.6/10**

*Significant imbalance*

#### OVERALL SCORE

**5.5/10**

*Significant imbalance*

*Average of Hardfacts and Softfacts*



## KEY — Score Definitions

### Individual Scores per Criterion (0–10)

<b>0</b>	<b>No finding</b>	No relevant anomaly detected.
<b>1–2</b>	<b>Weak finding</b>	Minor anomaly without substantial impact on balance.
<b>3–4</b>	<b>Slight to moderate finding</b>	Recognizable tendency; low to moderate impact relevance.
<b>5</b>	<b>Moderate finding with impact</b>	Relevant imbalance affecting the audience's opinion-forming potential.
<b>6</b>	<b>Significant finding (threshold)</b>	Scores of 6 and above are classified as 'significant findings.'
<b>7</b>	<b>Significant finding</b>	Clear, well-documented imbalance with distinct impact relevance.
<b>8–9</b>	<b>Severe finding</b>	Pronounced imbalance; multiple documented individual findings in this criterion.
<b>10</b>	<b>Maximum severity</b>	Systematic, pervasive imbalance in this criterion.

### Aggregated Deviation Index — Interpretation Ranges

<b>0.0 – 2.5</b>	<b>Unremarkable</b>	No significant patterns detected; broadcast meets the impartiality standard.
<b>2.6 – 4.0</b>	<b>Slight imbalance</b>	Isolated anomalies; statistically visible but within tolerance range.
<b>4.1 – 6.0</b>	<b>Significant imbalance</b>	Multiple significant findings; relevant impairment of perspective diversity.
<b>6.1 – 8.0</b>	<b>Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation</b>	Pronounced, cross-broadcast patterns; high impact relevance.
<b>8.1 – 10</b>	<b>Fundamental systemic one-sidedness. Very high bias degree</b>	Maximum severity across nearly all criteria; systematically one-sided reporting.

### Party-Political Bias (-5 to +5)

<b>-5 to -3</b>	<b>Strongly disadvantaged</b>	Party is significantly underrepresented in framing, airtime, or presentation.
<b>-2 to -1</b>	<b>Slightly disadvantaged</b>	Recognizable but minor disadvantage.
<b>0</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	No detectable favoritism or disadvantage.
<b>+1 to +2</b>	<b>Slightly favored</b>	Recognizable but minor favoritism.
<b>+3 to +5</b>	<b>Strongly favored</b>	Party is significantly overrepresented in framing, airtime, or presentation.



## CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL CLASSIFICATION (BBC Charter Art. 6)

### Assessment under BBC Charter Article 6

*The BBC Royal Charter and Agreement require the BBC to provide duly accurate and impartial news, current affairs and factual programming. Article 6 specifically requires due impartiality in matters of political controversy, with particular attention to ensuring that a wide range of significant views and perspectives are given due weight.*

#### Violation 1:

Standard: BBC Charter Art. 6 — Due Impartiality

Offence: The broadcast fails to ensure that the Remain position is given due weight in the agenda-setting of the debate. The entire segment is conducted on the Leave campaign's chosen terrain (immigration as the primary referendum criterion), and the moderator introduces no alternative referendum considerations.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:00–04:40 — The word "immigration" or cognates appears in virtually every exchange; no question is posed about trade, constitutional sovereignty, workers' rights, or financial regulation.

Assessment: Under Article 6, due impartiality does not require equal time but does require that significant views are given due weight. The structural exclusion of non-immigration referendum considerations from the agenda constitutes a failure of due impartiality, particularly in the context of a referendum campaign where the BBC's obligations were at their highest.

#### Violation 2:

Standard: BBC Charter Art. 6 — Due Accuracy

Offence: Multiple statistical claims are made by both speakers without source attribution, and the moderator does not request attribution or challenge the figures. The most significant uncontested claim — that the UK has "no control" over immigration while in the EU — is factually incomplete and goes unchallenged.

