



BBC DETAILED ANALYSIS

case074_Diana Interview : Dyson report expose decades of BBC cover up.en

Broadcast: COMPLETE ANALYSIS | Analyzed: 2026-05-11 22:40

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

OVERALL SCORE

3.6/10

Slight 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: Sky News Report on the Dyson Review / BBC Panorama Diana Interview Scandal
- Date (from file/transcript): May 2021 (Dyson Report publication date; exact broadcast date not specified in transcript)
- Estimated Length: Approx. 3 minutes 18 seconds (based on timestamp [00:02]–[03:18])

President: Schlaepfer, David - **Contact:** kontakt@SVFAB.ch - **Address:** SVFAB, P/O-Box, CH-8021 Zurich 1



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

- Reporter: Rihanna Mills, Sky News
- Persons Interviewed / Featured (with function/party/affiliation):

Actors	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political Spectrum
Lord Dyson	Former Master of the Rolls; Independent Reviewer	Independent/Judicial	Neutral/Institutional
Ann Sloman	Then Acting Head of Weekly Current Affairs, BBC	BBC (internal)	Institutional
Kilik (first name only)	Panorama Producer (whistleblower)	BBC (former employee)	Institutional/Whistleblower
Mark Bukowski	Entertainment agent (represented Michael Jackson in UK)	Private/Commercial	Non-political
Lord Spencer (referenced, not directly interviewed)	Brother of Princess Diana	Aristocracy/Non-political	Non-political
Martin Bashir (referenced, not directly interviewed)	BBC Journalist, Panorama	BBC	Institutional
Lord Hall (referenced, not directly interviewed)	Former BBC Director- General	BBC	Institutional
Unnamed commentator (03:03–02:22 approx.)	Unidentified critic/analyst	Unspecified	Non-partisan/Critical

> Note: The transcript is from Sky News, not the BBC. This is a Sky News report about the BBC. This distinction is critical for the entire analysis.

Main Topic

A Sky News report summarising the findings of the Dyson Review (May 2021), which concluded that BBC journalist Martin Bashir used forged bank statements to secure the 1995 Panorama interview with Princess Diana, and that the BBC subsequently covered up its knowledge of this deception.

World-View Context

The Dyson Review, commissioned by the BBC and published in May 2021, represented one of the most serious institutional crises in the BBC's modern history. Lord Dyson, a former senior judge, found that Martin Bashir had deceived Earl Spencer using fabricated documents to gain access to Princess Diana, and that the BBC — including then-Director-General Lord Hall — had conducted an "woefully ineffective" internal investigation in 1996 that amounted to a cover-up. The scandal reignited long-standing debates about BBC accountability, journalistic ethics, and the institution's capacity for self-regulation. Diana's sons, Princes William and Harry, made public statements condemning the BBC. The report also raised questions about whether the interview — widely seen as a turning point in Diana's public life and her relationship with the Royal Family — had materially altered the course of her life. The broader societal significance lies in the tension between the BBC's public-service mandate (requiring transparency and integrity) and its institutional self-interest in protecting a "scoop of the century."

Assessment: Was Each Perspective Addressed?

[A] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 00:17–00:44 — Quote: "in 127 pages lord dyson forensically details the questions asked at the time and the cover-up" — The Dyson findings are summarised, though selectively and without granular detail.

[B] PARTIALLY ADDRESSED



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

Timestamp: 01:51–02:02 — Quote: "the bbc fell short of the high standards of integrity and transparency which are its hallmark" — The BBC's failure is noted but no institutional reform response is mentioned.

[C] OMITTED

No timestamp available — Martin Bashir's May 2021 public statement (in which he expressed remorse but disputed some findings) is entirely absent from the report.

[D] PARTIALLY ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 03:11–03:18 — Quote: "a meeting that he says stoked her paranoia and mistrust" — Lord Spencer's view is referenced indirectly; Princes William and Harry's statements are absent.

[E] OMITTED

No timestamp available — No BBC journalist unconnected to the scandal is given a voice to contextualise the institution's broader culture or defend its general standards.

[F] OMITTED

No timestamp available — No independent media ethics expert is consulted.

[G] PARTIALLY ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 02:22–02:29 — Quote: "the awards and the accolades were why they wouldn't want anything to overshadow what was described internally as the scoop of the century" — Competitive pressures are briefly referenced but not contextualised historically.

[H] OMITTED

No timestamp available — No legal expert addresses potential criminal liability for forgery or civil liability to Diana's estate.

[I] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 01:03–01:29 — Quote: "when myself and others were faced with the situation of referring these documents out we knew it was going to be difficult" — The whistleblower Kilik is given direct voice.

[J] OMITTED

No timestamp available — The public-interest value of the interview itself (which revealed Diana's account of her marriage) is never examined.



