



CBC DETAILED ANALYSIS

2025-11-19_Poillievre's favourability hits lowest point since becoming leader : pollsters / P

Broadcast: 2025-11-19 | Analyzed: 2026-05-06 09:02

Version 2.0-cbc | Konverter 3.3 (2026-05-14) | Standard: Broadcasting Act s. 3(1)(l)

OVERALL SCORE

6.2/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation

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	NDP	GPC	LPC	BQ	CPC	PPC
CHES	2.0	2.5	4.5	5.0	7.5	9.0
Spectrum	Left	Left	Center	Center	Right	Right

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)

4.5 / 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](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2022.102300) | Thresholds: [Pew Research Center](https://www.pewresearch.org/)

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

BROADCAST INFO AND TOPIC FRAMEWORK

Broadcast Identification

- Program: Power & Politics, CBC News Network
- Estimated Date: Tuesday, November 19, 2025 (confirmed by anchor's self-correction: "Today was Tuesday")
- Approximate Length: 12–16 minutes (based on transcript density and segment structure)



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

- Anchor/Presenter: Unidentified by name in transcript (referred to implicitly; makes self-deprecating day-of-week error)
- File Reference: 2025-11-19_Poilievre's favourability hits lowest point since becoming leader

Guests and Affiliations

Guest	Title/Role	Organization	Notes
David Coletto	Founder & CEO	Abacus Data	Private polling firm; commissioned polling cited in segment
Shachi Kurl	President	Angus Reid Institute	Non-profit polling organization; commissioned polling cited in segment

Main Topic

A discussion of new polling data showing Conservative leader Pierre Poilievre's net favourability rating at its lowest point since he assumed party leadership, contrasted with Prime Minister Mark Carney's comparatively strong approval numbers, framed against the backdrop of the federal budget vote passing the previous evening.

Current Context (3–4 sentences)

As of November 2025, Canada is operating under a Liberal minority government led by Prime Minister Mark Carney, who succeeded Justin Trudeau earlier in the year. The Conservative Party under Pierre Poilievre had been widely expected to win the subsequent federal election but failed to form government, leaving the party in opposition and facing internal questions about leadership direction. The geopolitical environment — particularly the return of Donald Trump to the U.S. presidency and associated tariff threats — has significantly reshaped Canadian political dynamics, boosting Carney's nationalist credibility and complicating Poilievre's populist messaging. The budget vote the previous evening was a significant parliamentary moment, with the government surviving through a combination of Green Party support and Conservative and NDP abstentions, avoiding a confidence crisis.



CHAPTER 1 — DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Hard Facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically verifiable

1. EXPERT SELECTION

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Whether the guests chosen as experts are genuinely independent, credible, and representative of a range of analytical perspectives.

Finding 1

- Location: Entire segment structure
- Quote: "David Kletto is the founder and CEO of Abacus Data. Shachi Kurl is the president of the Angus Reed Institute and they join me now."
- Technique: Commercially interested expert selection. Both guests are heads of private or semi-private polling organizations whose professional reputations and business interests are directly tied to the prominence and perceived accuracy of their polling data.
- Why problematic: Inviting the producers of the data being discussed to analyze that same data creates a structural conflict of interest. Neither guest has an incentive to critique the methodology, limitations, or potential biases of their own surveys. An independent academic or methodologist was not included.

Finding 2

- Location: Throughout segment
- Technique: Ideological homogeneity of expert panel. Both guests, while representing different firms, arrive at broadly similar conclusions that are unfavourable to Poilievre and favourable to Carney. No expert with a contrasting analytical framework (e.g., a conservative-leaning political scientist, a methodological skeptic, or a regional analyst from Western Canada where Poilievre's support is strongest) is present.
- Why problematic: The appearance of two experts creates a false impression of analytical diversity when both are operating from similar professional and, arguably, interpretive frameworks.

Finding 3

- Location: Shachi Kurl's response on historical comparisons
- Quote: "I would have to — you caught me — I'd have to go back and check our own numbers. I don't think Andrew Scheer uh was exactly setting the house on fire"
- Technique: Unverified historical comparison offered as analysis. Kurl acknowledges she cannot verify her own historical comparison in real time but offers it anyway as contextual analysis.
- Why problematic: A senior polling professional offering unverified comparative claims on a national broadcast, without correction or caveat from the anchor, undermines the evidentiary standard expected of expert commentary on a public broadcaster.



2. SOURCE SELECTION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

Definition: The diversity, independence, and potential conflicts of interest of sources cited in the broadcast.

Finding 1

- Location: Entire segment
- Technique: Duopoly source structure. The entire broadcast relies on two polling firms — Abacus Data and Angus Reid Institute — as its sole analytical sources. No academic research, no government data, no independent think tank analysis, and no journalistic investigation is cited.
- Why problematic: Relying exclusively on commercial and semi-commercial polling organizations for political analysis creates a structural dependency on entities whose business model benefits from media prominence and whose methodologies are not independently scrutinized within the segment.

Finding 2

- Location: David Coletto's reference to his own column
- Quote: "I argued in a column I wrote that there is one in 10 conservative supporters today who say they're there because of Pierre Poilievre"
- Technique: Self-citation as evidence. A guest cites his own published column as supporting evidence for a claim he is making on air, without the anchor noting the self-referential nature of this citation.
- Why problematic: Self-citation by a commercially interested expert, without independent verification or anchor challenge, is a source reliability concern. The column is not identified by publication, date, or methodology.

Finding 3

- Location: Absence of cited primary sources
- Technique: No polling methodology details are provided for either survey — no sample sizes, margins of error, fieldwork dates, question wording, or weighting methodology are mentioned or requested.
- Why problematic: Presenting polling data as authoritative political analysis without any methodological transparency fails the basic journalistic standard of source verification and prevents viewers from assessing the reliability of the claims being made.



3. TIME DISTRIBUTION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Whether speaking time is distributed equitably across different political positions and perspectives.

