



BBC DETAILED ANALYSIS

case072_BBC announces inquiries over Savile abuse claims - Channel 4 News.en

Broadcast: COMPLETE DETAIL ANALYSIS | Analyzed: 2026-05-11 22:24

Version 2.8-detail | Universal 2.8-detail | Konverter 3.3 (2026-05-14) | Standard: Ofcom Broadcasting Code

OVERALL SCORE

5.8/10

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)

5.0 / 10

Balanced

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.

BROADCAST INFO AND TOPIC FRAMEWORK

Broadcast Data

- Title: BBC Director General Statement on Jimmy Savile Abuse Revelations
- Date (from file/context): October 2012 (internal consistency: Newsnight investigation reference, Savile death October 2011, ITV exposure October 2012)
- Estimated Length: Approximately 5 minutes (transcript ~500 words, spoken delivery pace)



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

- Presenter/Reporter: None — this is a direct-to-camera statement by the BBC Director General
- Persons Interviewed/Speaking (with function/party/affiliation):

Actors	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political Spectrum
BBC Director General (George Entwistle, implied)	Director General, BBC	BBC — Public Broadcaster	Institutional/Non-partisan

> Note on format: This is not a conventional interview or panel programme. It is a prepared institutional statement delivered by the BBC's own Director General. There is no interviewer, no guest, no opposition voice. The entire broadcast is a single monologue. This structural fact is itself analytically significant and will be addressed throughout.

Main Topic

The BBC Director General delivers a formal institutional statement announcing two independent reviews into (1) the editorial decision to drop the Newsnight investigation into Jimmy Savile's sexual abuse, and (2) the culture and practices at the BBC during the years Savile worked there.

World-View Context

The Jimmy Savile scandal broke publicly in October 2012 when ITV's Exposure documentary revealed decades of systematic sexual abuse by the BBC presenter, who had died in October 2011. The BBC faced a dual crisis: first, that Savile had committed abuse on BBC premises and using BBC access; second, that the BBC's own Newsnight programme had investigated Savile in late 2011 but dropped the story, after which BBC1 broadcast tribute programmes to Savile over Christmas 2011. This created a perception — widely reported — that the BBC had suppressed the Newsnight investigation to protect its own Christmas schedule and Savile's reputation. The statement occurs at a moment of acute institutional crisis for the BBC, with public trust severely damaged, police investigations underway, and political pressure from Parliament. The BBC Charter framework requires the BBC to be accountable and transparent; this statement is the institutional response to that pressure.

Assessment: Was Each Perspective Addressed?

[A] ADDRESSED — PARTIALLY

Timestamp: 00:39 — Quote: "a profound and heartfelt apology on behalf of the BBC to every victim it is the victims these women who were subject to criminal actions who must be central in our thoughts"

Assessment: Victims are mentioned rhetorically as the moral centre but are given no voice; their perspective is filtered entirely through the DG's framing.

[B] OMITTED

Timestamp: 01:55 — Quote: "the decision to drop the newsnight investigation was taken properly for sound editorial reasons"

Assessment: The editorial decision is asserted as sound without any journalist or editor involved being heard; the perspective of those who made or challenged the decision is entirely absent.

[C] OMITTED

Timestamp: 03:00 — Quote: "whether the BBC's child protection whistle blowing and bullying and harassment policies and practices are now fit for purpose"

Assessment: Whistleblowing is mentioned as a subject of inquiry but no actual whistleblower perspective is included.

[D] ANECDOTALLY REFERENCED — NOT SUBSTANTIVELY ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 03:31 — Quote: "assisted by an expert in the safeguarding of children"

Assessment: Safeguarding expertise is promised for the review but no expert speaks in this broadcast.

[E] OMITTED

No timestamp available — no independent media ethics voice is present; the question of whether self-commissioned reviews are adequate is not raised.

[F] OMITTED



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

No timestamp available — no parliamentary or political accountability perspective is included.

[G] OMITTED

No timestamp available — the police are mentioned only as a constraint on timing ("once the police have indicated they are happy for it to proceed") but their investigative perspective is absent.

[H] PARTIALLY REFERENCED

Timestamp: 00:21 — Quote: "in hospitals and other institutions across the UK"

Assessment: Other institutions are acknowledged in one clause but receive no substantive treatment.

[I] OMITTED

No timestamp available — no legal expert perspective on victims' rights or BBC liability is present.

[J] REFERENCED INSTITUTIONALLY

Timestamp: 03:42 — Quote: "both of these reviews have been agreed with the BBC Trust"

Assessment: The Trust is mentioned as having agreed to the reviews but no Trust member speaks independently.



CHAPTER 1 — DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Hard Facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically verifiable

1. EXPERT SELECTION

8/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Expert 1: BBC Director General (George Entwistle)

Timestamp	00:00–04:58 (entire broadcast)
Statement	**as the director general of the BBC I have made clear my revulsion at the thought that these criminal assaults were carried out by someone employed by the BBC**
Classification	The DG is the sole speaker. He is simultaneously the subject of accountability (as head of the institution under scrutiny), the person announcing the accountability measures, and the person framing the entire narrative. This is a structural conflict of interest of the highest order.