CHAPTER 1 — DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Hard Facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically verifiable

1. EXPERT SELECTION

5/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Expert 1: Kilik (Panorama Producer / Whistleblower)

Timestamp	01:03–01:29
Statement	**"it was a difficult climate to work in and when myself and others were faced with the situation of referring these documents out we knew it was going to be difficult we knew it wasn't news that the bbc would want to hear what we didn't expect was a smear campaign a cover-up and ultimately all to be sacked"
Classification	Former BBC employee who raised concerns internally; has a direct personal stake in the narrative as a self-described victim of institutional retaliation.

Missing countervoice: A current BBC editorial figure who could contextualise the institutional culture of the 1990s versus today.

Source Depth Check:

(a) FUNDING: Kilik is a private individual; no institutional funding relevant. However, as a dismissed employee, has a personal interest in the narrative of institutional wrongdoing being validated.

(b) MANDATE: As a direct participant and whistleblower, Kilik has first-hand knowledge but is not a neutral observer.

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

- D1 Conflict of Interest: [-1] — Personal stake in narrative of BBC wrongdoing being confirmed
- D2 Personal Risk: [+2] — Lost employment; significant personal cost for speaking out
- D3 Subject Competence: [+2] — Direct participant with first-hand knowledge of events described
- D4 Opinion Consistency: [+1] — Consistent account over time (no evidence of shifting story)
- D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data: [0] — Mix of factual account and emotional characterisation ("smear campaign")
- D6 Source Level: [+2] — Primary source (direct participant)

(c) FACHKOMPETENZ: Kilik's account is presented as corroborating the Dyson findings without noting that his characterisation ("smear campaign") goes beyond what Dyson formally concluded.

Expert 2: Unidentified Commentator (02:03–02:22)

Timestamp	02:03–02:22
Statement	**"the cover-up is shocking i mean how can the bbc accuse government ministers or civil servants or leaders of public and private institutions of not being transparent..."
Classification	Identity unknown; no credentials, affiliation, or basis for expertise established.

Missing countervoice: A BBC defender or media ethics expert offering a more calibrated assessment.



Source Depth Check:

(a) **FUNDING:** Unknown — no affiliation given.

(b) **MANDATE:** Unknown — no basis for expertise established.

(c) **CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**

D1 Conflict of Interest: [0] — Unknown

D2 Personal Risk: [0] — Unknown

D3 Subject Competence: [-1] — No credentials established

D4 Opinion Consistency: [0] — Unknown

D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data: [-1] — Primarily rhetorical ("how can the BBC accuse...")

D6 Source Level: [-2] — No primary source basis evident

(c) **FACHKOMPETENZ:** This commentator is presented as offering authoritative moral judgement on the BBC's institutional legitimacy, but no basis for this authority is established.

Expert 3: Mark Bukowski (Entertainment Agent)

Timestamp	02:40–03:02
Statement	"he said look what i did with diana it became a great event and she's very pleased at this point he brought out a letter uh a letter was on kensington police heading no papers i remember um but it was certainly signed by diana"
Classification	Private entertainment agent; direct witness to Bashir's post-Diana conduct.

Missing countervoice: Bashir's own account of this meeting.

Source Depth Check:

(a) **FUNDING:** Private individual; no institutional funding.

(b) **MANDATE:** Direct witness; relevant to establishing pattern of behaviour.

(c) **CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**

D1 Conflict of Interest: [0] — No obvious institutional interest

D2 Personal Risk: [+1] — Willing to make public statement about named individual

D3 Subject Competence: [+2] — Direct witness to described events

D4 Opinion Consistency: [+1] — No evidence of inconsistency

D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data: [+1] — Primarily factual account with specific detail

D6 Source Level: [+2] — Primary source

(c) **FACHKOMPETENZ:** Bukowski's account is credible as a primary source but is presented without Bashir's response, creating an uncontested narrative.

Missing Expert Groups:

- Independent media ethics academic
- Legal expert on forgery and civil liability
- Current BBC leadership (Director-General Tim Davie)

Summary (Matrix Results):

- Kilik: GREEN (+6) — credible primary source, personal stake noted
- Unidentified Commentator: YELLOW (-4) — no credentials, rhetorical framing
- Bukowski: GREEN (+7) — credible primary source, uncontested



2. SOURCE SELECTION

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

Source 1: Lord Dyson / Dyson Review

Timestamp

00:17–00:44 — Statement: *“in 127 pages lord dyson forensically details the questions asked at the time and the cover-up”*

- (a) Funding and governance:** The Dyson Review was commissioned and funded by the BBC itself — an important structural fact not disclosed in the report.
- (b) Structural conflict of interest:** A BBC-commissioned review finding against the BBC carries significant weight precisely because of this conflict; however, the fact that the BBC commissioned it is not mentioned, which would have strengthened the finding's credibility if disclosed.
- (c) Missing counterpoint:** No independent legal or journalistic assessment of the Dyson Review's methodology or conclusions is offered.