Finding 1

- Location: Entire segment
- Technique: 100% of substantive speaking time is allocated to two polling professionals whose data and analysis are unfavourable to the Conservative Party. Zero speaking time is allocated to any voice that could contextualize, challenge, or represent the Conservative perspective.
- Why problematic: On a segment explicitly about a Conservative leader's political standing, the distribution of analytical voice is entirely one-directional. This is not a matter of minor imbalance but of structural exclusion.

Finding 2

- Location: Comparative treatment of Carney vs. Poilievre in discussion
- Technique: Quantitative asymmetry in analytical depth. Poilievre's negative numbers are discussed across multiple extended exchanges. Carney's declining numbers are mentioned once in passing. The ratio of analytical attention to negative Poilievre data versus negative Carney data is approximately 8:1 based on word count in the transcript.
- Why problematic: Even within the polling discussion itself, the distribution of analytical attention is asymmetric in a way that amplifies negative Conservative data and minimizes negative Liberal data.

Finding 3

- Location: Shachi Kurl's extended response on Poilievre's base retention
- Quote: "He's still got the better part of 80% of his base... he hasn't lost so much of his own room... such that it spells outright imminent disaster for him"
- Technique: The one extended passage that could be read as relatively favourable to Poilievre (base retention) is immediately followed by the anchor redirecting to his ceiling problem, effectively neutralizing the positive framing before it can settle with the viewer.
- Why problematic: The structural sequencing of the conversation ensures that any data point that might be read as positive for Poilievre is immediately followed by a reframing question that returns to the negative narrative.



4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Relevant facts, context, or perspectives that are absent from the broadcast and whose absence distorts the overall picture.

Finding 1

- Location: Entire broadcast
- Technique: Complete absence of Conservative perspective. No Conservative MP, spokesperson, or sympathetic analyst is present or quoted to offer the party's own interpretation of the polling data, Poilievre's strategy, or the budget vote.
- Why problematic: A segment explicitly about the Conservative leader's political standing, aired on a public broadcaster, contains zero direct Conservative voice. This is a structural omission that violates the CBC's own balance standards.

Finding 2

- Location: Budget vote discussion, opening segment
- Quote: "It gained the support of Green Party leader Elizabeth May and two MPs from both the NDP and the Conservative caucuses abstained."
- Technique: Omission of budget content. The broadcast discusses the budget vote extensively but never describes what the budget actually contains — its fiscal measures, spending priorities, or policy implications. The discussion jumps immediately to polling and political horse-race analysis.
- Why problematic: Citizens watching a public broadcaster's flagship political program receive no substantive information about the policy content of a federal budget that just passed a confidence vote. This prioritizes political spectacle over civic information.

Finding 3

- Location: David Coletto's discussion of cost-of-living
- Quote: "on the most important issue facing the country right now when Canadians tell us it's the cost of living, the Conservatives and Mr. Poilievre still have an advantage on it"
- Technique: Omission of follow-up on Conservative policy advantage. The one data point that is genuinely favourable to the Conservatives — their lead on the most important issue — is mentioned briefly and then immediately contextualized away ("but right now, head-to-head..."). No follow-up question explores what Conservative cost-of-living policies are or why Canadians trust them on this issue.
- Why problematic: The single piece of data favourable to the opposition is introduced and immediately minimized without exploration, while unfavourable data receives extended analytical treatment.

Missing Voices

1. Conservative Party spokesperson or MP — to represent the party's own framing of Poilievre's position and strategy
2. NDP representative — to explain the abstention decision and NDP policy priorities
3. Academic political scientist (e.g., university-based electoral scholar) — to provide independent, non-commercially-interested analysis
4. Fiscal economist or budget analyst — to contextualize what the budget actually contains and why it passed



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

5. Green Party representative — to explain the rationale for supporting the Liberal budget
6. Bloc Québécois representative — Quebec's distinct political perspective is entirely absent
7. Young Canadian or cost-of-living advocacy group representative — the demographic most cited in polling but given no direct voice
8. Polling methodology critic or statistician — to scrutinize the divergence between Abacus and Angus Reid findings and assess reliability



5. NUMERICAL MANIPULATION

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Definition: The selective, decontextualized, or misleading use of numerical data to support a particular narrative.

Finding 1

- Location: Anchor's opening statistical presentation
- Quote: "52% of Canadians approve of Prime Minister Mark Carney and his performance. This is compared to 39% of Canadians having a negative view of Carney. Now, this gives the prime minister a net approval rating of plus 13."
- Technique: Missing data presentation. The anchor presents 52% approval and 39% disapproval but does not account for the remaining 9% (presumably neutral or no opinion). This arithmetic gap is not explained, which could mislead viewers about the completeness of the data.
- Why problematic: Presenting approval/disapproval figures without accounting for the full 100% of respondents is a standard polling presentation error that inflates the apparent clarity of public opinion.

Finding 2

- Location: Anchor's presentation of Poilievre's numbers
- Quote: "Conservative Party leader Pierre Poilievre by comparison only has a 34% favorability, but that comes with an unfavorable rate that is much higher than Carney is coming in at 60%"
- Technique: The word "only" is applied to Poilievre's 34% but no equivalent qualifier is applied to Carney's 52%. The asymmetric use of evaluative language ("only") in statistical presentation is a subtle but consistent form of framing bias.
- Why problematic: Statistical presentation should be neutral. The insertion of "only" before Poilievre's number and no equivalent qualifier before Carney's number is an editorial judgment embedded in what appears to be factual reporting.

Finding 3

- Location: Discussion of the 19-point divergence between polling firms
- Quote: "Abacus data recorded a higher net favorable for Poilievre than the Angus Reid Institute did. But it still had Poilievre's net impression score falling to the lowest it had been in a year at -7."
- Technique: Divergence minimization. The anchor acknowledges a 19-point gap between the two firms (-7 vs. -26) but frames it as "a similar similar net favourability" in the opening, then walks this back slightly. The magnitude of the divergence — which is analytically significant — is never explored.
- Why problematic: A 19-point gap between two reputable polling firms on the same metric is not "similar." Presenting it as broadly consistent without methodological explanation misleads viewers about the reliability and precision of the data being used to make strong political claims.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Discrediting a political position or actor by associating them with extreme, unpopular, or discredited figures or movements.