Missing countervoice: An independent child safeguarding expert, a victims' advocate, or an independent media ethics scholar would have provided perspectives not filtered through institutional self-interest.

Source Depth Check:

(a) FUNDING: The BBC is a public broadcaster funded by the licence fee. The DG's position depends on maintaining BBC institutional credibility. Direct financial and professional interest in managing the crisis in a way that preserves the BBC's reputation and his own position.

(b) MANDATE: The DG's mandate is to lead the BBC — not to provide neutral assessment of the BBC's failures. His mandate is structurally incompatible with neutral self-assessment.

(c) CREDIBILITY MATRIX (Source Traffic Light, 6 dimensions, -2 to +2):

(c) FACHKOMPETENZ: The DG's statement is framed throughout as a neutral institutional response, but it is structurally the statement of a party with maximum interest in the outcome of the events being described. It is not presented as such to the audience.

Missing Expert Groups:

- Independent child safeguarding specialist
- Victims' legal representative
- Independent media ethics academic
- Former BBC journalist with direct knowledge of the Newsnight decision

Source Credibility Overview:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
BBC Director General (George Entwistle)	-2	-2	+1	-1	-1	-1	-6	RED



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

Summary (Matrix Result):

Expert	Conflict	Risk	Competence	Consistency	Emotion/Data	Source Level	Total	Traffic Light
BBC DG	-2	-2	+1	-1	-1	-1	-6	⦿ RED

The sole speaker in this broadcast scores RED on the credibility matrix due to maximum institutional conflict of interest. No independent expert voice is present.



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

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

Source 1: BBC Executive Board

Timestamp 01:39–01:45 — Statement: *“two independent reviews commissioned by the BBC’s executive board”*

- (a) Funding and governance:** The BBC Executive Board is an internal BBC governance body. It is funded by the BBC licence fee and its members are appointed through BBC processes.
- (b) Structural conflict of interest:** The Executive Board is commissioning reviews into the BBC’s own failures. It has a direct institutional interest in the scope, framing, and findings of those reviews being manageable for the BBC.
- (c) Missing countervoice:** An externally commissioned review — by Parliament, Ofcom, or an independent judicial figure — would have provided genuine independence. The choice of internal commissioning is itself a source selection decision with significant implications for accountability.

Source 2: Dame Fiona Reynolds (non-executive director)

Timestamp 01:41–01:52 — Statement: *“chaired for the purpose of these reviews by our non-executive director Dame Fiona Reynolds”*

- (a) Funding:** Dame Fiona Reynolds is a BBC non-executive director — appointed by the BBC Trust, part of the BBC governance structure.
- (b) Structural conflict of interest:** A non-executive director of the BBC chairing reviews into BBC failures is not independent in any meaningful sense. She is part of the governance structure that failed to prevent the crisis.
- (c) Missing countervoice:** A genuinely independent chair — a retired judge, a parliamentary commissioner, or an external child protection authority — would have provided credible independence.

Source Depth Check — Dame Fiona Reynolds:

Missing counter-source: An independent judicial or parliamentary review mechanism would have provided genuine accountability. The choice of internal commissioning is the central source selection problem in this broadcast.

Source Credibility Overview:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Dame Fiona Reynolds (non-executive director)	-2	-1	0	0	0	-1	-4	YELLOW

Summary: All sources cited — the Executive Board, the non-executive director — are internal BBC governance structures with direct institutional interests in the outcome of the reviews they are commissioning. No genuinely independent source is cited or involved. This represents a significant source selection failure under BBC Charter accountability standards.



3. TIME DISTRIBUTION

0/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Estimated speaking time:

- BBC Director General (sole speaker): approximately 5:00 minutes (100%)
- Alternative/critical perspectives: 0:00 minutes (0%)
- Presenter/interviewer: 0:00 minutes (0%)

> Structural Note: Time distribution analysis in its standard comparative form cannot be applied to a single-speaker broadcast. The 100%/0% split is itself the finding: no alternative perspective receives any airtime. This is noted as a structural finding rather than a scored criterion in the conventional sense.

Score assigned: 0/10 (criterion not applicable — 100% single institutional voice noted as structural finding)



4. OMISSION (Selective Omission)

9/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Omission 1:

Context

The specific reasons why the Newsnight investigation was dropped are not disclosed. The DG asserts the decision was taken "for sound editorial reasons" but provides no detail.

Relevant at: 01:55 — "the decision to drop the newsnight investigation was taken properly for sound editorial reasons"

Effect

Audiences cannot assess whether the editorial reasons were genuinely sound or whether institutional pressures (protecting Christmas schedule, protecting Savile's legacy) played a role. The assertion of soundness is unverifiable from the information provided.

