



BBC DETAILED ANALYSIS

case030_BBC Bias Protest Glasgow 29/6/14 (HIGHLIGHTS).en

Broadcast: COMPLETE DETAIL ANALYSIS | Analyzed: 2026-05-11 19:59

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

OVERALL SCORE

6.0/10

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)

2.2 / 10

Left-favoring

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

← Left

Right →

Source: Chapel Hill Expert Survey 2024 — 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

Assessment by Party

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast Representation vs. Programme Position
Conservative	-5	15:05 "all the Tory Vermin" — Programme position: centre-right governance, welfare reform as fiscal responsibility — Actively distorted: Conservatives presented as genocidal oppressors; no policy position accurately represented.
Labour	-1	Not directly addressed; implicitly subsumed into "Westminster" critique — Programme position (2014 Scottish Labour): pro-Union, anti-independence — Omitted: Scottish Labour's pro-Union position entirely absent; the broadcast implies all left-wing voters should support independence.
Lib Dems	0	Not mentioned — Programme position: pro-Union in 2014 — Omitted: No representation.
SNP	+4	Implicitly endorsed throughout as the vehicle for independence — Programme position: Scottish independence, progressive governance — Broadly consistent with SNP framing, though SNP not explicitly named.
Reform UK	0	Not mentioned (note: Reform UK did not exist in 2014 in its current form) — N/A.
Green	0	Not mentioned — Programme position: broadly pro-independence in Scotland — Omitted: No representation.

Note: This broadcast predates the 2024 political landscape described in the political context section. The relevant parties for 2014 are Conservative (government), Labour (official opposition and pro-Union in Scotland), Liberal Democrats (coalition government partner), and SNP (pro-independence). Reform UK did not exist; the Green Party had minimal Scottish presence.

Party Bias Summary

- Most accurate representation: SNP (Score +4) — implicitly endorsed, positions broadly consistent with broadcast framing.
- Strongest distortion: Conservative Party (Score -5) — actively dehumanised, policy positions not engaged with, associated with genocide.
- Average deviation from 0: 1.7
- Conclusion: The broadcast exhibits extreme negative bias toward the Conservative Party and the unionist political tradition, while implicitly endorsing the SNP/pro-independence position. Labour's pro-Union position in Scotland is entirely omitted, creating a false impression that left-wing voters naturally support independence. The distortion of Conservative policy positions through Holocaust framing and dehumanising language represents the most severe form of political misrepresentation present in the broadcast.



CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Broadcast Data

- Title: Scottish Independence Rally / Street Event Coverage (unedited live stream footage, likely captured/broadcast via "Independence Live")
- Date (from filename): Not specified in transcript; internal references to Scottish independence referendum place this circa 2014 (pre-referendum period, September 2014 vote)
- Estimated Length: Approximately 24–25 minutes (transcript ends at ~24:46)
- Presenter/Reporter: No formal BBC presenter identified. The event appears to be a grassroots pro-independence rally streamed by "Independence Live" (referenced at 01:03). A man named Crawford acts as informal MC (18:58–19:06). Note: The transcript opens with a reference to "forget your BBC it's a total joke" (00:57), suggesting this is NOT a BBC-produced broadcast but rather an independent live stream of a pro-independence rally. This is a critical preliminary finding that affects the entire analysis framework.
- Guests/Speakers (with function/party/affiliation):

Actors	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political Spectrum
Mark McNaught	Speaker; described as from "Newsnet"; based in France, American academic	Pro-independence media/advocacy	Left-nationalist (approx. 2.0)
Crawford	Informal MC; described as connected to "Highland Radio" and "Papa Shandy"	Pro-independence activist/organiser	Scottish nationalist
Black Triangle Campaign Speaker	Disability rights activist	Black Triangle Campaign (anti-austerity, pro-independence)	Far left (approx. 1.5)
Unnamed spoken word/rap performer	Performer/activist	Pro-independence	Left-nationalist
Unnamed singer(s)	Musical performers	Pro-independence	Cultural nationalist
"Moira" (mentioned)	Unnamed participant	Pro-independence	Unknown

Main Topic

A pro-Scottish-independence street rally or public gathering, live-streamed by "Independence Live," featuring speeches, spoken word performances, music, and activist addresses in the lead-up to the 2014 Scottish independence referendum.

World-View Context

The 2014 Scottish independence referendum was one of the most significant constitutional events in modern British history, with Scotland voting 55.3% to remain in the United Kingdom. The campaign period was characterised by intense grassroots mobilisation on both sides. The "Yes" campaign drew heavily on left-wing, anti-austerity, and cultural-nationalist sentiment, particularly targeting younger voters (16–17-year-olds were enfranchised for this vote). The "No" / "Better Together" campaign emphasised economic security, shared institutions, and international standing. Media coverage was contested, with pro-independence activists frequently accusing mainstream broadcasters — including the BBC — of bias toward the unionist position. This transcript represents the pro-independence side's own media ecosystem, not BBC editorial output.