Evidence: Timestamp 01:23–01:26 — "we have no control the only way we get control is to vote to leave the European Union" — no moderator challenge; timestamp 00:37–00:45 — polling figures cited without source; timestamp 02:31–02:42 — economic figures cited without source.

Assessment: BBC Charter Article 6 requires due accuracy. The failure to challenge or contextualise the "no control" claim — which omits the UK's existing controls over non-EU immigration and the range of post-Brexit models — constitutes a material failure of accuracy in a high-stakes political broadcast.

#### Violation 3:

Standard: BBC Charter Art. 6 — Due Impartiality / Range of Views

Offence: The broadcast presents only two voices (Farage/Leave and Eddie/Remain) on a question that involved at least six distinct political parties with active referendum positions. The Liberal Democrats, SNP, Greens, and the Conservative Remain campaign are entirely absent.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:00–04:40 — No voice other than Farage and Eddie is given substantive speaking time; the only other references are to absent figures (Hague, Wollaston).

Assessment: While a panel format cannot include all parties, the complete absence of the SNP, Liberal Democrats, and Green Party — all of which had distinct and publicly prominent referendum positions — represents a failure to ensure that a wide range of significant views are given due weight, as required by Article 6.

### Overall Assessment under BBC Charter Article 6

This broadcast segment exhibits three distinct areas of concern under BBC Charter Article 6: a failure of due impartiality through agenda-setting that systematically advantages the Leave position; a failure of due accuracy through the non-challenge of the "no control" claim and the absence of source attribution for statistical claims; and a



**Schweizerischer Verein** für ausgewogene Berichterstattung  
**Association suisse** pour une information équilibrée  
**Associazione svizzera** per un reporting equilibrato

failure to represent the range of significant views by excluding the Liberal Democrat, SNP, and Green Party perspectives entirely. These failures are individually moderate but cumulatively significant, particularly given the proximity to the referendum vote and the BBC's heightened obligations in electoral and referendum contexts under both the Charter and the Ofcom Broadcasting Code Section 6. A court or regulatory body assessing this segment against the Charter standard would likely find that the due impartiality and due accuracy requirements were not met, though the violations fall short of the systematic and deliberate distortion that would constitute the most serious category of Charter breach.



## CHAPTER 6 — Source Depth Check

*All sources cited in this broadcast segment are informal — polling data, economic studies, and political statements cited without attribution. No formal expert body, NGO, or advisory institution is named. The following assessment therefore applies to the categories of source implied by the claims made.*

### 1. Unnamed polling data (Farage, 00:37–00:45)

- FUNDING:** Unknown — no source cited. Polling organisations range from fully independent (academic) to commercially funded (YouGov, Ipsos) to campaign-commissioned.
- MANDATE:** Cannot be assessed without source identification.
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** High — polling data cited by a campaign leader to support his campaign position, without independent verification.
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** D1 Conflict of Interest: -2 | D2 Personal Risk: 0 | D3 Subject Competence: -1 (politician citing polling, not pollster) | D4 Consistency: +1 | D5 Emotion vs. Data: -1 | D6 Source Level: -2 → TOTAL: -5 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: RED
- COUNTER-SOURCE:** British Election Study, NatCen Social Research, or academic polling analysis would have contextualised the figures. Not cited.

### 2. Unnamed economic study (Eddie, 02:31–02:42)

- FUNDING:** Unknown — likely refers to UCL Centre for Research and Analysis of Migration (CReAM) study by Dustmann and Frattini (2014), which found EU migrants made a net positive fiscal contribution. If so, this is a peer-reviewed academic study.
- MANDATE:** If CReAM, mandate is compatible with neutral assessment; however, the figure is cited without attribution, preventing verification.
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Moderate — cited to support Remain position; without attribution, cannot assess whether the study's methodology and scope support the specific claim made.
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** D1 Conflict of Interest: -1 | D2 Personal Risk: 0 | D3 Subject Competence: 0 (panellist citing study, not researcher) | D4 Consistency: 0 | D5 Emotion vs. Data: +1 | D6 Source Level: -1 → TOTAL: -1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW
- COUNTER-SOURCE:** Studies on distributional effects of immigration (e.g., wage suppression in low-skill sectors, Nickell and Saleheen 2015) are not cited. Not provided.