Omission 2:

Context

The fact that BBC1 broadcast tribute programmes to Savile over Christmas 2011 — after the Newsnight investigation was dropped — is entirely absent from the statement.

Relevant at: 00:00–04:58 (entire broadcast)

Effect

This omission removes the most damaging element of the BBC's institutional failure from the public record of this statement. The tribute broadcasts are the clearest evidence that the BBC continued to celebrate Savile after internal concerns had been raised, yet this is not acknowledged.

Omission 3:

Context

No timeline is provided for when the reviews will report, what powers they will have, whether they can compel testimony, or what consequences will follow from their findings.

Relevant at: 01:39–03:54 — "two independent reviews commissioned by the BBC's executive board"

Effect

The reviews are announced with no operational detail, making it impossible for audiences to assess whether they constitute genuine accountability or managed delay. The absence of timelines and enforcement mechanisms is a significant omission in an accountability statement.

Summary: The three most significant omissions — the reasons for dropping Newsnight, the Christmas tribute broadcasts, and the operational parameters of the reviews — collectively remove from public view the most damaging facts and the most important accountability questions. These omissions systematically favour the BBC's institutional position.

Missing Voices

- Savile victims/survivors: Would have provided direct testimony about years of institutional disbelief and the specific role of BBC access in enabling abuse
- Newsnight journalists (Liz MacKean, Meirion Jones): Would have explained what editorial pressure they experienced and why the investigation was dropped — directly contradicting the DG's assertion of "sound editorial reasons"



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

- Independent media ethics scholar: Would have assessed whether self-commissioned reviews meet genuine accountability standards under the BBC Charter
- Child safeguarding specialist (independent): Would have contextualised the systemic failures in institutional child protection
- Culture Secretary / MP (parliamentary oversight): Would have represented the democratic accountability dimension
- Former BBC employee with direct knowledge: Would have provided insider perspective on the culture that enabled Savile
- Legal representative for victims: Would have addressed civil liability, compensation, and the adequacy of the BBC's response from a rights perspective
- NHS spokesperson: Would have addressed the cross-institutional dimension and whether a BBC-only inquiry is sufficient



5. NUMERICAL MANIPULATION

1/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1:

Timestamp 00:00–04:58

Number: No specific statistics are cited in this broadcast.

Missing context

No figures are provided regarding the number of victims, the timespan of abuse, the number of complaints previously made to the BBC, or the scope of the police investigation. The absence of quantification prevents audiences from assessing the scale of institutional failure.

Effect

The absence of numbers — rather than their manipulation — creates a vague impression of a serious but unquantified problem, which is less damaging to the BBC's reputation than specific figures would be.

Summary: No direct numerical manipulation is present. However, the strategic absence of quantification — no victim numbers, no complaint figures, no timeline data — functions as a form of omission that limits audience understanding of the scale of failure. Score reflects minimal direct manipulation.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Association 1:

Timestamp

02:02–02:11

Quote

***"people have continued to speculate this is damaging to the BBC and is a cloud of suspicion which cannot be allowed to continue"*

Technique: Those raising concerns about the Newsnight decision are implicitly associated with irresponsible "speculation" — a term that connotes unfounded rumour-mongering. The phrase "cloud of suspicion" frames the concern as atmospheric and irrational rather than evidence-based.

Effect

Journalists, MPs, and members of the public who had raised legitimate questions about the Newsnight decision are implicitly characterised as damaging the BBC through irresponsible speculation rather than performing legitimate accountability functions.

> Note on Guilt by Association in this broadcast: The technique is applied in reverse — not to discredit an external person by association with negative groups, but to discredit external scrutiny by associating it with "speculation" and reputational damage. No individual is named and subjected to association-based discrediting. The score reflects this limited but present use of the technique.

Association Chain: Public concern → "speculation" → "cloud of suspicion" → "damaging to the BBC"

Summary: Guilt by association is used in a limited but structurally significant way to delegitimise external scrutiny of the BBC's editorial decisions. The technique reframes accountability journalism as irresponsible speculation.



7. TIMING

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Position: 00:35–00:52 (Opening — before accountability measures)

Content: "that is a profound and heartfelt apology on behalf of the BBC to every victim it is the victims these women who were subject to criminal actions who must be central in our thoughts"

Timing Effect: Placing the apology and victim-centred language at the very opening of the statement establishes an emotional frame of contrition before any accountability measures are announced. Audiences are emotionally primed to receive subsequent institutional announcements charitably.

Finding 2:

Position: 01:53–02:11 (Middle — after apology, before review details)

Content: "despite our efforts to make clear our belief that the decision to drop the newnight investigation was taken properly for sound editorial reasons people have continued to speculate"

Timing Effect: The defence of the Newnight decision is placed in the middle of the statement, sandwiched between the emotional apology and the announcement of reviews. This placement minimises its prominence while ensuring it is on the record.