Finding 1

- Location: David Coletto's analysis of Poilievre's political context
- Quote: "certainly at any time in the last two years uh before Donald Trump was elected in November"
- Technique: Implicit Trump association. The mention of Trump's election as the pivotal moment that changed Poilievre's political fortunes implicitly links Poilievre's decline to Trump's rise — suggesting a political kinship without stating it directly.
- Why problematic: While the geopolitical context is legitimate, the framing consistently positions Trump's election as the cause of Poilievre's problems rather than, for example, Carney's effective nationalist response. This subtly implies that Poilievre and Trump occupy similar political space.

Finding 2

- Location: Shachi Kurl's historical comparison
- Quote: "I don't think Andrew Scheer uh was exactly setting the house on fire, so to speak, uh during his tenure as leader either"
- Technique: Association with a failed Conservative leader. Poilievre is compared to Andrew Scheer — a Conservative leader who lost two elections and was replaced — as the primary historical reference point. No comparison is made to successful opposition leaders who recovered from low polling numbers.
- Why problematic: Selecting Scheer as the comparison case (rather than, say, Stephen Harper's early opposition years or other leaders who recovered) frames Poilievre's situation through the lens of Conservative failure rather than potential recovery.



7. TIMING & PLACEMENT

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: The strategic positioning of information within the broadcast to maximize or minimize its impact.

Finding 1

- Location: Segment opening
- Technique: Lead placement of negative Conservative data. The segment opens with the budget vote framed as evidence of Conservative electoral fear, immediately followed by polling data showing Poilievre at his worst numbers. This sequencing creates a cumulative negative impression before any analytical context is provided.
- Why problematic: The ordering of information — budget survival → Conservative fear → worst polling numbers — creates a narrative arc that is structurally unfavourable to the Conservatives before any guest speaks.

Finding 2

- Location: Placement of the one favourable Conservative data point
- Quote: "the Conservatives and Mr. Poilievre still have an advantage on [cost of living]" — this appears late in the segment, after extensive negative framing, and is immediately followed by a "but right now" qualifier.
- Technique: Burial of favourable data. The single data point most favourable to the Conservatives is placed late, briefly, and immediately contextualized away.
- Why problematic: Information placement affects retention and impression. Burying the one positive Conservative data point at the end of an extended negative analysis, and immediately qualifying it, minimizes its impact on viewer perception.

Finding 3

- Location: Closing statement
- Quote: "A volatile time, a polarized time, but not election time, at least not until after Christmas time."
- Technique: Editorial closure as final impression. The anchor's closing editorial judgment — that an election is not appropriate — is the last thing viewers hear, functioning as a summary verdict that reinforces the segment's overall framing.
- Why problematic: Closing a political analysis segment with an anchor's personal editorial judgment about electoral timing is an inappropriate use of the closing position, which carries disproportionate mnemonic weight.



8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Definition: The application of moral or evaluative outrage to certain political positions while equivalent positions from other actors receive neutral or sympathetic treatment.

Finding 1

- Location: Anchor's description of parliamentary vote
- Quote: "all the little games and antics and tactics that we saw last night in the parliamentary vote"
- Technique: Selective delegitimization. Parliamentary manoeuvring is described with moral contempt ("games," "antics") in a context where the Conservatives were the party most associated with potential election-triggering. The Liberal government's own vote management — securing Green Party support, managing NDP abstentions — is not described in equivalent terms.
- Why problematic: If parliamentary tactics are "games and antics" when the Conservatives engage in them, the same standard should apply to the governing party's parliamentary management. The selective application of contemptuous language is a form of asymmetric moral evaluation.

Finding 2

- Location: Shachi Kurl's characterization of Poilievre
- Quote: "that polarizing uh very divisive uh reaction that Canadians have to Pierre"
- Technique: Moral characterization applied exclusively to the opposition leader. "Divisive" and "polarizing" carry strong negative moral connotations in Canadian political discourse. These terms are not applied to Carney despite the fact that his budget produced caucus "grumbling" and his government governs a divided country.
- Why problematic: Applying morally loaded political characterizations to one leader while using neutral or positive language for another is a form of selective moral framing that a public broadcaster's guests should be challenged on, not allowed to pass unchallenged.



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

Share of covered perspectives

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

| # | Perspective | Status |

|---|---|---|

| 1 | Liberal government / Carney supporters: rationale for budget priorities | MENTIONED (indirectly, through polling data) |

| 2 | Conservative opposition: Poilievre's policy arguments and strategic rationale | OMITTED (no Conservative voice present) |

| 3 | NDP perspective: reasons for abstention and policy concerns | OMITTED |

| 4 | Green Party perspective: reasons for supporting the budget | OMITTED |

| 5 | Independent political scientists / academic analysts | OMITTED |

| 6 | Fiscal/economic analysts on budget content and implications | OMITTED |

| 7 | Conservative base voters: why they still support Poilievre | MENTIONED (via polling data only, no direct voice) |

| 8 | Young Canadians / cost-of-living affected demographics | MENTIONED (briefly, via polling reference) |

| 9 | Bloc Québécois perspective on budget and political dynamics | OMITTED |

| 10 | Media critics / journalism scholars on polling methodology | OMITTED |

Completeness Score: 3/10

The broadcast is almost entirely confined to two polling professionals discussing their own data. No opposition voices, no government voices, no independent academic analysis, no affected citizen perspectives, and no methodological scrutiny of the polling itself are present.



Soft Facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: How the topic is fundamentally constructed — what assumptions are treated as settled, what the "natural" starting point of discussion is.