*IMPORTANT: "Recognised" is not a substantive qualification. It is a social attribution that must itself be examined. Neither source in this broadcast is attributed with sufficient detail to permit independent verification, which is itself a failure of the due accuracy standard.*

*End of Analysis — Version 2.7-detail*

*All 15 criteria assessed | All 4 steps completed | Methodological Principles K5+K13 applied throughout*

## Legal and Methodological Notes

### No factual determination

The results presented do not constitute factual determinations about individual persons, editorial teams, or broadcasts. They are the product of a standardized operationalization, not a finding of individual responsibility.



**Schweizerischer Verein** für ausgewogene Berichterstattung  
**Association suisse** pour une information équilibrée  
**Associazione svizzera** per un reporting equilibrato

**No legal judgment**

The aggregated deviation index does not replace a legal assessment under Ofcom Broadcasting Code. The determination of whether a specific broadcast violates legal requirements is exclusively the responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular Ofcom).

**No proof of causation**

Statistical correlations are not to be interpreted as proof of causal relationships or editorial intent. Deviation values may be influenced by topic selection, news environment, political controversy, or format logic.

**No judgment of intent**

The analysis measures observable structural characteristics of broadcasts. A score of 7 means a significant imbalance was detected — not that the editorial team intended it. The methodology makes no claims about motives or strategic objectives.

**Heuristic comparison tool**

The index serves comparative pattern recognition across thousands of broadcasts, not precise metric measurement of individual segments. Threshold values serve heuristic orientation, not sharp legal qualification.



## APPENDIX 1: NATIONAL BROADCASTING LAW

### Legal Framework United Kingdom — BBC

---

#### Legislation

---

- BBC Royal Charter (2017, valid until 2027)
- Communications Act 2003
- Ofcom Broadcasting Code

#### Relevant Provisions

##### BBC Royal Charter

---

- Art. 5 (Public Purposes): Sustaining citizenship and civil society through the provision of impartial news and information to help people understand and engage with the world around them.
- Art. 6(4): The BBC must observe high standards of due impartiality.

##### Communications Act 2003

---

- s.319(2)(c): News included in television and radio services is presented with due impartiality.
- s.320(1): Special impartiality requirements for matters of political controversy and matters relating to current public policy.

##### Ofcom Broadcasting Code

---

- Section 5 (Due Impartiality): Due impartiality on matters of political or industrial controversy and matters relating to current public policy. "Due" means adequate or appropriate to the subject and nature of the programme.

#### Core Obligations

---

- 1. Due Impartiality:** Not absolute equal treatment, but appropriate to the subject matter
- 2. Due Accuracy:** Adequate accuracy in reporting
- 3. Editorial Independence:** Independence from government and commercial interests

#### Regulatory Authority

---

- Ofcom (Office of Communications): External regulator with sanctioning powers
- BBC Board: Internal governance

#### Complaints Procedure

---

1. BBC Complaints (internal, three-tier)
2. Ofcom (external complaint after exhausting internal routes)
3. Judicial Review (High Court)



## APPENDIX 2: SCIENTIFIC REFERENCES

### References

---

- Bennett, W. L. (1990). Toward a theory of press-state relations in the United States. *Journal of Communication*, 40(2), 103–125.
- Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*. Free Press.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58.
- fög – Forschungszentrum Öffentlichkeit und Gesellschaft (2024). *Jahrbuch Qualität der Medien 2024*. Schwabe.
- Gilardi, F., Alizadeh, M. & Kubli, M. (2023). ChatGPT outperforms crowd workers for text-annotation tasks. *PNAS*, 120(30).
- Iyengar, S. & Kinder, D. R. (1987). *News that matters: Television and American opinion*. University of Chicago Press.
- Jolly, S. et al. (2022). Chapel Hill Expert Survey trend file, 1999–2019. *Electoral Studies*, 75, 102420.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- McCombs, M. E. & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 176–187.
- Shoemaker, P. J. & Vos, T. P. (2009). *Gatekeeping theory*. Routledge.
- SVFAB (2026). *Methodenbericht v4.1: Zählbare Kriterien und Multi-Modell-Kreuzvalidierung*.
- Törnberg, P. (2023). ChatGPT-4 outperforms experts and crowd workers in annotating political Twitter messages. arXiv:2304.06588.