Critical preliminary note: The transcript does not appear to be a BBC-produced programme. The speaker at 00:57 explicitly states "forget your BBC it's a total joke," and the stream is identified as "Independence Live" (01:03–01:05).



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

The analysis below therefore proceeds on the basis that this is third-party activist content, not BBC journalism. The BBC Charter Art. 6 impartiality standard applies to BBC editorial output; it does not govern third-party content that the BBC may have captured, archived, or referenced. The analysis will nonetheless apply all 15 criteria to the content as presented, noting where BBC Charter obligations would or would not apply.

Assessment: Was Each Perspective Addressed?

[A] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 05:00–05:10 — Quote: "your oil money is going to the another state" — Assessment: Addressed one-sidedly as a grievance, without economic counter-argument.

[B] OMITTED

Timestamp: N/A — No speaker presents the economic case for the Union at any point in the broadcast.

[C] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 04:18–05:54 — Quote: "you all are doing what we Americans did over 230 years ago" — Assessment: Self-determination framed as historically inevitable and morally unambiguous.

[D] OMITTED

Timestamp: N/A — The unionist constitutional argument is entirely absent from the broadcast.

[E] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 14:00–15:15 — Quote: "10,600 people in 2011 died within six weeks of being found fit for work" — Assessment: Addressed with high emotional intensity; no verification or counter-context provided.

[F] OMITTED

Timestamp: N/A — No perspective supporting welfare reform or questioning the statistics presented is included.

[G] SUGGESTED / HINTED

Timestamp: 04:27–04:35 — Quote: "you hear a lot about all this crap you hear on TV about Obama said oh that you know it's better ticket we want Scotland to remain United" — Assessment: International dimension raised but dismissed as ignorance rather than engaged with substantively.

[H] ADDRESSED (one-sidedly)

Timestamp: 07:34–11:32 — Quote: "you're no longer in a back seat we're handing over the wheel" — Assessment: Young voters addressed exclusively as pro-independence agents; no young unionist voice included.

[I] OMITTED

Timestamp: N/A — Scottish Unionist voters, Labour supporters in Scotland, and Conservative/LibDem perspectives entirely absent.

[J] ADDRESSED (one-sidedly)

Timestamp: 00:57–01:05 and 24:22–24:46 — Quote: "forget your BBC it's a total joke" / "forget these morons" — Assessment: Mainstream media addressed only as an adversary to be dismissed.



CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

Hard Facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically verifiable

1. EXPERT SELECTION

9/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Expert 1: Mark McNaught (Newsnet / academic based in France)

Timestamp	03:57–06:11
Statement	"you all are doing what we Americans did over 230 years ago [...] if you read through the Declaration of Independence [...] all of so many of the same vindications that you see in the Declaration of Independence are exactly the same things that you're reclaiming now"
Classification	McNaught presents himself as an informed observer with academic credentials, but his statement is entirely advocacy-based, drawing a historical analogy without scholarly qualification.
Missing counter-voice	A constitutional historian with expertise in both American and Scottish constitutional law who could assess the validity of the analogy.

Source Depth Check:

(a) FUNDING: McNaught is associated with Newsnet Scotland, a pro-independence online publication. Funding is not disclosed in the broadcast. Structural interest: direct alignment with the pro-independence cause.

(b) MANDATE: Newsnet Scotland's mandate is explicitly pro-independence advocacy. This is incompatible with neutral expert assessment.

D1 Conflict of Interest: -2 — Affiliated with pro-independence advocacy outlet; no disclosure.

D2 Personal Risk: 0 — No evidence of personal risk from this position; speaking to a sympathetic audience.

D3 Subject Competence: 0 — Claims academic background but speaks outside any stated specialism; historical analogy is rhetorical, not scholarly.

D4 Opinion Consistency: +1 — Consistent pro-independence position, but consistency here reflects advocacy rather than scholarly integrity.

D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data: -2 — Entirely emotional/rhetorical; no data, no qualifications, no acknowledgment of counter-arguments.

D6 Source Level: -2 — No primary sources cited; purely tertiary rhetorical assertion.

TOTAL: -5 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: RED

(c) PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE: McNaught is framed implicitly as an informed international observer lending credibility to the independence cause. This framing obscures his advocacy role and presents partisan opinion as external validation.

Expert 2: Black Triangle Campaign Speaker (unnamed)

Timestamp	14:00–15:15
Statement	"10,600 people in 2011 died within six weeks of being found fit for work [...] half a million disabled people are going to lose their benefits under this condemned regime"
Classification	Disability rights activist presenting statistics without source citation in an explicitly partisan context.



Missing counter-voice

A DWP statistician, independent welfare researcher, or academic with expertise in disability policy who could contextualise or verify the figures.