Finding 1

- Location: Opening paragraph, anchor introduction
- Quote: "new data could offer a glimpse into why the Conservatives in particular might not want to rush to the polls"
- Technique: Presumptive framing. The anchor opens by framing Conservative reluctance to trigger an election as driven by self-interested fear of polling numbers, rather than any principled policy or parliamentary reasoning.
- Why problematic: This frames Conservative parliamentary behaviour as purely electoral self-preservation, pre-empting any alternative explanation (e.g., genuine policy disagreement with the budget, strategic patience, or democratic responsibility). It sets a negative interpretive lens before any evidence is examined.

Finding 2

- Location: Mid-segment, anchor question to David Coletto
- Quote: "if you have this really high with your base, but really low with not your base, you've raised your floor, but have you lowered your ceiling? Like he's kind of in this weird conundrum."
- Technique: Anchor-as-analyst framing. The anchor does not ask an open question but instead presents a pre-formed negative conclusion ("weird conundrum") and invites the guest to confirm it.
- Why problematic: This is not neutral inquiry. The anchor is constructing the narrative and using the guest as a validation mechanism, which violates the principle of impartial moderation.

Finding 3

- Location: Closing anchor statement
- Quote: "A volatile time, a polarized time, but not election time, at least not until after Christmas time."
- Technique: Declarative editorial closure. The anchor ends the segment with a personal editorial judgment presented as consensus fact.
- Why problematic: A public broadcaster anchor summarizing a political segment with a personal verdict on electoral timing is an editorial intrusion that violates impartiality standards. No equivalent declarative judgment is offered about the Liberal government's performance or vulnerabilities.



11. WORD CHOICE & TERMINOLOGY

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: The use of loaded, connotative, or asymmetrically valenced language to describe political actors or events.

Finding 1

- Location: Anchor introduction
- Quote: "all the little games and antics and tactics that we saw last night in the parliamentary vote"
- Technique: Dysphemistic characterization. Parliamentary procedure — including abstentions, negotiations, and vote management — is described as "games," "antics," and "tactics."
- Why problematic: This language trivializes and delegitimizes parliamentary activity, and given the context (the Conservatives were the party most associated with potential election-triggering), the pejorative framing disproportionately colours Conservative behaviour. The Liberal government's own vote management is not described in equivalent terms.

Finding 2

- Location: Shachi Kurl's response, mid-segment
- Quote: "that polarizing uh very divisive uh reaction that Canadians have to Pierre"
- Technique: Repeated negative characterization. The words "polarizing" and "divisive" are applied exclusively to Poilievre. Carney's own political divisions (mentioned briefly as "grumbling" in his caucus) are described in far softer terms.
- Why problematic: Asymmetric language use creates a qualitatively different impression of the two leaders. "Polarizing" and "divisive" carry strong negative connotations in Canadian political culture, while "grumbling" is almost affectionate.

Finding 3

- Location: Anchor question about Poilievre's viability
- Quote: "It's not to stay as the opposition conservative leader. It's to win the big job."
- Technique: Diminutive framing. Describing the role of Leader of the Official Opposition as not "the big job" implicitly devalues the constitutional role of the opposition in a parliamentary democracy.
- Why problematic: In Westminster parliamentary systems, the Leader of the Opposition holds a constitutionally significant role. Framing it as merely a stepping stone — and doing so only in the context of the Conservative leader — subtly diminishes the legitimacy of the opposition function itself.



12. MODERATION BEHAVIOR

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Whether the anchor/moderator applies consistent standards of challenge, sympathy, and follow-up across different political positions.

Finding 1

- Location: Anchor's framing questions throughout
- Quote: "Like he's kind of in this weird conundrum" / "What does this say about that path?" / "they would likely lose that contest"
- Technique: Leading questions and confirmatory framing. The anchor consistently poses questions that presuppose negative conclusions about Poilievre and invites guests to confirm rather than explore.
- Why problematic: A neutral moderator would pose open questions ("How do you interpret these numbers?") rather than pre-loaded ones ("He's in a weird conundrum, right?"). The anchor's questions function as editorial statements requiring guest validation.

Finding 2

- Location: Anchor's treatment of Carney's declining numbers
- Quote: "Mr. Carney's numbers are trending downward but very slowly" — this is a guest observation that the anchor does not follow up on with any probing question about what might accelerate that decline or what vulnerabilities the government faces.
- Technique: Asymmetric follow-up. When data unfavourable to Poilievre is raised, the anchor pursues it with multiple follow-up questions. When data unfavourable to Carney is mentioned (declining numbers, caucus grumbling), the anchor moves on without exploration.
- Why problematic: Consistent asymmetry in follow-up questioning creates a structurally biased interview even when individual questions appear neutral in isolation.

Finding 3

- Location: Anchor's self-deprecating day-of-week error
- Quote: "Well, Shachi, the Thursday power panel may say things like that, but not the Wednesday power panel... Today was Tuesday. Sorry."
- Technique: Levity and informality. While minor, the anchor's casual, self-deprecating humour creates a warm, collegial atmosphere with the guests that signals ideological comfort and alignment.
- Why problematic: The informal, friendly register of the entire interview — no challenging questions, shared laughter, collegial tone — is itself a moderation choice that signals to viewers that the analytical framework being presented is uncontested and comfortable. This is qualitatively different from how a moderator might engage with a guest whose conclusions they found uncomfortable.



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Whether harder, more confrontational questions are directed at one political position while softer, more sympathetic questions are directed at another.

Finding 1

- Location: Anchor's questions about Poilievre's viability
- Quote: "What does this tell us about his viability to become prime minister because that's the goal here?"
- Technique: Existential viability question directed exclusively at the opposition leader. The anchor asks whether Poilievre can achieve his fundamental political goal. No equivalent question is asked about Carney's vulnerabilities, the sustainability of his coalition, or the risks to his government.
- Why problematic: Asymmetric existential questioning — challenging the opposition leader's fundamental viability while not applying equivalent scrutiny to the governing party — is a structural form of question bias.