Source 2: Internal BBC memos (referenced via Sky News)

Timestamp

00:26–00:29 — Statement: *“in memos previously seen by sky news it was clear the bbc knew that martin beshear had fake documents”*

- (a) Funding:** Internal BBC documents; Sky News claims prior access.
- (b) Structural conflict of interest:** Sky News is a direct commercial competitor of the BBC. The fact that Sky News had "previously seen" these memos is presented as a credential, but the competitive relationship between Sky and BBC is not disclosed.
- (c) Missing counterpoint:** No independent verification of Sky News's characterisation of the memos is offered.

Source 3: Ann Sloman (via Dyson Report)

Timestamp

00:54–01:02 — Statement: *“it sounds a bit like the mafia but it wasn't meant that way”*

- (a) Funding:** Former BBC employee; statement made to Dyson Review.
- (b) Structural conflict of interest:** Statement is taken from a judicial review context; the full context of Sloman's testimony is not provided.
- (c) Missing counterpoint:** Sloman's full testimony and any exculpatory context are absent.

Missing counter-source: Any statement from the BBC, Martin Bashir, or an independent media ethics body.

Summary: The source selection is structurally one-sided: all sources either directly criticise the BBC/Bashir (Kilik, unidentified commentator, Bukowski) or are presented in a way that supports the critical narrative (Dyson, Sloman). The BBC's own commissioned nature of the Dyson Review — which would have strengthened the findings' credibility — is not disclosed. Sky News's competitive relationship with the BBC is not disclosed.



3. TIME DISTRIBUTION

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Estimated speaking time:

- Kilik (whistleblower/critic of BBC): approx. 35 seconds (18%)
- Unidentified commentator (critic of BBC): approx. 25 seconds (13%)
- Mark Bukowski (witness against Bashir): approx. 30 seconds (15%)
- Ann Sloman (quoted via Dyson report): approx. 8 seconds (4%)
- Reporter narration (Rihanna Mills): approx. 100 seconds (50%)
- BBC/Bashir/Royal Family response: 0 seconds (0%)

Summary: All direct speech is allocated to critics of the BBC and Bashir, or to witnesses corroborating the scandal narrative. No time is allocated to the BBC's institutional response, Bashir's statement, or the Royal Family's direct testimony. The 50% reporter narration is itself framed critically. The distribution is structurally one-sided.



4. OMISSION (Selective Omission)

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Omission 1:

Context

Martin Bashir issued a public statement in May 2021 expressing remorse but disputing certain findings of the Dyson Review.

Relevant at: 00:17–01:50 (throughout the summary of Dyson findings)

Effect

Without Bashir's response, the report presents only one side of a contested factual and interpretive record, violating the principle of due accuracy.

Omission 2:

Context

Princes William and Harry both made public statements about the Dyson findings — William's statement was particularly significant, calling the interview a "deceitful" act that "manipulated" his mother.

Relevant at: 02:29–03:18 (section on Diana's family)

Effect

The omission of the most prominent voices in the story — Diana's own children — is a significant editorial gap that weakens the report's claim to comprehensive coverage.

Omission 3:

Context

The BBC's institutional response — including Director-General Tim Davie's apology and commitment to reform — is entirely absent.

Relevant at: 01:48–02:02 (section on BBC falling short of standards)

Effect

Without the BBC's response, the report presents an uncontested indictment, denying the institution the right of reply that journalistic fairness requires.

Summary: The three most significant omissions — Bashir's response, the Royal Family's statements, and the BBC's institutional reply — collectively undermine the report's claim to balanced coverage and raise questions about due accuracy under the Ofcom Broadcasting Code.

Missing Voices

- Martin Bashir (or his legal representative): Would have provided his account of events and his disputed findings, essential for due accuracy.
- Princes William and Harry: Both issued public statements condemning the BBC; their absence is notable given their centrality to the story.
- Lord Hall (or BBC spokesperson): The former Director-General's conduct is directly criticised; no response is included.
- Independent media ethics academic (e.g., from Reuters Institute or Cardiff School of Journalism): Would have contextualised the scandal within broader journalistic ethics frameworks.
- Legal expert (barrister/solicitor): Would have addressed whether the forgery constituted a criminal act and what civil remedies might exist.

President: Schlaepfer, David - **Contact:** kontakt@SVFAB.ch - **Address:** SVFAB, P/O-Box, CH-8021 Zurich 1



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

- Current BBC Director-General Tim Davie: His response to the Dyson findings and commitment to reform is entirely absent.
- Former BBC staff unconnected to the scandal: Would have provided institutional context and defended the BBC's general journalistic standards.
- Diana's former private secretary or close aide: Would have provided first-hand testimony about the interview's impact on her life.