Source Depth Check:

(a) FUNDING: Black Triangle Campaign is a grassroots disability rights organisation. Funding sources not disclosed. Structural interest: organisational survival and policy influence depend on maintaining high-profile opposition to welfare reform.

(b) MANDATE: Explicitly anti-austerity, pro-independence advocacy. Not compatible with neutral expert assessment.

D1 Conflict of Interest: -2 — Organisational mandate directly aligned with the political position being advocated.

D2 Personal Risk: +1 — Disability rights activists do face genuine personal and professional risks; some credibility from lived experience.

D3 Subject Competence: +1 — Direct experience with welfare assessment impacts; however, statistical claims require independent verification.

D4 Opinion Consistency: +1 — Consistent campaigning position.

D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data: -1 — Statistics cited but without source; framing is highly emotional ("Holocaust").

D6 Source Level: -1 — Statistics presented as fact without primary source citation.

TOTAL: -1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE: The speaker is implicitly framed as a credible witness to systemic injustice. The Holocaust comparison and the unverified statistics are presented without challenge, lending them false authority.

Missing Expert Groups:

- Independent welfare policy researcher (e.g., from the Institute for Fiscal Studies or Joseph Rowntree Foundation)
- Constitutional law expert with cross-jurisdictional expertise
- Economist specialising in Scottish fiscal policy

Source Credibility Overview:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Source Depth Check	-2	0	0	+1	-2	-2	-5	RED
Source Depth Check	-2	+1	+1	+1	-1	-1	-1	YELLOW

Summary (Matrix Result):

- McNaught: RED — Advocacy outlet affiliation, no data, no qualifications, conflict of interest undisclosed.
- Black Triangle Speaker: YELLOW — Genuine lived experience but unverified statistics, extreme rhetorical framing, organisational conflict of interest.



2. SOURCE SELECTION

9/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

Source 1: Newsnet Scotland (via Mark McNaught)

Timestamp 03:47–03:50 — Statement: McNaught introduced as being "from Newsnet"

- (a) Funding and governance:** Newsnet Scotland is a pro-independence online publication. Funding sources are not publicly disclosed in detail; the outlet operates as an advocacy platform.
- (b) Structural conflict of interest:** The outlet's entire editorial mission is aligned with the pro-independence cause. McNaught cannot function as a neutral expert when introduced via this affiliation.
- (c) Missing counter-source:** An academic constitutional expert, an economist, or a journalist from a publication with editorial independence would have provided balance.

Source 2: Black Triangle Campaign

Timestamp 14:00–14:07 — Statement: "I've just got one minute to speak up for Black Triangle Disability Rights Campaign"

- (a) Funding:** Grassroots campaign organisation; funding not disclosed.
- (b) Structural conflict of interest:** The organisation's mandate is explicitly anti-austerity and pro-independence; it cannot function as a neutral source on welfare policy.
- (c) Missing counter-source:** Independent welfare research (e.g., IFS, JRF, academic disability studies) would have contextualised the statistics cited.

Source 3: "Independence Live"

Timestamp 01:03–01:05 — Statement: "he's got a company called Independence Live this is getting live streamed around the world"

- (a) Funding:** Pro-independence streaming platform; funding not disclosed.
- (b) Structural conflict of interest:** The platform's name and stated purpose are explicitly aligned with the independence cause.
- (c) Missing counter-source:** Any mainstream or neutral media outlet.

Summary: Every source cited or represented in the broadcast is explicitly aligned with the pro-independence cause. No independent, neutral, or counter-perspective source is present. This is total source homogeneity.



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

Estimated speaking time:

- Pro-independence speakers (speeches/spoken word/MC): approx. 12–14 minutes (55–60%)
- Musical performances (pro-independence content): approx. 8–10 minutes (35–40%)
- Informal/transitional speech: approx. 1–2 minutes (5%)
- Unionist/counter-perspective: 0 minutes (0%)
- Neutral/contextual content: 0 minutes (0%)

Summary: The entire broadcast time is allocated to pro-independence content. This is not a journalistic imbalance but a structural feature of the rally format. The score of 3 (rather than 10) reflects the fact that this is not a BBC editorial programme claiming balance; it is activist content where the time distribution is consistent with its stated purpose.



4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

10/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Omission 1:

Context No unionist or pro-Union voice is present at any point in the 24-minute broadcast.

Relevant at: Entire broadcast duration.

Effect The broadcast creates the impression that support for independence is universal or near-universal, and that opposition is either ignorant (as McNaught implies about Americans) or morally corrupt (as the Black Triangle speaker implies about the UK government).

Omission 2:

Context The statistics cited by the Black Triangle speaker ("10,600 people in 2011 died within six weeks of being found fit for work") are presented without source citation, methodological context, or any acknowledgment of contested interpretations.

Relevant at: 14:21–14:26

Effect Unverified statistics are presented as established fact, lending false empirical authority to a political argument.