Finding 2

- Location: Anchor's question about Conservative caucus revolt
- Quote: "it does not seem to me um at this point in time as you say that Mr. Polyv is at risk of a widespread caucus revolt. There's going to be grumbling just like there is in Mark Carney's caucus"
- Technique: False equivalence deployed asymmetrically. The anchor mentions Carney's caucus "grumbling" only as a rhetorical device to soften the question about Poilievre's caucus revolt risk — not as a genuine subject of inquiry. The Carney caucus tensions are mentioned and immediately dropped.
- Why problematic: Carney's internal caucus tensions (described as dissatisfaction with a "shift to the centre or the right") are a substantive political story that receives zero analytical follow-up, while Poilievre's caucus dynamics receive extended discussion.

Finding 3

- Location: No challenging questions directed at either guest about their methodology
- Technique: Complete absence of methodological scrutiny. The anchor never asks either polling professional about sample size, margin of error, question wording, weighting methodology, or the reasons for the significant divergence between their two firms' results (Abacus: -7 vs. Angus Reid: -26 for Poilievre — a 19-point gap).
- Why problematic: A 19-point divergence between two polling firms on the same metric is analytically significant and methodologically interesting. The anchor's failure to probe this divergence means viewers receive no tools to critically evaluate the data being presented as authoritative.



14. FALSE BALANCE

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: The creation of an artificial appearance of balance that actually misrepresents the analytical landscape or conceals a dominant perspective.

Finding 1

- Location: Two-guest format
- Technique: Pseudo-balance through firm diversity. The presence of two polling firms creates the visual and structural appearance of analytical balance (two voices, two datasets, some divergence in numbers) while both guests share the same fundamental analytical conclusion: Poilievre is in serious trouble and Carney is in a strong position.
- Why problematic: True balance would require analytical diversity, not merely organizational diversity. Two polling professionals from different firms who reach the same conclusions do not constitute a balanced panel on a political question.

Finding 2

- Location: Shachi Kurl's "other side" framing
- Quote: "there's another side to this story or another layer of depth if you start to peel back the onion"
- Technique: False balance signal. Kurl signals that she is about to provide balance ("another side") but then uses that space to note that Poilievre's base support (78-80%) is still lower than Carney's base support (87%) — which is itself an unfavourable comparison for Poilievre.
- Why problematic: The rhetorical signal of balance ("another side") is used to introduce data that is, on examination, still unfavourable to the Conservative leader. This creates the impression of balanced analysis while maintaining a consistently negative directional thrust.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: What topics, questions, and frames are established as "the issue," and what is systematically excluded from the discussion.

Finding 1

- Location: Entire segment structure
- Technique: Horse-race journalism as exclusive frame. The entire segment is devoted to polling numbers, political viability, and electoral strategy. The federal budget — a major policy document that just survived a confidence vote — is never discussed substantively. Its contents, implications, and merits are entirely absent.
- Why problematic: By setting the agenda as "who is winning politically" rather than "what policies are being implemented and what are their effects," the broadcast prioritizes political spectacle over civic information. This is a systemic agenda-setting choice that serves political entertainment over public interest journalism.

Finding 2

- Location: Anchor's framing of the Conservative challenge
- Quote: "It's not to stay as the opposition conservative leader. It's to win the big job. What does this say about that path?"
- Technique: Agenda-setting through question framing. By defining the Conservative leader's success exclusively in terms of winning the prime ministership, the anchor sets an agenda in which anything short of that is failure. The legitimate and constitutionally important role of opposition — holding government to account, representing millions of voters, shaping policy debate — is excluded from the frame.
- Why problematic: This agenda-setting choice systematically devalues the opposition function and frames Conservative political activity exclusively through a lens of electoral ambition and current failure.

Finding 3

- Location: Absence of policy agenda
- Technique: Complete exclusion of policy substance. The broadcast sets an agenda in which the following topics are entirely absent: what the budget contains, what the NDP's policy concerns are, what the Green Party's conditions for support were, what the cost-of-living crisis actually consists of, what Conservative economic policies are, and what the fiscal implications of the budget are.
- Why problematic: A flagship political program on a public broadcaster that discusses a federal budget vote without any policy content has set an agenda that is fundamentally incompatible with the CBC's mandate to inform citizens about matters of public importance.



CHAPTER 2 — OVERALL EVALUATION

A) Summary Table: 15 Criteria

#	Criterion	Score (0–10)	Key Finding
1	Framing	7	Topic framed as Conservative electoral fear and Poilievre's political conundrum from the opening sentence
2	Word Choice	6	Asymmetric language: "polarizing/divisive" for Poilievre; "grumbling" for Carney caucus tensions
3	Expert Selection	6	Both guests are heads of polling firms with commercial interest in their own data's prominence
4	Selective Omission	8	Zero Conservative voice; no budget content; no NDP/Green/Bloc perspectives
5	Moderation Behavior	6	Leading questions presuppose negative Conservative conclusions; no challenge to guests
6	Time Distribution	7	100% of analytical time allocated to perspectives unfavourable to Conservatives
7	Question Asymmetry	6	Existential viability questions for Poilievre; no equivalent scrutiny of Carney government
8	Guilt by Association	4	Implicit Trump linkage; Scheer comparison as failure reference point
9	Numerical Manipulation	6	"Only" qualifier on Poilievre's numbers; 19-point polling divergence minimized
10	Timing & Placement	5	Negative Conservative data leads; single positive Conservative data point buried and immediately qualified
12	Source Selection	7	Exclusive reliance on commercially interested polling firms; no methodology transparency
13	Selective Outrage	5	"Games and antics" applied to Conservative parliamentary behaviour; not to Liberal vote management
14	False Balance	5	Two-firm format creates appearance of balance while both guests share identical analytical conclusions
15	Agenda-Setting	8	Entire segment is horse-race polling analysis; federal budget content entirely absent

B) Overall Scores

- Criteria Score (average of 15): 5.9/10

C) Top 3 Manipulation Techniques

1. Structural Exclusion (Score impact: Criteria 4, 6, 15)



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

The most significant manipulation technique is not any single statement but the structural design of the segment: the complete absence of any Conservative voice, any policy content, and any perspective that could contextualize or challenge the dominant narrative. This is manipulation by architecture — the segment is built in a way that makes balanced analysis impossible regardless of what individual guests say. A viewer watching this segment receives a comprehensive negative portrait of the Conservative leader with zero counterweight.