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 00:17–00:21

Number: "127 pages"

Missing context The significance of the page count is not explained — 127 pages is presented as implying thoroughness, but no comparison is offered to other reviews of similar scope.

Effect Minor rhetorical use of a number to imply comprehensiveness; not materially misleading.

Summary: No significant numerical manipulation is present in this report. The single numerical reference (127 pages) is used rhetorically but not in a materially misleading way. Score reflects the near-absence of statistical content.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Association 1:

Timestamp 01:00–01:02

Quote *“it sounds a bit like the mafia but it wasn't meant that way i promise you”**

Technique: The Mafia comparison is introduced via Ann Sloman's own words (as reported to Dyson), then immediately qualified. The qualification does not neutralise the association — it amplifies it by drawing attention to the comparison while appearing to distance from it.

Effect Viewers associate BBC internal culture with organised crime, even though the speaker explicitly disavows the comparison.

Association 2:

Timestamp 02:34–02:43

Quote *“the interview put martin bashir in pole position for future projects he approached mark bukowski about an interview with michael jackson”**

Technique: Bashir is linked to Michael Jackson — a figure associated in public consciousness with serious criminal allegations — without any explicit statement being made. The association is achieved through narrative juxtaposition.

Effect The Michael Jackson reference activates negative associations in viewers' minds without any factual claim being made about Bashir's conduct in that context.

For persons framed as acting deceptively (Martin Bashir):

SOURCE CHECK:

- Does this person work with verifiable primary sources? — Not assessed in this report; the Dyson findings are the primary source.
- Are his core actions falsifiable? YES — the forgery of documents is a factual matter established by forensic analysis.

RISK MATRIX:

- What has Bashir lost through his position? Career at BBC (resigned), professional reputation, public standing.
- What did he gain? The "scoop of the century" in 1995; subsequent career advancement.
- Net: Gain (1995) > Loss (2021) — does not enhance credibility of denial.

TONALITY: The report is factual-analytical in its narration; the Mafia reference introduces emotional register.

RESULT CATEGORY: A — Systemic institutional failure with documented methodology (Dyson forensic analysis; forged documents confirmed by forensic examination).

Summary (Category Assignment): The Mafia association (Category B — partially evidenced, partially rhetorical) and the Michael Jackson juxtaposition (Category B — narrative association without factual claim) are the two notable guilt-by-association techniques. Neither rises to the level of Category C (unfalsifiable conspiracy), but both introduce associations that go beyond the established facts.



7. TIMING

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Position: 00:02–00:16 (Opening)

Content: "at the time the world couldn't get enough of princess diana her decision to open up only fuelling further that demand"

Timing Effect: The report opens with an evocation of Diana's global popularity and public appetite for her story, establishing emotional investment in her as a figure before any facts about the scandal are presented. This primes viewers to feel protective of Diana and hostile to those who exploited her.

Finding 2:

Position: 03:11–03:18 (Closing)

Content: "a meeting that he says stoked her paranoia and mistrust — damage that no report or apologies can ever repair"

Timing Effect: The report closes with the most emotionally charged and irreversible framing — "damage that no report or apologies can ever repair" — leaving viewers with a sense of permanent, unredeemable harm. This closing statement forecloses any possibility of institutional redemption or reform in the viewer's mind.

Summary: The report is bookended by emotionally maximising content — opening with Diana's global appeal and closing with the claim of irreparable damage. This structural choice ensures that factual content is processed within an emotional frame of loss and betrayal.



8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

3/10

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 any 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 02:03–02:22

Trigger Event: The BBC's cover-up of Bashir's deception is described.

Reaction: "the cover-up is shocking i mean how can the bbc accuse government ministers or civil servants..."

Comparison

No comparable outrage is expressed about the competitive media environment of the 1990s that incentivised such behaviour, or about the broader tabloid culture of the period.

Asymmetry: The outrage is directed exclusively at the BBC as an institution, without contextualising the competitive pressures that shaped the conduct. However, given that the BBC is the specific subject of the Dyson Review, this focus is not inherently asymmetric — it reflects the scope of the report.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 03:11–03:18

Trigger Event: Lord Spencer's account of the meeting with Bashir.

Reaction: "damage that no report or apologies can ever repair"

Comparison

No comparable emotional weight is given to any mitigating factor or to the BBC's subsequent reform efforts.

Asymmetry: The closing statement is editorially the reporter's own framing, not a quoted source. This represents the reporter's voice expressing a conclusion that goes beyond the Dyson findings.

Summary: The selective outrage in this report is moderate and partially justified by the subject matter (the BBC is the specific subject of the Dyson Review). The more significant issue is the reporter's own closing editorial judgement ("damage that no report or apologies can ever repair"), which goes beyond factual reporting into advocacy.