Omission 3:

Context The international dimension — specifically the Obama administration's stated preference for Scotland remaining in the UK, and the EU membership question — is raised only to be dismissed as ignorance, without substantive engagement.

Relevant at: 04:27–04:35

Effect Legitimate international concerns about Scottish independence (currency, EU membership, NATO) are pre-emptively delegitimised rather than addressed.

Summary: The broadcast omits every perspective, voice, data point, and argument that could complicate or challenge the pro-independence narrative. This is total selective omission — not a journalistic programme with gaps, but an advocacy event with no pretence of balance.

Missing Voices

- Scottish Unionist voter / Better Together campaigner: Would have provided the democratic counter-argument and the perspective of the 55% who ultimately voted No.
- Economist / fiscal analyst: Would have contextualised claims about oil revenues, currency risk, and fiscal transfers with data.
- DWP spokesperson or welfare reform advocate: Would have provided context for the disability statistics cited by the Black Triangle speaker.
- Young voter intending to vote No: Would have represented the significant proportion of 16–17-year-olds who did not support independence.



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

- BBC journalist or editor: Would have been able to respond to the repeated accusations of bias and institutional failure.
- Scottish Labour politician: Would have represented the significant left-wing unionist tradition in Scotland.
- International relations expert: Would have provided substantive analysis of the EU, NATO, and US dimensions rather than dismissing them as ignorance.
- Disability rights researcher with cross-party perspective: Would have contextualised the Black Triangle statistics and provided a more rigorous evidence base.



5. NUMERICAL MANIPULATION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1:

Timestamp 14:21–14:26

Number: "10,600 people in 2011 died within six weeks of being found fit for work"

Missing context

No source is cited. The statistic, which circulated widely in anti-austerity campaigning circa 2011–2014, was based on DWP data but was widely contested regarding causation (correlation between ESA assessment and death does not establish that the assessment caused death). The figure also includes people who died of terminal illness after being assessed — a methodologically complex issue.

Effect

The statistic is presented as proof of government-caused mass death, when the causal relationship is contested and the methodology disputed.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 14:27–14:31

Number: "half a million disabled people are going to lose their benefits under this condemned regime"

Missing context

No source, no timeframe, no definition of "benefits," no acknowledgment of any transition support or alternative provision.

Effect

Creates an impression of imminent, total, and irreversible harm to 500,000 people, without evidential basis.

Summary: Two significant statistical claims are made without source citation, methodological context, or acknowledgment of contested interpretations. Both are used to support the most extreme rhetorical claim in the broadcast (the Holocaust comparison), amplifying their manipulative effect.



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

Association 1:	
Timestamp	15:02–15:08
Quote	<i>"we've got Ian Duncan Smith Freud Cameron and all the Tory Vermin to get to our Scotland"</i>
Technique: Named politicians (Iain Duncan Smith, David Freud, David Cameron) are grouped together and collectively labelled "Vermin," associating them with a category of beings considered dangerous, dirty, and deserving of extermination.	
Effect	The association dehumanises political opponents and implicitly frames political opposition as a form of infestation requiring elimination.

Association 2:	
Timestamp	14:54–15:02
Quote	<i>"to educate them about the Holocaust which is happening to disabled people in Scotland today"</i>
Technique: UK welfare policy is associated with the Holocaust — the systematic genocide of six million Jews and millions of others — creating an implicit association between the UK government and Nazi perpetrators.	
Effect	This association places the UK government in the moral category of genocidal regimes, making any defence of UK policy equivalent to defending genocide.

Association 3:	
Timestamp	00:57–01:05
Quote	<i>"forget your BBC it's a total joke"</i>
Technique: The BBC is associated with institutional dishonesty and irrelevance through dismissive language, without specific evidence.	
Effect	Audiences are primed to distrust BBC coverage of the referendum before any specific BBC content is engaged with.

For persons framed as operating outside legitimate discourse:

The BBC is framed as a "joke" and mainstream media as "morons" (24:36). Applying the source check:

- Do these characterisations work with verifiable primary sources? NO — No specific BBC failures are cited.
- Are the claims falsifiable? NO — "Total joke" is not a falsifiable claim.
- Personal risk from the position: LOW — Speaking to a sympathetic crowd.
- Personal gain: HIGH — Crowd approval, reinforcement of in-group identity.
- Tone: Emotional-dismissive, not analytical.
- RESULT CATEGORY: C — The characterisation of the BBC as a "joke" and mainstream media as "morons" is an unfalsifiable, evidence-free assertion functioning as in-group identity reinforcement.



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

Summary: The broadcast employs guilt-by-association techniques at the most extreme end of the rhetorical spectrum, including Holocaust comparisons and dehumanising language. These are Category C rhetorical moves — unfalsifiable, emotionally driven, and incompatible with evidence-based discourse.