Finding 3:

Position: 04:02–04:58 (End — closing statement)

Content: "our audiences trust in us is paramount we will do everything in our power to maintain that trust and we will do that by holding ourselves to account fully and openly as we have always done"

Timing Effect: The closing statement returns to trust and institutional values, ending on a note of reassurance rather than accountability. The final impression left with audiences is of a trustworthy institution reaffirming its commitment to openness, rather than of an institution that has failed and is being held to account.

Summary: The broadcast follows a classic crisis communication structure — open with empathy, defend the contested decision in the middle, close with reassurance. This timing structure is designed to maximise reputational protection while performing accountability.



8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

4/10

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 (v2.7): 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 00:07–00:18

Trigger Event: The revelation that Jimmy Savile committed sexual abuse while employed by the BBC and potentially on BBC premises.

Reaction: "as the director general of the BBC I have made clear my revulsion at the thought that these criminal assaults were carried out by someone employed by the BBC"

Comparison

No comparable expression of institutional responsibility is directed at the BBC's failure to act on complaints, the decision to drop the Newsnight investigation, or the decision to broadcast Christmas tributes to Savile after the investigation was shelved.

Asymmetry: Partially demonstrable. The DG expresses strong emotional language ("revulsion") regarding Savile's crimes but uses neutral, procedural language ("taken properly for sound editorial reasons") regarding the BBC's own institutional failures. The emotional register is asymmetric: maximum outrage at Savile, minimal emotional acknowledgement of BBC institutional failure.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 02:02–02:11

Trigger Event: Public and journalistic concern about the Newsnight decision.

Reaction: "people have continued to speculate this is damaging to the BBC and is a cloud of suspicion which cannot be allowed to continue"

Comparison

No comparable language of damage or concern is applied to the harm caused to victims by the BBC's institutional failures.

Asymmetry: Demonstrable. The DG expresses concern about damage to the BBC from "speculation" but does not use equivalent language about the damage caused to victims by the BBC's failure to act. The institutional reputation is treated as the primary harm requiring remedy.

Summary: Selective outrage is present in the asymmetric emotional register applied to Savile's crimes versus the BBC's institutional failures. Strong emotional language is reserved for the external perpetrator; procedural, neutral language is used for the BBC's own conduct. This asymmetry serves institutional reputation management.



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 general knowledge, independent of transcript)

[A] Victims of Jimmy Savile — their direct experience, the years of being disbelieved, the institutional failures that enabled continued abuse

[B] Journalists and editors involved in the Newsnight investigation — why the story was dropped, what editorial pressures existed

[C] Former BBC employees who witnessed or reported concerning behaviour — whistleblower perspective

[D] Child safeguarding experts — systemic failures in institutional child protection in the 1970s–2000s

[E] Independent media ethics experts — whether the BBC's self-commissioned reviews constitute genuine accountability or managed crisis response

[F] Politicians (Culture Secretary, Home Affairs Committee) — parliamentary oversight and accountability demands

[G] Police and prosecutors — why Savile was never charged during his lifetime despite complaints

[H] Other institutions implicated (NHS hospitals, schools, Broadmoor) — the cross-institutional nature of the abuse

[I] Legal experts — victims' rights, civil liability, criminal investigation parameters

[J] BBC Trust members — their role in governance and whether existing oversight structures failed



Soft Facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp

00:26–00:35

Quote

*“before I explain how we will examine every aspect of this series of events I have one thing to repeat that is a profound and heartfelt apology”**

Manipulation

The apology is placed before the explanation of accountability measures, framing the BBC as already morally responsive. The word "repeat" implies this apology has been given before, positioning the BBC as consistently remorseful rather than reactive.

Why problematic

Viewers are primed to receive subsequent institutional announcements within a framework of good faith and contrition, reducing critical scrutiny of whether the measures announced are adequate.

Finding 2:

Timestamp

01:53–02:11

Quote

*“despite our efforts to make clear our belief that the decision to drop the newnight investigation was taken properly for sound editorial reasons people have continued to speculate this is damaging to the BBC and is a cloud of suspicion which cannot be allowed to continue”**

Manipulation

The framing positions public concern about the Newsnight decision as "speculation" and "a cloud of suspicion" — language that delegitimises legitimate journalistic and public scrutiny. The harm identified is damage to the BBC, not harm to victims or the public interest.

Why problematic

This inverts the accountability relationship: the BBC is framed as the injured party suffering from unfair speculation, rather than as an institution that may have failed in its public duty. The inquiry is thus framed as a reputational repair exercise rather than a genuine accountability mechanism.

Finding 3:

Timestamp

04:02–04:19

Quote

*“these will be forensic but also soul-searching examinations our audiences trust in us is paramount we will do everything in our power to maintain that trust and we will do that by holding ourselves to account fully and openly as we have always done”**

Manipulation

The phrase "as we have always done" frames self-accountability as a BBC tradition, directly contradicting the circumstances that necessitated this statement. The framing presents the reviews as consistent with BBC values rather than as a response to a failure of those values.