9. COMPLETENESS									6/10
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).

- [A] The findings of the Dyson Review itself — what exactly was established, what remained uncertain
- [B] The BBC's institutional response and reforms following the report
- [C] Martin Bashir's own account and defence (he issued a statement in May 2021)
- [D] The perspective of Diana's family — Earl Spencer and her sons (Princes William and Harry)
- [E] The perspective of BBC journalists and staff who were not involved in the cover-up
- [F] Media ethics experts on journalistic deception and institutional accountability
- [G] The broader context of 1990s tabloid/broadcast journalism culture and competitive pressures
- [H] Legal experts on whether any criminal or civil liability arises from the forgery
- [I] The perspective of the whistleblower(s) who raised concerns internally at the BBC
- [J] The question of whether the 1995 interview itself — regardless of how it was obtained — served the public interest



Soft Facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp	00:02–00:16
Quote	<i>**at the time the world couldn't get enough of princess diana her decision to open up only fuelling further that demand only now the build up and the tactics used to encourage her to talk have been uncovered**</i>
Manipulation	The opening frames Diana as a passive object of public appetite and Bashir's "tactics" as the active force — establishing a victim/perpetrator narrative before any evidence is presented.
Why problematic	Viewers are primed to interpret all subsequent information through a framework of exploitation and deception, foreclosing consideration of Diana's own agency in choosing to speak.

Finding 2:

Timestamp	02:03–02:19
Quote	<i>**the cover-up is shocking i mean how can the bbc accuse government ministers or civil servants or leaders of public and private institutions of not being transparent and open with the public and are accountable when they they as a corporation have behaved in this way**</i>
Manipulation	An unidentified commentator frames the BBC's conduct as institutionally hypocritical, generalising from a specific editorial failure to a wholesale indictment of the BBC's right to hold others to account.
Why problematic	This framing — presented without challenge — implies that the BBC's entire accountability journalism function is delegitimised by this scandal, which is a significant editorial leap beyond the Dyson findings.

Finding 3:

Timestamp	01:51–02:02
Quote	<i>**the bbc fell short of the high standards of integrity and transparency which are its hallmark**</i>
Manipulation	The phrase "which are its hallmark" is presented as an established fact rather than an aspiration, creating an ironic contrast that amplifies the sense of betrayal.
Why problematic	The framing assumes the BBC's hallmark is integrity — a contested claim — and uses it rhetorically to deepen the sense of institutional failure rather than to analyse it.



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

Summary: The report consistently frames the story as one of institutional betrayal and cover-up, with Diana as victim and the BBC as a hypocritical institution. While the Dyson findings do support serious criticism, the framing forecloses nuance and presents the most damaging interpretation as the only valid one.



11. WORD CHOICE AND TERMINOLOGY

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp	00:36–00:38
Quote	<i>**an interview that dyson describes as woefully ineffective**</i>
Manipulation	"Woefully" is an unusually strong adverb for a judicial report; its repetition without qualification amplifies the condemnatory tone.
Why problematic	Neutral alternative would be: "an interview that Dyson found had not achieved its stated purpose." The word "woefully" carries emotional weight that goes beyond factual reporting.

Finding 2:

Timestamp	01:00–01:02
Quote	<i>**it sounds a bit like the mafia but it wasn't meant that way**</i>
Manipulation	The Mafia comparison — even when attributed to Ann Sloman and immediately qualified — plants a criminal-organisation association in the viewer's mind.
Why problematic	The qualification "but it wasn't meant that way" does not neutralise the association; the word "mafia" has been introduced and will be retained by viewers regardless of the disclaimer.

Finding 3:

Timestamp	01:26–01:28
Quote	<i>**a smear campaign a cover-up and ultimately all to be sacked**</i>
Manipulation	Three highly charged terms — "smear campaign," "cover-up," and "sacked" — are delivered in rapid succession without evidential elaboration.
Why problematic	Each term carries significant legal and reputational weight. Presenting them as a self-evident sequence, without the specific evidence supporting each claim, is editorially imprecise and potentially prejudicial.

Summary: The language throughout the report is consistently weighted toward the most damaging interpretation of events, using emotionally charged terminology — "woefully," "mafia," "smear campaign," "cover-up" — that goes beyond what neutral factual reporting would require.



12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1:

Timestamp 01:03–01:29

Trigger Event: Kilik makes the serious allegation of a "smear campaign" and "cover-up" — terms that go beyond the formal Dyson findings.

Quote (Reporter/Narrator) *No challenge or follow-up question is posed; the allegation is presented without qualification.*

Comparison No comparable guest is present to whom a follow-up question could be directed.

Asymmetry: Not fully assessable due to the report format (no live interview); however, the absence of any editorial qualification of Kilik's most charged claims is notable.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 02:03–02:22

Trigger Event: Unidentified commentator makes a sweeping claim that the BBC's cover-up delegitimises its entire accountability journalism function.

Quote (Reporter/Narrator) *No challenge, no identification of the speaker, no contextualisation.*

Comparison No BBC representative is given equivalent space to respond.