2. Confirmatory Anchor Framing (Score impact: Criteria 1, 5, 7)

The anchor consistently poses questions that are pre-loaded with negative conclusions about Poilievre and invites guests to confirm rather than explore. Phrases like "he's kind of in this weird conundrum," "they would likely lose that contest," and "what does this say about that path?" are not journalistic questions — they are editorial statements dressed as questions. This technique is particularly effective because it appears to be neutral inquiry while actually directing the analytical conclusion.

3. Asymmetric Statistical Presentation (Score impact: Criteria 9, 10, 14)

The broadcast presents polling data in a consistently asymmetric manner: negative Conservative data is presented first, with evaluative qualifiers ("only"), in detail, with multiple follow-up questions. Positive Conservative data (cost-of-living advantage) is presented late, briefly, and immediately qualified away. The 19-point divergence between the two polling firms — which should be the most analytically interesting number in the segment — is minimized as "similar." This selective statistical presentation creates a false impression of analytical precision while systematically amplifying the negative Conservative narrative.

D) 3 Core Messages Embedded in the Broadcast

Content Message (what the viewer learns):

"Pierre Poilievre is at his worst political position since becoming Conservative leader, is a polarizing and divisive figure who has lowered his party's electoral ceiling, and the Conservatives were right not to trigger an election because they would likely lose."

- Technique: Agenda-setting + statistical framing + confirmatory questioning
- Evidence: "The worst that Angus Reid has recorded since Poilievre took over leadership of the party" / "he is so offputting to the rest of the country that you can't imagine any of them at this stage being in a position to vote Conservative" / "the reason why Conservatives didn't want an election, uh, last night is because they would likely lose that contest"

Personal Message (who is presented positively/negatively):

"Mark Carney is a competent, popular prime minister with strong public trust, while Pierre Poilievre is a polarizing, divisive figure whose political viability is in serious question."

- Technique: Asymmetric word choice + selective omission + time distribution
- Evidence: Carney described through neutral-to-positive polling language (52% approval, plus 13 net, "incredibly popular relatively speaking"); Poilievre described as "polarizing," "divisive," "offputting," in a "weird conundrum," facing questions about his "viability"

Societal Message (what worldview is reinforced):

"Canadian political common sense is centrist and Liberal-leaning; populist conservatism is an aberration that alienates mainstream Canadians; and the appropriate role of the Conservative Party is to wait patiently in opposition while the Liberal government governs."

- Technique: Framing + agenda-setting + guilt by association (Trump reference)
- Evidence: "A volatile time, a polarized time, but not election time" / "the choice then for voters might change" (framing Conservative hope as dependent on Liberal failure rather than Conservative merit) / the entire segment's implicit assumption that Carney's governance is the natural state of Canadian politics

E) Classification

Classification: CLEAR ONE-SIDEDNESS (4.1–6.0)

President: Schläpfer, David - **Contact:** kontakt@SVFAB.ch - **Address:** SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zurich 1



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

This broadcast exhibits clear, systematic one-sidedness that falls short of the most extreme manipulation category but significantly exceeds minor or incidental bias. The one-sidedness is structural rather than merely rhetorical — it is built into the segment's design through guest selection, question framing, topic exclusion, and statistical presentation. Individual elements might be defensible in isolation; their consistent directional alignment across all 15 criteria indicates a pattern rather than an accident.

F) Summary

This broadcast segment of Power & Politics exhibits clear one-sidedness (combined score: 5.03/10) that raises significant concerns under the CBC's Journalistic Standards and Practices and the Broadcasting Act. The CBC JSP requires that "we contribute to informed debate on issues of public interest" and that coverage be "fair and reflects a diversity of perspectives" — standards that are materially compromised by a segment that discusses a federal budget vote and a major opposition leader's political standing without including a single Conservative voice, any policy content, or any independent analytical perspective. The Broadcasting Act, Section 3(1)(l), requires that the CBC "provide a reasonable opportunity for the public to be exposed to the expression of differing views on matters of public concern" — a standard that is structurally violated when 100% of analytical speaking time is allocated to perspectives that reach identical unfavourable conclusions about the Official Opposition. The most significant concern is not any individual statement but the architectural design of the segment: the combination of commercially interested expert selection, confirmatory anchor questioning, asymmetric statistical presentation, and complete omission of Conservative and policy perspectives creates a cumulative effect that a reasonable viewer would experience as advocacy rather than journalism. The CBC's mandate to "safeguard, enrich and strengthen the... political... fabric of Canada" is not served by political analysis that systematically excludes the perspective of a party representing millions of Canadian voters from a discussion explicitly about that party's political standing.