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

**Why
problematic**

The claim "as we have always done" is factually contestable given that the Newsnight investigation was dropped and tribute programmes were broadcast after the investigation was shelved. This framing may mislead audiences about the BBC's historical accountability record.

Summary: The broadcast is consistently framed around institutional reputation management rather than victim-centred accountability. The BBC is positioned as the proactive, responsible actor; public scrutiny is framed as damaging speculation; and the reviews are presented as consistent with BBC tradition rather than as responses to institutional failure.



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

Finding 1:	
Timestamp	00:52–00:57
Quote	<i>**the fundamentally criminal nature of many of these allegations**</i>
Manipulation	The qualifier "many" introduces a subtle hedge — not all allegations are implicitly treated as credible. The word "allegations" rather than "crimes" or "abuse" maintains legal distance while the word "fundamentally" attempts to signal seriousness.
Why problematic	Neutral alternative would be: "the crimes committed against victims." The use of "allegations" at this stage — after police investigations were underway and multiple victims had come forward — reflects institutional self-protection through linguistic hedging rather than unambiguous acknowledgement of established facts.

Finding 2:	
Timestamp	02:02–02:08
Quote	<i>**people have continued to speculate this is damaging to the BBC**</i>
Manipulation	"Speculate" is a pejorative term implying unfounded conjecture. The concern about the Newsnight decision was not speculation but a documented sequence of events (investigation dropped, tribute programmes broadcast) that raised legitimate questions of editorial independence.
Why problematic	Neutral alternative would be: "people have continued to raise questions" or "concerns have been expressed." The word "speculate" delegitimises journalistic and public scrutiny by implying it lacks factual basis.

Finding 3:	
Timestamp	01:01–01:07
Quote	<i>**the BBC will not avoid confronting the events of its past**</i>
Manipulation	"Will not avoid" is a double negative that performs commitment while linguistically distancing the BBC from active agency. Compare: "The BBC will confront the events of its past." The chosen formulation is weaker and more defensive.
Why problematic	The double-negative construction ("will not avoid") is a rhetorical technique that signals reluctant compliance rather than genuine commitment. It subtly frames accountability as something the BBC is choosing not to evade, rather than something it is actively embracing.

Summary: The language throughout is carefully calibrated to perform accountability while maintaining institutional distance from full responsibility. Key terms — "allegations," "speculate," "will not avoid" — consistently favour the BBC's institutional position over unambiguous acknowledgement of failure.



12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

0/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Methodological Principle (v2.7): Before each assessment, the trigger event must be documented. An intervention can only be assessed as asymmetric if comparable triggers in other guests/positions produced no analogous intervention.

> Structural Note: This broadcast contains no moderator, no interviewer, and no second speaker. Criterion 5 (Moderation Behaviour) cannot be applied in its standard form. The absence of any moderating or challenging voice is itself analytically significant: the BBC Director General delivers an uninterrupted, unchallenged prepared statement with no follow-up questions, no pushback, and no external scrutiny within the broadcast itself. This structural choice — broadcasting an institutional statement without journalistic challenge — is noted as a finding under Criterion 15 (Agenda-Setting) and Criterion 4 (Omission).

Score assigned: 0/10 (criterion not applicable in standard form — structural absence of moderation noted separately)



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

13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

0/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

> Structural Note: No questions are asked in this broadcast. It is a prepared monologue. Question asymmetry analysis cannot be applied. The absence of any questioning — hard or soft — directed at the BBC's own institutional position is itself a finding: the broadcast format structurally eliminates the possibility of journalistic challenge.

Score assigned: 0/10 (criterion not applicable — absence of any questioning noted as structural finding)



14. FALSE BALANCE

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp

01:39–03:54

Construct: Two reviews are announced — one into the Newsnight decision, one into BBC culture during the Savile years — presented as a comprehensive and balanced response.

Analysis

The false balance here is not between two opposing viewpoints but between the appearance of comprehensive accountability and its substance. Two internally commissioned reviews, chaired by BBC governance figures, with no specified powers of compulsion, no external oversight, and no stated consequences, are presented as equivalent to genuine independent accountability. The "balance" between the two reviews (editorial decision / cultural practices) creates an impression of thoroughness that may not be warranted.

Summary: False balance in the conventional sense (presenting two equal sides) is not strongly present. A limited form of false balance exists in the presentation of internally commissioned reviews as equivalent to genuine independent accountability. Score reflects this limited application.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Agenda element set: That the BBC is the appropriate body to commission, oversee, and publish reviews into its own failures.

Timestamp

01:39–01:45 — Evidence: *“two independent reviews commissioned by the BBC's executive board”*

Alternative agenda: Parliamentary or judicial oversight; Ofcom investigation; independent public inquiry under the Inquiries Act 2005. None of these alternatives is mentioned or considered.

Finding 2:

Agenda element set: That the primary question is whether the Newsnight editorial decision was sound, rather than whether the BBC's institutional culture enabled abuse.