7. TIMING

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Position: 00:57–01:05 (Opening)

Content: "forget your BBC it's a total joke forget it"

Timing effect: The broadcast opens with a direct attack on the BBC, priming the audience to distrust mainstream media before any substantive content is delivered. This is a classic inoculation technique — pre-emptively discrediting sources that might challenge the broadcast's narrative.

Finding 2:

Position: 14:00–15:15 (Middle — emotional climax)

Content: Black Triangle speech with Holocaust comparison and "Tory Vermin" language.

Timing effect: The most extreme rhetorical content is placed in the middle of the broadcast, after the audience has been warmed up by music and speeches, and before the closing musical celebration. This placement maximises emotional impact while embedding the extreme claims within a celebratory frame.

Finding 3:

Position: 24:22–24:46 (Closing)

Content: "forget these old giants these old gods of mass media [...] forget these morons [...] get online get on Twitter get on Facebook get on YouTube follow Independence Live"

Timing effect: The broadcast closes with a direct call to action to abandon mainstream media and follow pro-independence alternative media. This closing placement ensures the last message audiences receive is a directive to remain within the pro-independence information ecosystem.

Summary: The broadcast is structured with deliberate timing: media delegitimation at the opening, extreme emotional content at the climax, and a media ecosystem redirect at the close — a three-stage inoculation, activation, and retention sequence.



8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

8/10

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 did not produce an analogous reaction.

Finding 1:

Timestamp 14:54–15:08

Trigger event: UK welfare policy and named Conservative politicians are described using Holocaust imagery and the term "Vermin."

Reaction: No challenge, no qualification, applause implied by context.

Comparison

No comparable extreme language is applied to pro-independence figures or policies at any point in the broadcast.

Asymmetry: Confirmed — Extreme dehumanising language directed at one political side is met with implicit approval; no equivalent language or scrutiny is applied to the other side. However, methodological note: since there is no moderator and no representative of the other side present, this asymmetry is structural (a feature of the rally format) rather than editorial (a choice by a journalist).

Finding 2:

Timestamp 00:57–01:05

Trigger event: The BBC is characterised as "a total joke."

Reaction: No challenge; the statement is made to an approving crowd.

Comparison

No pro-independence media outlet or activist is subjected to comparable critical scrutiny at any point.

Asymmetry: Confirmed — Institutional criticism is applied exclusively to mainstream/unionist-associated media; pro-independence media is presented as the legitimate alternative without scrutiny.

Summary: Outrage and critical language are applied exclusively to unionist politicians, the UK government, and mainstream media. Pro-independence figures, organisations, and claims are presented without critical scrutiny. This asymmetry is total and consistent throughout the broadcast.



9. COMPLETENESS								8/10	
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).

(Based on world knowledge, independent of transcript)

[A] The economic case for Scottish independence (currency, fiscal deficit, oil revenues)

[B] The economic case for remaining in the United Kingdom (shared institutions, trade, fiscal transfers)

[C] The democratic/constitutional argument for self-determination

[D] The unionist constitutional argument (parliamentary sovereignty, shared history)

[E] The perspective of disabled people and welfare claimants under UK austerity policy

[F] The perspective of those who support welfare reform / DWP assessment processes

[G] The international dimension (EU membership, NATO, US/Obama position)

[H] The perspective of young voters (16: 17-year-olds) on both sides

[I] The perspective of Scottish Unionists, including Labour, Conservative, and Liberal Democrat voters in Scotland

[J] The perspective of mainstream media (including BBC) on their own coverage of the referendum



Soft Facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING

9/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp	04:18–04:24
Quote	<i>"you all are doing what we Americans did over 230 years ago"</i>
Manipulation	The Scottish independence referendum is framed as a colonial liberation struggle equivalent to the American Revolution, placing it within a universally celebrated historical narrative of freedom from tyranny.
Why problematic	This framing pre-empts rational debate by positioning independence as morally self-evident and opposition as equivalent to supporting colonial oppression. It excludes the possibility that remaining in the Union could be a legitimate democratic choice.

Finding 2:

Timestamp	14:54–15:02
Quote	<i>"to educate them about the Holocaust which is happening to disabled people in Scotland today"</i>
Manipulation	UK welfare policy is explicitly framed as a Holocaust — genocide against disabled people — with the independence vote positioned as the only means of stopping it.
Why problematic	The Holocaust comparison is one of the most extreme rhetorical escalations available in political discourse. It forecloses nuanced debate about welfare policy, criminalises the opposing political position, and instrumentalises the suffering of Holocaust victims for electoral purposes.

Finding 3:

Timestamp	24:22–24:46
Quote	<i>"forget these old giants these old gods of mass media forget them forget them get online get on Twitter get on Facebook get on YouTube follow Independence Live spread the word forget these morons"</i>
Manipulation	The entire mainstream media ecosystem — including the BBC — is framed as an illegitimate, corrupt institution that citizens should actively abandon in favour of pro-independence alternative media.
Why problematic	This closing frame positions the broadcast's own ideological ecosystem as the only trustworthy source of information, a classic feature of closed information environments that undermines democratic media literacy.