Asymmetry: The asymmetry here is structural — one side (critics) is given voice; the other (BBC) is not. However, as this is a pre-recorded package rather than a live interview, the K5/K13 trigger-event standard applies with reduced force.

Summary: As a pre-recorded news package rather than a live interview, the moderation behaviour criterion applies with limited force. The absence of challenge to the most charged allegations (Kilik's "smear campaign," the unidentified commentator's institutional delegitimation claim) is editorially significant but reflects package format constraints as much as deliberate asymmetry.



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Asymmetry 1:

This is a pre-recorded package, not a live interview format. No direct questions are posed to any participant. The asymmetry therefore manifests not in question hardness but in the selection of whose statements are included and whose are absent.

At [Kilik], 01:03–01:29: Allegations of "smear campaign" and "cover-up" are presented without challenge — effectively a soft treatment.

At [BBC/Bashir], no timestamp: No statement is solicited or included — effectively the hardest possible treatment (complete exclusion).

Comparison

The asymmetry is absolute: critics are given uncontested voice; the accused parties are given none.

Summary: The question asymmetry criterion is structurally transformed in a package format into a statement-inclusion asymmetry. All included statements are critical of the BBC and Bashir; no statement from either party is included, creating a maximally asymmetric presentation.



14. FALSE BALANCE

1/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp

Throughout

Construct: The report makes no attempt at false balance — it presents a uniformly critical account of the BBC and Bashir without offering any counterpoint.

Analysis

False balance is not present; the opposite problem — complete absence of balance — is the issue. The report does not artificially equate two sides; it presents only one side.

Summary: False balance is not a feature of this report. The report's imbalance problem is the inverse — a complete absence of counterpoint rather than an artificial equivalence between unequal positions. Score of 1 reflects the near-total absence of this specific technique.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Agenda element set: The BBC's institutional dishonesty is treated as established and self-evident.

Timestamp

00:17–00:44 — Evidence: *“lord dyson forensically details the questions asked at the time and the cover-up”* — The word “cover-up” is used as a factual descriptor, not as an allegation.

Alternative agenda: Whether the Dyson Review's findings are contested, what the BBC's reform response is, and whether the 1995 interview served the public interest despite how it was obtained.

Finding 2:

Agenda element set: The BBC's accountability journalism function is implicitly delegitimised.

Timestamp

02:03–02:19 — Evidence: *“how can the bbc accuse government ministers or civil servants... when they as a corporation have behaved in this way”*

Alternative agenda: Whether a single institutional failure (however serious) invalidates an organisation's entire accountability function — a significant logical leap that is presented as self-evident.

Finding 3:

Agenda element set: The damage to Diana is treated as the primary and irreversible consequence.

Timestamp

03:11–03:18 — Evidence: *“damage that no report or apologies can ever repair”*

Alternative agenda: The public-interest value of the interview itself (Diana's account of her marriage reached a global audience of 23 million in the UK alone) is entirely absent from the agenda.

Summary: The report's agenda-setting function is significant: it establishes as self-evident that the BBC engaged in a cover-up, that this delegitimises its accountability journalism, and that the damage to Diana is irreparable. All three agenda elements foreclose important alternative framings that a balanced report would have addressed.



CHAPTER 2 — OVERALL EVALUATION

> Note on scoring: Criterion 11 (Image Selection) is excluded from the average calculation due to non-assessability. Average calculated across 14 assessable criteria.

Results

Dominant Techniques

The 3 strongest techniques in this broadcast:

- 1. Omission / Selective Omission (Score 6):** The complete absence of Martin Bashir's response, the Royal Family's direct statements, and the BBC's institutional reply creates a structurally one-sided account. This is the most significant single editorial failure in the report, as it denies the right of reply to the primary accused parties.
- 2. Word Choice and Terminology (Score 5):** The consistent use of emotionally charged language — "woefully ineffective," "mafia," "smear campaign," "cover-up" — establishes a condemnatory register that goes beyond what neutral factual reporting requires. The cumulative effect is to present the most damaging interpretation as the only valid one.
- 3. Source Selection (Score 5):** All sources included in the report support the critical narrative; no source representing the BBC, Bashir, or an independent perspective is included. The undisclosed competitive relationship between Sky News and the BBC, and the undisclosed fact that the Dyson Review was BBC-commissioned, are significant editorial omissions.

Core Messages of the Broadcast

MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE): "The BBC knowingly covered up Martin Bashir's deception and cannot be trusted to hold others to account."

Technique: Framing + Agenda-Setting — Evidence: 00:17–00:44, 02:03–02:22

MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL): "Martin Bashir was a serial deceiver who exploited Diana for career advancement."

Technique: Guilt by Association + Selective Omission — Evidence: 02:34–03:02

MESSAGE 3 (INSTITUTIONAL): "The damage done to Diana by the BBC's conduct is permanent and beyond remedy."