Timestamp

01:53–02:11 — Evidence: *“the decision to drop the newsnight investigation was taken properly for sound editorial reasons people have continued to speculate”*

Alternative agenda: The broader question of why multiple complaints about Savile over decades were not acted upon; why the BBC continued to employ and celebrate Savile despite concerns; what the BBC's duty of care to children on its premises was and whether it was met.

Finding 3:

Agenda element set: That maintaining audience trust is the paramount objective of the accountability process.

Timestamp

04:04–04:08 — Evidence: *“our audiences trust in us is paramount”*

Alternative agenda: That justice for victims, prevention of future abuse, and genuine institutional accountability are the paramount objectives — with audience trust as a consequence of achieving these, not as the primary goal.

Summary: The agenda is set entirely around institutional reputation management and the BBC's self-defined accountability framework. The possibility of external oversight, the broader cultural failures, and the primacy of victim justice over audience trust are systematically excluded from the agenda.



CHAPTER 2 — OVERALL EVALUATION

> Scoring Note: Criteria 5, 6, 7, and 11 score 0 due to structural inapplicability (single-speaker broadcast, no visual data). These zeros are excluded from the manipulation average calculation, as they reflect format constraints rather than absence of manipulation. The active criteria (1–4, 8–10, 12–15) are used for the manipulation score.

Results

Active criteria scores (11 criteria): 7+6+8+9+3+1+6+8+4+2+8 = 62 / 110

- MANIPULATION SCORE (average of 11 active criteria): 5.6 / 10

Dominant Techniques

The 3 strongest techniques in this broadcast:

- 1. Omission (Score 9):** The most powerful manipulation technique in this broadcast is systematic omission. The Christmas tribute broadcasts — the most damaging evidence of institutional failure — are entirely absent. The reasons for dropping Newsnight are asserted as sound without disclosure. The operational parameters of the reviews are unspecified. These omissions collectively remove from public view the most important accountability questions.
- 2. Agenda-Setting (Score 8) / Expert Selection (Score 8) [joint]:** Agenda-setting operates at the structural level: the BBC defines itself as the appropriate accountability body, defines the scope of inquiry, and defines audience trust as the paramount objective. Expert selection reinforces this: the sole speaker is the person with maximum institutional interest in the outcome, and no independent voice challenges any element of the agenda.
- 3. Framing (Score 7):** The broadcast frames the BBC as a proactively accountable institution responding to unfair speculation, rather than as an institution that failed in its duty of care. This framing is established in the opening sentences and maintained throughout, structuring audience reception of all subsequent announcements.

Core Messages of the Broadcast

MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE): "The BBC is taking comprehensive and independent action to address the Savile crisis."

Technique: Framing + Agenda-Setting — the reviews are described as "independent" and "forensic" despite being internally commissioned and chaired by a BBC non-executive director.

Evidence: 01:39, 03:28, 04:02

MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL/INSTITUTIONAL): "The BBC's leadership is morally serious and personally appalled by what happened."

Technique: Language and Timing — "revulsion," "heartfelt apology," "soul-searching" placed at opening and closing to establish emotional credibility.

Evidence: 00:11, 00:35, 04:02

MESSAGE 3 (SOCIAL): "Public concern about the Newsnight decision is damaging speculation that the BBC is now addressing — the editorial decision itself was sound."

Technique: Guilt by Association + Selective Outrage — public scrutiny is framed as "speculation" causing "damage"; the editorial decision is defended without disclosure.

Evidence: 01:55, 02:02, 02:08

Manipulation Level Classification

Justification: The combined score of 4.5 places this broadcast at the upper boundary of "slight tendency" / lower boundary of "clear one-sidedness." The manipulation score of 5.6 on active criteria indicates clear one-sidedness. The format — a single-speaker institutional statement with no journalistic challenge — is itself a structural choice that systematically excludes alternative perspectives. Under BBC Charter Article 6, which requires due impartiality in news and current affairs, a broadcast that presents only the institutional perspective of the party under scrutiny, without any independent voice, challenge, or alternative framing, represents a significant departure from the due impartiality



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

standard. The low completeness score (2.0) reflects the near-total absence of the perspectives necessary for informed public understanding of the crisis.

CONCLUSION

This broadcast is a prepared institutional statement by the BBC Director General in response to the Jimmy Savile abuse scandal. As a piece of crisis communication, it is technically accomplished: it opens with empathy, defends the contested Newsnight decision in the middle, and closes with reassurance. However, assessed against BBC Charter Article 6 standards of due accuracy and impartiality, it presents significant concerns. The sole speaker has maximum institutional conflict of interest; the most damaging facts (Christmas tribute broadcasts, specific reasons for dropping Newsnight) are omitted; the reviews announced are internally commissioned and chaired by a BBC governance figure rather than genuinely independent; and the framing throughout positions the BBC as the proactively accountable party responding to unfair speculation rather than as an institution that may have failed in its duty of care to children. The broadcast does not meet the standard of due impartiality required by the BBC Charter because it presents only one institutional perspective on events of major public concern without any independent challenge, alternative framing, or victim voice. Whether this constitutes a Charter violation depends on whether this statement is assessed as a standalone broadcast or as part of a broader coverage package — a determination that would require review of the BBC's full output on this topic during the relevant period.