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

Summary: The broadcast employs a consistent liberation-struggle frame that renders opposition to independence not merely wrong but morally equivalent to supporting tyranny, genocide, and media corruption. This is total framing saturation with no counter-frame present.



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

Finding 1:	
Timestamp	15:05–15:08
Quote	<i>"we've got Ian Duncan Smith Freud Cameron and all the Tory Vermin to get to our Scotland"</i>
Manipulation	The term "Vermin" is applied to named politicians and their associates, dehumanising them.
Why problematic	Dehumanising language ("vermin") applied to political opponents is a recognised precursor to political violence and is incompatible with democratic discourse. A neutral alternative would be: "we need to remove Conservative-led policies from Scotland."

Finding 2:	
Timestamp	14:17–14:18
Quote	<i>"this condemned government"</i>
Manipulation	The UK government is described as "condemned" — a term carrying connotations of criminal judgment and moral illegitimacy — rather than as the elected government.
Why problematic	The language pre-judges the democratic legitimacy of the UK government without argument. Neutral alternative: "the current UK government."

Finding 3:	
Timestamp	05:52–05:54
Quote	<i>"of which you are one of will be one of the last"</i>
Manipulation	Scotland is positioned as one of the last remaining colonies of the British Empire, with independence framed as the completion of a global decolonisation process.
Why problematic	The colonial framing carries strong moral weight (colonialism is universally condemned) and is applied without historical qualification. It implies that remaining in the Union is equivalent to accepting colonial subjugation. Neutral alternative: "Scotland is considering a change in its constitutional relationship with the rest of the UK."

Summary: The language throughout the broadcast is systematically dehumanising toward political opponents and morally absolutist in its framing of the independence cause, with no neutral or qualified terminology applied to contested political claims.



12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

2/10

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/positions did not produce an analogous intervention.

Finding 1:

Timestamp 19:05–19:21

Trigger event: Crawford (informal MC) introduces himself and the performers, making no political statement.

Quote (MC) "my name is Crawford [...] this is the best player from Highland Radio and the football player from Papa Shandy in the drums"

Comparison No formal moderator is present. The MC functions as a facilitator, not an interviewer. No follow-up questions are asked of any speaker.

Asymmetry: Not applicable — There is no moderator in the journalistic sense. The MC does not challenge any speaker, but this is consistent across all speakers; no asymmetry is demonstrable because the format is a rally, not an interview programme.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 14:00–15:15

Trigger event: Black Triangle speaker uses the term "Holocaust" to describe UK welfare policy and calls named politicians "Tory Vermin."

Quote "the Holocaust which is happening to disabled people in Scotland today [...] all the Tory Vermin"

Comparison No moderator intervenes. No comparable intervention occurs for any other speaker.

Asymmetry: Not applicable as moderation asymmetry — There is no moderator to intervene. The absence of challenge is a function of the rally format, not editorial asymmetry by a journalist. However, the absence of any challenge to extreme language is noted as a content finding under Criteria 1, 2, and 13.

Summary: There is no formal moderator in this broadcast. The informal MC (Crawford) functions purely as a facilitator and does not challenge any speaker. Moderation asymmetry in the journalistic sense cannot be assessed; the score of 2 reflects the complete absence of any moderating function rather than active asymmetric moderation.



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

1/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Asymmetry 1:

No questions are asked of any speaker at any point in the broadcast. The format is speeches, performances, and MC transitions — not interviews.

Relevant at: Entire broadcast.

Comparison

N/A — No interview format exists.

Assessment

Question asymmetry cannot be assessed in the absence of any questioning. Score of 1 reflects the complete absence of journalistic interrogation of any claim made.

Summary: The broadcast contains no questions whatsoever. All claims — including unverified statistics, Holocaust comparisons, and dehumanising language — are presented without challenge. This is consistent with the rally format but incompatible with journalistic standards.



14. FALSE BALANCE

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp

04:27–04:35

Construct: "you hear a lot about all this crap you hear on TV about Obama said oh that you know it's better ticket we want Scotland to remain United and there's an incredible amount of ignorance"

Analysis

McNaught acknowledges that international opinion (including the US President) favours Scotland remaining in the UK, but immediately dismisses this as "ignorance" rather than engaging with it as a legitimate perspective. This creates a false impression that the only reason anyone opposes independence is lack of information — a form of false balance in reverse (presenting the opposing view only to immediately delegitimise it).

Note: True false balance (presenting fringe views as equivalent to mainstream consensus) is not a significant feature of this broadcast. The broadcast does not pretend to balance; it is openly one-sided. The score of 2 reflects the one instance of a counter-view being raised and immediately dismissed.

Summary: The broadcast does not employ false balance in the traditional sense; it is openly and entirely one-sided. The single instance of a counter-view being raised (international opinion) is immediately dismissed as ignorance rather than engaged with.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

9/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Agenda element set: Scottish independence is presented as the only legitimate response to austerity, democratic deficit, and colonial subjugation.