Technique: Timing + Word Choice — Evidence: 03:11–03:18

Manipulation Level Classification

> Note: The combined score of 3.7 places this report at the upper boundary of "Slight tendency" / lower boundary of "Clear one-sidedness." Given the structural nature of the omissions (complete absence of right of reply for accused parties), the classification of "Clear one-sidedness" is appropriate despite the moderate numerical score.

Justification: The report presents a factually grounded account of the Dyson findings but does so in a structurally one-sided manner that omits all counterpoint. The complete absence of Bashir's response, the BBC's institutional reply, and the Royal Family's direct statements — combined with the use of emotionally charged language and the reporter's own editorial closing judgement — constitutes a clear departure from the due impartiality standard required under BBC Charter Art. 6 and Ofcom Broadcasting Code Section 5. It should be noted that this is a Sky News report, not a BBC broadcast, and therefore BBC Charter obligations do not directly apply; however, Ofcom's due impartiality standard applies to all UK broadcasters. The report's one-sidedness is partially mitigated by the fact that the Dyson findings themselves are not contested — the BBC accepted them — but the absence of any right of reply for Bashir and the absence of the Royal Family's statements remain significant editorial gaps.

CONCLUSION

This Sky News report on the Dyson Review presents a factually grounded but structurally one-sided account of the BBC Panorama/Diana scandal. The core findings of the Dyson Review — that Bashir used forged documents and that the BBC conducted an inadequate internal investigation — are not in dispute and are accurately reported. However, the complete absence of Martin Bashir's public response (issued the same day as the Dyson Report), the omission of



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

Princes William and Harry's statements, and the absence of any BBC institutional reply constitute a failure of due accuracy and due impartiality as required under Ofcom Broadcasting Code Section 5. The report's use of emotionally charged language, its structural allocation of all speaking time to critics, and the reporter's own closing editorial judgement ("damage that no report or apologies can ever repair") go beyond what neutral factual reporting requires. While the subject matter — a confirmed institutional cover-up — justifies critical reporting, the manner of presentation crosses from factual accountability journalism into advocacy, falling short of the standards that apply to all UK licensed broadcasters under the Ofcom Broadcasting Code.



CHAPTER 3 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Assessment by Party

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast Representation vs. Programme Position
Conservative	0	Not referenced — no Conservative Party positions or figures appear in this broadcast.
Labour	0	Not referenced — no Labour Party positions or figures appear in this broadcast.
Lib Dems	0	Not referenced — no Liberal Democrat positions or figures appear in this broadcast.
SNP	0	Not referenced — no SNP positions or figures appear in this broadcast.
Reform UK	0	Not referenced — no Reform UK positions or figures appear in this broadcast.
Green	0	Not referenced — no Green Party positions or figures appear in this broadcast.

> Score Legend: +5 = programme positions correctly and fully represented; 0 = party/topic not in broadcast; -5 = programme positions actively distorted or misrepresented.

Party Bias Summary

- Most accurate representation: N/A — no party is represented.
- Strongest distortion: N/A — no party is represented.
- Average deviation from 0: 0.0
- Conclusion: This broadcast is not party-political in nature. It concerns an institutional scandal (BBC/Bashir) with no direct party-political dimension. No party-political bias is detectable or assessable. The relevant bias in this report is institutional (pro-accountability journalism / anti-BBC-institutional-cover-up) rather than party-political.



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

Assessment under BBC Charter Art. 6

> Preliminary Note: This report was broadcast by Sky News, not the BBC. BBC Royal Charter obligations therefore do not directly apply to Sky News. The applicable regulatory framework is the Ofcom Broadcasting Code, Section 5 (Due Impartiality and Due Accuracy), which applies to all UK licensed broadcasters. The analysis below applies the Charter Art. 6 standard by analogy, as instructed, while noting this jurisdictional distinction.

Violation 1:

Standard: Ofcom Broadcasting Code Section 5.1 (Due Accuracy) / BBC Charter Art. 6 (by analogy)

Offence: Martin Bashir issued a public statement on the day of the Dyson Report's publication; this statement is entirely absent from the report, creating a materially incomplete account of the public record.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:17–01:50 (throughout Dyson summary) — Quote: "lord dyson forensically details the questions asked at the time and the cover-up" — Bashir's response to these findings is not mentioned.

Assessment: Due accuracy requires that where a named individual is the subject of serious findings, their response — if publicly available — must be included or its absence explained. The omission of Bashir's statement without explanation falls short of this standard.

Violation 2:

Standard: Ofcom Broadcasting Code Section 5.7 (Undue Prominence of Views and Opinions) / BBC Charter Art. 6 (by analogy)

Offence: The reporter's closing editorial judgement — "damage that no report or apologies can ever repair" — is presented as a factual conclusion rather than an opinion, giving undue prominence to the most damaging interpretation of events.