### SVFAB Working Papers

---

- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Systematic AI-Assisted Analysis of Public Broadcaster Impartiality: A Scalable Methodological Framework for Measuring Structural Bias in Public Service Media. [SSRN 6688478](#)
- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Measuring Editorial Noise: A Retrospective Suppression Index for Public Broadcasting Content Analysis. [SSRN 6733280](#)
- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Source Traffic Light: A Six-Dimensional Credibility Framework for Systematic Source Assessment in Public Service Media. [SSRN 6733880](#)

*David Schläpfer — ORCID: 0009-0000-5671-9266*



**Schweizerischer Verein** für ausgewogene Berichterstattung  
**Association suisse** pour une information équilibrée  
**Associazione svizzera** per un reporting equilibrato

## Reports and Membership at SVFAB

At SVFAB.ch you will find detailed reports and can also commission custom analyses for any broadcast (billed separately). To ensure the quality of our work, we depend on membership fees and donations.

### Contact and further information:

[www.SVFAB.ch](http://www.SVFAB.ch) | [Kontakt@SVFAB.ch](mailto:Kontakt@SVFAB.ch)

**Bank details:** PostFinance – POFICHBE

**IBAN:** CH32 0900 0000 1675 6251 1

**Beneficiary:** SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zürich 1



## The following books are available from SVFAB

Orders via [www.svfab.ch](http://www.svfab.ch) or [kontakt@svfab.ch](mailto:kontakt@svfab.ch)



**Unbalanced Reporting** is the response to the halving initiative in Switzerland: Manipulation techniques are explained in detail, starting with the selection of staff and sources. Then 15 principles are explained: omission, framing, temporal framing, guilt by association, emotionalisation, context removal and many more, illustrated with numerous examples. Additionally, it becomes apparent where we ourselves apply these techniques – fostering not only awareness but also empathy.

Optionally the book comes with **playing cards**.

Also available as an **audiobook**.



The interview is not a conversation. It is a stage – and someone else has written the script.

Those who don't know this deliver material. Good quotes that get cut wrong. Correct statements that end up in the wrong context. Honest answers framed as confessions.

This book is not a media criticism book. It is a toolbox – for everyone who faces a microphone and wants to know what to do about it. 7 chapters. 7 tools: What an interview really is. The 7 most common traps. The three principles of sovereignty – anchoring, reframing, setting boundaries. Preparation in one hour. Body and voice. What to do when things go wrong. And what matters after the interview.

For politicians, activists, entrepreneurs, whistleblowers – for everyone who is in the public eye and wants to understand how the game works. So they stop playing along – and start shaping it.

In A5 format. Direct. For preparation, reference, follow-up and when difficulties arise



**You think you see the world.** In reality you see the frame someone has placed around it. Framing is the oldest and most elegant manipulation technique in the world. It doesn't change the facts – it changes what we make of the facts. How we feel. What we believe. How we decide. And it works – because we all play along. Every day. Unconsciously. You too. This book is not a dry textbook. It is a workbook – playful, direct, full of real-life examples. You don't just learn how others frame you. You learn how you yourself frame – and how you can use it consciously and fairly.

Because whoever understands framing sees the world more clearly. Hears news differently. Conducts conversations more confidently. And no longer so easily accepts a frame chosen by someone else.



**Schweizerischer Verein** für ausgewogene Berichterstattung  
**Association suisse** pour une information équilibrée  
**Associazione svizzera** per un reporting equilibrato

With many exercises and concrete examples from politics, media and everyday life – and the occasional smile.

**Framing with style. Because the frame changes everything.**