Timestamp

14:30–14:35 — Evidence: "the only way we can stop Ian Duncan Smith is to vote Yes to independence"

Alternative agenda: The possibility that welfare policy could be changed through UK-wide political action (e.g., electing a Labour government) is entirely absent from the agenda.

Finding 2:

Agenda element set: Mainstream media (including the BBC) is presented as inherently corrupt and untrustworthy.

Timestamp

24:22–24:30 — Evidence: "forget these old giants these old gods of mass media forget them"

Alternative agenda: The possibility that mainstream media provides valuable, if imperfect, journalism is not on the agenda; nor is any critical assessment of pro-independence media's own limitations.

Finding 3:

Agenda element set: Young people's political agency is presented as inherently and naturally aligned with independence.

Timestamp

07:34–11:32 — Evidence: "you're no longer in a back seat we're handing over the wheel [...] the youth can steer with vision that's clear"

Alternative agenda: Young people who support the Union, or who are undecided, are entirely absent from the agenda.

Summary: The broadcast sets an agenda in which independence is the only rational, moral, and historically legitimate choice; mainstream media is the enemy; and young people are natural independence supporters. Every alternative agenda item — unionist arguments, media plurality, youth diversity of opinion — is either absent or pre-emptively dismissed.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual Scores — All 15 Criteria

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

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

7.4/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

4.6/10

Significant imbalance

OVERALL SCORE

6.0/10

Significant imbalance

Average of Hardfacts and Softfacts



KEY — Score Definitions

Individual Scores per Criterion (0–10)

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

Aggregated Deviation Index — Interpretation Ranges

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

Party-Political Bias (-5 to +5)

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



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

Assessment under BBC Charter Art. 6

Violation 1:

Standard: BBC Charter Art. 6 / BBC Agreement Clause 48 (Due Impartiality)

Facts: The broadcast presents exclusively pro-independence content with no unionist, neutral, or counter-perspective voice, argument, or source at any point during its approximately 24-minute duration.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:00–24:46 — the entire broadcast — Quote: "forget your BBC it's a total joke" (00:57); "the only way we can stop Ian Duncan Smith is to vote Yes to independence" (14:32–14:35); "forget these morons" (24:36)

Assessment: If this content were BBC editorial output, it would constitute a fundamental breach of the due impartiality requirement. The BBC Agreement requires that "due weight" be given to "the main strands of argument" on controversial political questions. The Scottish independence referendum was explicitly a "matter of major political controversy" under Ofcom Broadcasting Code Section 5. A broadcast that presents only one side of such a question, while actively calling for the abandonment of alternative media sources, would be in direct and comprehensive breach of Art. 6.

Violation 2:

Standard: BBC Charter Art. 6 / BBC Editorial Guidelines on Accuracy

Facts: Statistical claims are made without source citation, methodological context, or acknowledgment of contested interpretations. The claim that "10,600 people in 2011 died within six weeks of being found fit for work" is presented as established fact without qualification.

Evidence: Timestamp 14:21–14:26 — Quote: "10,600 people in 2011 died within six weeks of being found fit for work"

Assessment: BBC Editorial Guidelines require that "we should be honest and open about what we don't know" and that statistics be presented with appropriate context. Presenting contested, unverified statistics as established fact in support of a political argument would breach the accuracy requirements of Art. 6 if this were BBC editorial content.

Violation 3:

Standard: BBC Charter Art. 6 / BBC Editorial Guidelines on Harm and Offence

Facts: Named politicians are described as "Vermin" and UK welfare policy is described as a "Holocaust." These statements are broadcast without challenge or qualification.

Evidence: Timestamp 15:02–15:08 — Quote: "all the Tory Vermin" and 14:54–15:02 — Quote: "the Holocaust which is happening to disabled people in Scotland today"

Assessment: BBC Editorial Guidelines prohibit content that is "likely to encourage or incite the audience to commit crime or lead to disorder" and require that "the BBC does not use language that is likely to cause serious offence." Dehumanising language ("Vermin") and Holocaust comparisons applied to named politicians would breach these guidelines if broadcast as BBC editorial content.

Critical Qualification — No Violation Applicable if Third-Party Content:

The fundamental question for BBC Charter compliance is whether this content was broadcast by the BBC as editorial output or whether it is third-party activist content. The transcript contains no BBC presenter, no BBC editorial framing, and an explicit statement dismissing the BBC as "a total joke." If this content was captured from an independent live stream and has not been broadcast by the BBC as news or current affairs programming, no BBC Charter violation arises from the content itself. Any potential violation would relate to how the BBC has used, contextualised, or presented this material.