CHAPTER 3 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Party Bias Scores

Party	Bias Score (-5 to +5)	Evidence
NDP	-1	Mentioned only as having two MPs abstain from the budget vote; no NDP voice, no NDP policy perspective, no analysis of NDP strategic position. Neutral-to-slight omission. Quote: "two MPs from both the NDP and the Conservative caucuses abstained" — NDP treated as a minor procedural actor.
Green Party (GPC)	+1	Elizabeth May's support for the budget is mentioned first and positively in the opening, implicitly framing the Greens as responsible parliamentary actors. Quote: "It gained the support of Green Party leader Elizabeth May" — presented as the decisive positive vote, slightly elevating the party's profile.
Liberal Party (LPC)	+4	Carney presented with consistently positive framing: 52% approval, plus 13 net, "incredibly popular relatively speaking," budget passed, caucus issues described as mere "grumbling." No challenging questions about Liberal policy, no Liberal vulnerabilities explored. Quote: "Today Mark Carney is incredibly popular relatively speaking. Today he still has the trust of everybody who voted for him."
Bloc Québécois (BQ)	-2	Entirely absent from the broadcast. In a discussion of a federal budget confidence vote, the Bloc — a significant parliamentary force representing Quebec — receives zero mention. This is a significant omission for a national public broadcaster. No quote available; absence is the evidence.
Conservative Party (CPC)	-4	Systematically portrayed as electorally weak, internally troubled, led by a "polarizing" and "divisive" figure, with a "lowered ceiling," in a "weird conundrum," and likely to lose an election. Zero Conservative voice present. Quote: "he is so offputting to the rest of the country that you can't imagine any of them at this stage being in a position to vote Conservative"
People's Party (PPC)	-1	Entirely absent; no mention. Minor negative score reflects the pattern of omission of right-of-centre perspectives generally.

Summary Statistics

- Most Favored Party: Liberal Party (LPC) — Score: +4
- Most Disadvantaged Party: Conservative Party (CPC) — Score: -4
- Average Absolute Deviation from 0: $(1 + 1 + 4 + 2 + 4 + 1) \div 6 = 2.17$



CHAPTER 4 — LEGAL CLASSIFICATION

A) CBC Journalistic Standards and Practices (JSP)

Accuracy

- Finding: The anchor describes the polling divergence as "a similar similar net favourability" when the actual gap between the two firms is 19 points (-7 vs. -26). This is a material inaccuracy in characterizing the data.
- Quote: "recent polling from Abacus data reported a similar similar net favourability for Carney at plus 12" — this refers to Carney, but the divergence on Poilievre (-7 vs. -26) is described as broadly consistent when it is not.
- Standard: CBC JSP Section 2.2 (Accuracy): "We seek out the truth in all matters of public interest."
- Severity: Moderate

Fairness

- Finding: The complete absence of any Conservative voice in a segment explicitly about the Conservative leader's political standing is a material failure of fairness. The CBC JSP requires that "we present a wide range of perspectives."
- Quote: Entire segment — no Conservative voice present despite the subject being the Conservative Party's political position.
- Standard: CBC JSP Section 2.3 (Fairness): "We ensure that our content reflects a diversity of perspectives."
- Severity: Significant

Balance

- Finding: The segment presents exclusively unfavourable analysis of the Conservative Party from two commercially interested polling professionals, with no counterbalancing perspective, no Conservative voice, and no independent academic analysis.
- Quote: "he is so offputting to the rest of the country that you can't imagine any of them at this stage being in a position to vote Conservative" — presented without challenge or counterpoint.
- Standard: CBC JSP Section 2.4 (Balance): "We provide a reasonable opportunity for the public to be exposed to the expression of differing views on matters of public concern."
- Severity: Significant

Impartiality

- Finding: The anchor makes multiple editorial judgments presented as factual analysis, including characterizing Conservative parliamentary behaviour as "games and antics," describing Poilievre as being in a "weird conundrum," and closing the segment with a personal verdict on electoral timing.
- Quote: "A volatile time, a polarized time, but not election time, at least not until after Christmas time."
- Standard: CBC JSP Section 2.5 (Impartiality): "We do not express our own personal opinions on matters of controversy."
- Severity: Moderate

Independence

- Finding: No direct evidence of external editorial influence. However, the exclusive reliance on two polling firms whose business interests are served by media prominence, without any independent scrutiny of their methodology, raises questions about the independence of the analytical framework.
- Standard: CBC JSP Section 2.6 (Independence): "We are independent of all lobbying groups and interest groups."
- Severity: Minor

B) Broadcasting Act, S.C. 1991, c. 11, Section 3(1)

Section 3(1)(l) — Reasonable opportunity for differing views:



- Finding: The broadcast fails to provide a reasonable opportunity for the expression of differing views on the matter of the Conservative Party's political standing and the federal budget. The segment is structurally designed to present a single analytical perspective.
- Severity: Significant

Section 3(1)(d)(i) — Safeguard the political fabric of Canada:

- Finding: A broadcast that systematically excludes the perspective of the Official Opposition — a party representing millions of Canadians — from a discussion about that party's political standing does not "safeguard... the political fabric of Canada." Healthy democratic discourse requires that opposition voices be heard and taken seriously on public broadcasting.
- Severity: Moderate

Section 3(1)(d)(ii) — Reflect Canada's diversity:

- Finding: The complete absence of Bloc Québécois perspective, Western Canadian Conservative perspective, and any regional voice other than the Ottawa-centric polling analysis fails to reflect Canada's geographic and political diversity.
- Severity: Moderate

C) CRTC Conditions of Licence

High Standard of Journalistic Ethics:

- Finding: The use of commercially interested polling firm heads as the sole analytical voices, without methodological scrutiny or independent counterpoint, falls below the high standard of journalistic ethics required by CRTC conditions of licence for national public broadcasters.
- Evidence: Both guests are heads of firms whose professional reputation depends on the prominence of their polling data; neither is challenged on methodology; the 19-point divergence between their firms is not explored.
- Severity: Moderate

Overall Regulatory Assessment

This broadcast segment raises material concerns under multiple provisions of the CBC's Journalistic Standards and Practices, the Broadcasting Act, and CRTC conditions of licence. The most significant regulatory concern is the structural failure of fairness and balance: a segment explicitly about the Conservative Party's political standing that contains zero Conservative voice, no independent academic analysis, and no policy content fails the CBC JSP's requirements for diversity of perspective and the Broadcasting Act's Section 3(1)(l) requirement for reasonable opportunity for differing views. The anchor's editorial intrusions — characterizing parliamentary behaviour as "games and antics," describing the Conservative leader as being in a "weird conundrum," and closing with a personal verdict on electoral timing — constitute violations of the CBC JSP's impartiality standard that are particularly concerning given the public broadcaster's unique constitutional position and public funding. While individual elements of the broadcast might be defensible in isolation, their consistent directional alignment across framing, guest selection, question design, statistical presentation, and topic exclusion indicates a pattern of one-sidedness that, if representative of the program's broader editorial approach, would warrant formal review under the CBC's accountability mechanisms and CRTC oversight framework.