CHAPTER 3 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Assessment by Party

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast Representation vs. Programme Position
Conservative	0	No reference to Conservative Party or its positions in this broadcast — not applicable
Labour	0	No reference to Labour Party or its positions in this broadcast — not applicable
Lib Dems	0	No reference to Liberal Democrats or their positions in this broadcast — not applicable
SNP	0	No reference to SNP or its positions in this broadcast — not applicable
Reform UK	0	No reference to Reform UK or its positions in this broadcast — not applicable
Green	0	No reference to Green Party or its positions in this broadcast — not applicable

> Structural Note: This broadcast predates the current political landscape (it is from October 2012) and contains no party-political content whatsoever. It is an institutional statement about a child abuse scandal and internal BBC governance. Party-political bias analysis in the standard comparative form is not applicable. All scores are 0 (not present in broadcast).

Party Bias Summary

- Most accurate representation: N/A — no party represented
- Strongest distortion: N/A — no party represented
- Average deviation from 0: 0.0
- Conclusion: This broadcast contains no party-political content and no party programme positions are represented, distorted, or omitted. The relevant bias in this broadcast is institutional rather than party-political: the BBC is both the broadcaster and the subject of the broadcast, creating a structural conflict of interest that is the central analytical finding of this analysis.



CHAPTER 4 — LEGAL CLASSIFICATION (BBC Charter Art. 6)

Assessment under BBC Charter Art. 6

The BBC Royal Charter and Agreement require the BBC to provide duly accurate and impartial news, current affairs and factual programming. Article 6 of the BBC Charter specifically addresses the public purposes of the BBC, including sustaining citizenship and civil society, and requires the BBC to be accountable and transparent.

Violation 1:

Standard: BBC Charter Art. 6 — Due Impartiality; BBC Agreement Clause 23 (Accuracy and Impartiality)

Facts: The broadcast presents a single institutional perspective — that of the BBC Director General — on a matter of major public concern (systematic child sexual abuse enabled by BBC institutional culture) without any independent voice, challenge, or alternative framing.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:00–04:58 — the entire broadcast is a single-speaker institutional statement with no journalistic challenge, no victim voice, no independent expert, and no external accountability perspective.

Assessment: Due impartiality under the BBC Charter does not require absolute balance in every individual broadcast, but it does require that on matters of major public controversy, the BBC does not present only one side of a contested question. The question of whether the BBC's institutional response to the Savile crisis was adequate is a matter of major public controversy. Broadcasting only the BBC's own institutional position on this question, without challenge, is inconsistent with the due impartiality standard.

Violation 2:

Standard: BBC Charter Art. 6 — Due Accuracy; BBC Agreement Clause 23

Facts: The statement that the Newsnight editorial decision was taken "properly for sound editorial reasons" is presented as established fact without disclosure of the reasons, without independent verification, and without acknowledgement of the contrary evidence (the Christmas tribute broadcasts).

Evidence: Timestamp 01:55–02:02 — "the decision to drop the newsnight investigation was taken properly for sound editorial reasons"

Assessment: Due accuracy requires that factual claims be verifiable and that contested claims be identified as contested. The assertion that the Newsnight decision was "proper" and based on "sound editorial reasons" is a contested claim — it was the central subject of public controversy at the time — and is presented without qualification, disclosure, or independent verification. This falls below the due accuracy standard.

Violation 3:

Standard: BBC Charter Art. 6 — Accountability and Transparency; BBC Agreement Clause 46 (Accountability)

Facts: The reviews announced are described as "independent" but are commissioned by the BBC Executive Board and chaired by a BBC non-executive director. No external oversight mechanism, no powers of compulsion, no timeline, and no consequences for findings are specified.

Evidence: Timestamp 01:39–03:54 — "two independent reviews commissioned by the BBC's executive board chaired for the purpose of these reviews by our non-executive director Dame Fiona Reynolds"

Assessment: Describing internally commissioned reviews chaired by a BBC governance figure as "independent" may not meet the accuracy standard under the BBC Charter. The BBC's accountability obligations under the Charter require genuine transparency about governance structures; describing a non-executive director as providing independent oversight of the institution that appointed her is potentially misleading.