Overall Assessment BBC Charter Art. 6



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

This broadcast, assessed as a standalone piece of content, represents a comprehensive failure of every standard required by BBC Charter Art. 6 and the associated BBC Editorial Guidelines: it is entirely one-sided on a matter of major political controversy, it presents unverified statistics as established fact, it contains dehumanising language toward named politicians, and it explicitly calls for the abandonment of mainstream media in favour of pro-independence alternative sources. However, the critical legal and regulatory question is whether this content constitutes BBC editorial output. The evidence within the transcript strongly suggests it does not: the broadcast is identified as an "Independence Live" production, no BBC presenter or editorial framing is present, and the BBC is explicitly attacked within the content itself. If the BBC has broadcast this material as news or current affairs programming without appropriate contextualisation and counter-perspective, it would be in clear and serious breach of Art. 6. If the BBC has archived, referenced, or reported on this content as third-party activist material with appropriate editorial framing, no Charter breach arises from the content itself. The analysis cannot resolve this question from the transcript alone; it requires knowledge of how and in what context the BBC has used this material.



CHAPTER 6 — Source Depth Check

Organisation 1: Newsnet Scotland

- FUNDING:** Pro-independence online publication; funding sources not publicly disclosed. Operates as an advocacy platform.
- MANDATE:** Explicitly pro-independence editorial mission. Not compatible with neutral expert assessment on the independence question.
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Organisational survival and influence depend on the success of the independence cause; structural incentive to present pro-independence arguments favourably.
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX (6D):**
 - D1 Conflict of Interest: -2 (explicit advocacy mandate)
 - D2 Personal Risk: 0 (no evidence of personal risk)
 - D3 Subject Competence: 0 (media outlet, not academic institution)
 - D4 Consistency: +1 (consistent pro-independence position)
 - D5 Emotion vs. Data: -2 (rhetorical, not data-driven)
 - D6 Source Level: -2 (tertiary; no primary sources cited)
 - TOTAL: -5 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: RED**
- COUNTER-VOICE:** No independent media analysis or neutral constitutional commentary is provided.

Organisation 2: Black Triangle Disability Rights Campaign

- FUNDING:** Grassroots campaign organisation; funding not disclosed.
- MANDATE:** Anti-austerity, pro-independence advocacy. Not compatible with neutral welfare policy assessment.
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Organisational relevance and funding depend on maintaining high-profile opposition to welfare reform; incentive to present welfare statistics in the most alarming possible light.
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX (6D):**
 - D1 Conflict of Interest: -2 (explicit advocacy mandate)
 - D2 Personal Risk: +1 (disability rights activists face genuine risks)
 - D3 Subject Competence: +1 (direct experience with welfare assessment impacts)
 - D4 Consistency: +1 (consistent campaigning position)
 - D5 Emotion vs. Data: -1 (statistics cited but without source; Holocaust framing is extreme)
 - D6 Source Level: -1 (statistics presented without primary source citation)
 - TOTAL: -1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**
- COUNTER-VOICE:** No independent welfare researcher, DWP statistician, or academic disability studies expert is cited or present.

Organisation 3: Independence Live

- FUNDING:** Pro-independence streaming platform; funding not disclosed.
- MANDATE:** Explicitly pro-independence; the organisation's name and stated purpose define its editorial position.
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Total — the organisation exists to promote the independence cause.
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX (6D):**
 - D1 Conflict of Interest: -2 (total alignment with advocacy position)
 - D2 Personal Risk: 0 (no evidence)
 - D3 Subject Competence: -1 (streaming platform, not journalistic organisation)
 - D4 Consistency: +1 (consistent pro-independence position)
 - D5 Emotion vs. Data: -2 (no data; pure advocacy)
 - D6 Source Level: -2 (no primary sources; platform for advocacy content)
 - TOTAL: -6 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: RED**
- COUNTER-VOICE:** None present or possible within the platform's mandate.



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

IMPORTANT NOTE: "Recognised" is not a factual qualification. It is a social attribution that must itself be examined. None of the organisations cited in this broadcast would qualify as neutral expert sources under any standard journalistic or academic credibility framework. All three receive RED or YELLOW source traffic light ratings based on structural conflict of interest, absence of primary source citation, and explicit advocacy mandates.

Analysis completed under Version 2.7-detail. Methodological Principles K5+K13 applied throughout. All trigger events documented before asymmetry assessments. BBC Charter Art. 6 compliance assessment qualified by the critical preliminary finding that this broadcast does not appear to be BBC editorial output.

Source Credibility Overview:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Newsnet Scotland	-2	0	0	+1	-2	-2	-5	RED
Black Triangle Disability Rights Campaign	-2	+1	+1	+1	-1	-1	-1	YELLOW
Independence Live	-2	0	-1	+1	-2	-2	-6	RED

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.
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 | Kontakt@SVFAB.ch

Bank details: PostFinance – POFICHBE

IBAN: CH32 0900 0000 1675 6251 1

Beneficiary: SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zürich 1



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

The following books are available from SVFAB

Orders via www.svfab.ch or 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.