Source Credibility Assessment

Source	Funding	Conflicts of Interest	Credibility	Counter-Voice Offered?
Abacus Data	Private commercial polling firm; revenue from corporate, government, and media clients; specific funders of this survey not disclosed in broadcast	Direct commercial interest in prominence of polling data; CEO's professional reputation tied to accuracy and media visibility of firm's surveys; CEO	Medium — Reputable firm with published methodology, but commercial interests and self-citation are concerns	No — No independent methodologist or competing analyst challenges Abacus findings



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

		authored a column cited in the same segment (self-citation)		
Angus Reid Institute	Registered non-profit; funded through a combination of public interest research grants, media partnerships, and commissioned surveys; specific funders of this survey not disclosed in broadcast	Non-profit status reduces but does not eliminate commercial interest; media partnerships create incentive for prominent, newsworthy findings; President's professional reputation tied to firm's visibility	Medium-High — Non-profit structure and published methodology enhance credibility, but media partnership model creates structural incentive for newsworthy (i.e., dramatic) findings	No — No independent methodologist challenges Angus Reid findings or explains the 19-point divergence from Abacus
Polling data cited (general)	Neither survey's commissioning client, sample size, margin of error, fieldwork dates, or question wording is disclosed in the broadcast	Unknown — without knowing who commissioned the surveys, conflicts of interest cannot be fully assessed	Low-Medium — Data may be credible but cannot be assessed without methodological transparency	No

Critical Note on Source Independence: The most significant source credibility concern in this broadcast is not the credibility of either polling firm individually, but the structural decision to invite the producers of the data being discussed to serve as the sole analysts of that same data. This is analogous to inviting a pharmaceutical company's CEO to be the sole commentator on their own drug trial results. Regardless of the individual credibility of Abacus Data or the Angus Reid Institute, the absence of any independent analytical voice — an academic political scientist, an independent statistician, a journalist from a different outlet — means that the broadcast's analytical framework is entirely controlled by commercially interested parties with no external check.

End of Analysis Report — Version 1.0-cbc

Prepared under Senior Media Analysis Framework

All findings are evidence-based and directly referenced to the broadcast transcript



OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual Scores — All 15 Criteria

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

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

6.1/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

6.3/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation

OVERALL SCORE

6.2/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation

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 Broadcasting Act s. 3(1)(l). The determination of whether a specific broadcast violates legal requirements is exclusively the responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular CRTC).

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 Basis Canada — CBC/Radio-Canada

Law

Broadcasting Act (S.C. 1991, c. 11)

Relevant Sections

- Section 3(1)(d): The Canadian broadcasting system should safeguard, enrich and strengthen the cultural, political, social and economic fabric of Canada.
- Section 3(1)(l): The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, as the national public broadcaster, should provide radio and television services incorporating a wide range of programming that informs, enlightens and entertains; be predominantly and distinctively Canadian; reflect Canada and its regions to national and regional audiences; actively contribute to the flow and exchange of cultural expression; be in English and in French; contribute to shared national consciousness and identity.
- Section 3(1)(m): The programming provided by the Corporation should be made available throughout Canada by the most appropriate and efficient means.

CBC Journalistic Standards and Practices (JSP)

6 Core Principles:

1. **Accuracy:** Facts correct and verified
2. **Fairness:** Fair treatment of all parties
3. **Balance:** Balanced representation of controversial topics
4. **Impartiality:** Impartial reporting
5. **Integrity:** Journalistic integrity
6. **Independence:** Editorial independence

Online Legislation

- C-11 (Online Streaming Act): Streaming regulation
- C-18 (Online News Act): News compensation

Regulatory Authority

- CRTC (Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission): Regulation, licensing
- CBC Ombudsman: Internal complaints body (not independent, no sanctioning authority)

Special Note

Canada has no independent external regulator comparable to Switzerland's UBI. The CBC Ombudsman is an internal body. CBC left the CBSC (Canadian Broadcast Standards Council) in 2009.

Complaints Process

1. CBC Ombudsman (internal)
2. CRTC (licensing conditions)



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 Wirklichkeit siehst du den Rahmen, den jemand um sie gelegt hat. Framing ist die älteste und eleganteste Manipulationstechnik der world. Sie verändert nicht die Fakten – sie verändert, was wir aus den Fakten machen. Wie wir fühlen. Was wir glauben. Wie wir entscheiden. Und sie funktioniert – weil wir alle mitmachen. Täglich. Unbewusst. Auch du. Dieses Buch ist kein trockenes Lehrbuch. Es ist ein Übungsbuch – spielerisch, direkt, voller Beispiele aus dem echten Leben. Du lernst nicht nur, wie andere dich framen. Du lernst, wie du selbst framest – und wie du es bewusst und fair einsetzen kannst.

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.

President: Schläpfer, David - Contact: kontakt@SVFAB.ch - Address: SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zurich 1



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.



The SRG collects 1.56 billion francs per year – compulsorily, from every household. Those who feel unfairly treated can file a complaint. There is even an authority for this: the UBI, the Independent Complaints Authority for Radio and Television.

But: It is not independent. It has no sanctioning power. And it decides in 99.6% of all cases: nothing.

This analysis exposes the system – factual, precise, without polemics. Procedures, personnel, powers, costs, statistics, legal recourse. And the constitutional review showing: the UBI system meets none of the three fundamental criteria – it is not proportionate, not separated by powers, not market-based.

The authority supposed to protect citizens primarily protects the system it should be overseeing.

Essential reading for anyone considering a complaint – and for anyone who wants to understand why genuine media oversight in Switzerland is still pending.