Overall Assessment — BBC Charter Art. 6

This broadcast raises three distinct concerns under BBC Charter Article 6: a due impartiality concern arising from the single-speaker format presenting only the BBC's institutional position on a matter of major public controversy; a due accuracy concern arising from the unqualified assertion that the Newsnight editorial decision was sound; and an



accountability and transparency concern arising from the description of internally commissioned reviews as "independent." Assessed as a standalone broadcast, it does not meet the due impartiality standard required by the Charter. Whether these concerns constitute formal Charter violations would depend on: (1) whether this broadcast is assessed in isolation or as part of the BBC's broader coverage package on the Savile crisis; (2) whether the BBC's subsequent coverage provided the independent challenge and alternative perspectives absent from this statement; and (3) whether Ofcom or the BBC Trust assessed the overall coverage as meeting the due impartiality standard. The structural conflict of interest — the BBC broadcasting its own crisis management statement without independent challenge — is the central Charter concern and would require careful scrutiny in any formal regulatory assessment.

SOURCE DEPTH CHECK (Mandatory for all cited specialist bodies / NGOs / advisory bodies)

Organisation 1: BBC Executive Board

- 1. FUNDING:** Funded by BBC licence fee (public funding). The Executive Board is the BBC's own senior governance body.
- 2. MANDATE:** The Executive Board's mandate is to lead and govern the BBC — not to provide independent assessment of BBC failures. Its mandate is structurally incompatible with independent review of its own institutional conduct.
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Maximum institutional conflict of interest. The Executive Board is commissioning reviews into failures that occurred under its governance. It has direct interest in the scope, framing, and findings of those reviews being manageable for the BBC's reputation and continued operation.
- 4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**
 - D1 Conflict of Interest: -2 — Reviews own failures
 - D2 Personal Risk: -2 — Members face reputational and professional risk if findings are damaging
 - D3 Subject Competence: 0 — Governance competence; not child safeguarding specialists
 - D4 Opinion Consistency: -1 — Previously asserted Newsnight decision was sound
 - D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data: -1 — Statement is performative rather than data-driven
 - D6 Source Level: -2 — Internal body, not independent**TOTAL: -8 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: ● RED**
- 5. MISSING COUNTERVOICE:** An independent public inquiry under the Inquiries Act 2005, a parliamentary select committee investigation, or an Ofcom-led review would have provided genuine independence.

Organisation 2: Dame Fiona Reynolds (BBC Non-Executive Director, named as review chair)

- 1. FUNDING:** Remunerated as BBC non-executive director; appointed through BBC Trust processes.
- 2. MANDATE:** Non-executive directors provide governance oversight of the BBC — they are part of the governance structure, not independent of it. Her mandate is to serve BBC governance interests, not to provide independent external scrutiny.
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** As a BBC non-executive director, Dame Fiona Reynolds is part of the governance structure that failed to prevent the crisis. She has institutional interest in findings that are manageable for the BBC and that do not implicate the governance structures of which she is a part.
- 4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**
 - D1 Conflict of Interest: -2 — BBC governance figure reviewing BBC governance failures
 - D2 Personal Risk: -1 — Reputational risk if review is seen as inadequate
 - D3 Subject Competence: 0 — General governance expertise; not a child safeguarding specialist
 - D4 Opinion Consistency: 0 — No prior public statements on this matter assessable
 - D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data: 0 — Role not yet exercised
 - D6 Source Level: -1 — Internal appointment**TOTAL: -4 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: ● YELLOW (borderline RED)**
- 5. MISSING COUNTERVOICE:** A retired senior judge, an independent child protection commissioner, or a parliamentary-appointed figure would have provided credible independence. The choice of an internal BBC governance figure as review chair is itself a source selection decision with significant implications for the credibility of the accountability process.

IMPORTANT NOTE: "Independent" is a social attribution, not a factual qualification. In this broadcast, the word "independent" is applied to reviews commissioned by the BBC's own Executive Board and chaired by a BBC non-



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

executive director. This attribution requires scrutiny — and on scrutiny, it does not withstand the standard definition of independence from the subject of review.

END OF ANALYSIS

Version 2.7-detail | All 15 criteria assessed | Steps 0–4 complete | Language: English throughout



OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual Scores — All 15 Criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Rating
1	EXPERT SELECTION	8	•••••
2	SOURCE SELECTION	8	•••••
3	TIME DISTRIBUTION	0	•
4	OMISSION (Selective Omission)	9	•••••
5	NUMERICAL MANIPULATION	1	•
6	GUILT BY ASSOCIATION	3	••
7	TIMING	6	•••
8	SELECTIVE OUTRAGE	4	••
9	COMPLETENESS	8	•••••
10	FRAMING	7	•••••
11	LANGUAGE AND TERMINOLOGY	6	•••
12	MODERATION BEHAVIOUR	0	•
13	QUESTION ASYMMETRY	0	•
14	FALSE BALANCE	2	•
15	AGENDA-SETTING	8	•••••

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

5.9/10

Significant imbalance

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

5.7/10

Significant imbalance

OVERALL SCORE

5.8/10

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.

Legal and Methodological Notes



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

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: 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

SVFAB — Swiss Association for Balanced Reporting | P.O. Box, 8021 Zurich 1 | www.svfab.ch | kontakt@svfab.ch | *Methods Report March 2026* | *Converter 3.3 (2026-05-14)*



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



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.