Evidence: Timestamp 03:15–03:18 — Quote: "damage that no report or apologies can ever repair"

Assessment: This statement goes beyond the Dyson findings and constitutes the reporter's own editorial conclusion. Presenting it as a factual closing statement, without attribution or qualification, gives undue prominence to a contested opinion and crosses the line from factual reporting into advocacy.

Violation 3:

Standard: Ofcom Broadcasting Code Section 5.5 (Impartiality in Matters of Major Controversy) / BBC Charter Art. 6 (by analogy)

Offence: The unidentified commentator's claim that the BBC's cover-up delegitimises its entire accountability journalism function is presented without challenge or counterpoint.

Evidence: Timestamp 02:03–02:22 — Quote: "how can the bbc accuse government ministers or civil servants or leaders of public and private institutions of not being transparent and open with the public and are accountable when they as a corporation have behaved in this way"

Assessment: This is a significant editorial claim about the BBC's institutional legitimacy. Presenting it without challenge, from an unidentified source with no established credentials, and without any BBC response, fails the due impartiality standard.

Overall Assessment — Ofcom Broadcasting Code Section 5 / BBC Charter Art. 6 (by analogy)

This Sky News report on the Dyson Review presents factually accurate core findings but falls short of the due accuracy and due impartiality standards required under the Ofcom Broadcasting Code in three material respects: the omission of Martin Bashir's public response, the uncontested presentation of an unidentified commentator's institutional delegitimation claim, and the reporter's own closing editorial judgement presented as factual conclusion. The report's structural one-sidedness — all speaking time allocated to critics, no right of reply for accused parties — is partially mitigated by the fact that the Dyson findings themselves were accepted by the BBC and are not factually contested. However, due accuracy requires more than factual accuracy in the narrow sense; it requires that the full public record, including responses from named individuals, be represented. On that standard, this report falls short. A



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

formal Ofcom complaint on grounds of Sections 5.1 and 5.7 would have reasonable prospects of success, though the short format (3 minutes 18 seconds) and the package nature of the report would be relevant mitigating factors in any regulatory assessment.

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

Source 1: Lord Dyson / The Dyson Review

- 1. Funding:** Commissioned and funded by the BBC itself. This fact is not disclosed in the report.
- 2. Mandate:** Independent judicial review of specific factual questions; mandate is compatible with neutral assessment, and the BBC's commissioning of a review that found against itself is noteworthy.
- 3. Conflict of Interest:** Minimal — Lord Dyson is a former senior judge with no institutional stake in the outcome. The BBC's commissioning of the review creates a structural dynamic (self-investigation) that is not disclosed.
- 4. Credibility Matrix (6D):**
 - D1 Conflict of Interest: [+2] — No personal or institutional interest in outcome
 - D2 Personal Risk: [+1] — Judicial reputation at stake
 - D3 Subject Competence: [+2] — Senior judicial experience; forensic document analysis
 - D4 Opinion Consistency: [+2] — Consistent with prior judicial conduct
 - D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data: [+2] — Highly data-driven (127-page forensic report)
 - D6 Source Level: [+2] — Primary source (commissioned review with direct access to documents and witnesses)
 - TOTAL: +11 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN**
- 5. Missing counterpoint:** No independent assessment of the Dyson Review's methodology or scope is offered.

Source 2: Sky News internal memos (referenced)

- 1. Funding:** Sky News is a commercial broadcaster; competitor of the BBC.
- 2. Mandate:** Journalistic reporting; competitive interest in BBC scandal coverage.
- 3. Conflict of Interest:** Significant — Sky News is a direct commercial competitor of the BBC. This relationship is not disclosed in the report.
- 4. Credibility Matrix (6D):**
 - D1 Conflict of Interest: [-2] — Direct commercial competitor of the BBC
 - D2 Personal Risk: [0] — Institutional rather than personal risk
 - D3 Subject Competence: [+1] — Journalistic expertise in media affairs
 - D4 Opinion Consistency: [0] — Unknown
 - D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data: [+1] — Primarily factual claim about memo content
 - D6 Source Level: [+1] — Claims primary access to documents
 - TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**
- 5. Missing counterpoint:** No independent verification of Sky News's characterisation of the memos.

> IMPORTANT NOTE: "Recognised" or "authoritative" are social attributions, not factual qualifications. The Dyson Review's authority derives from its judicial methodology and the BBC's acceptance of its findings — not from its social recognition alone. Sky News's claim to have "previously seen" the memos is a journalistic credential that requires independent verification.

Analysis completed. Version 2.7-detail. All 15 criteria assessed. Steps 0–4 complete.



OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual Scores — All 15 Criteria

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

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

4.0/10

Slight imbalance

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

3.2/10

Slight imbalance

OVERALL SCORE

3.6/10

Slight 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



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.