



## CBC DETAILED ANALYSIS

20220207\_Ottawa declares state of emergency, police remove fuel from protest camp

Broadcast: MEDIA ANALYSIS REPORT | Analyzed: 2026-05-06 07:58

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

### OVERALL SCORE

**6.5/10**

*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)

**3.8 / 10**

*Left-favoring*

0 1 2 **3** 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

← Left

Right →

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

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

## BROADCAST INFO AND TOPIC FRAMEWORK

### Broadcast Identification

- Broadcast title: The National — CBC Television
- Estimated date: February 7, 2022 (Day 10 of the Ottawa convoy demonstration, consistent with Ottawa's state of emergency declaration)
- Approximate length: Estimated 4–6 minutes (field report segment)

**President:** Schläpfer, David - **Contact:** [kontakt@SVFAB.ch](mailto: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

- Anchor/Presenter: Ian (surname not provided in transcript; likely Ian Hanomansing or Ian Brown based on The National roster)
- Field Reporter: Travis Danraj, CBC News Ottawa correspondent

### Guests / Interviewees

Name	Affiliation / Role	Position Represented
Zexi Lee	Private citizen; plaintiff in proposed class action lawsuit against convoy organizers	Ottawa resident opposing convoy
Unnamed Ottawa resident (quoted re: "relentless horns")	Downtown Ottawa resident	Ottawa resident opposing convoy
Unnamed convoy organizer (quoted: "we'll find another way around it")	Freedom Convoy organizer	Pro-convoy / protest organizer

Note: No named convoy organizer, no named police spokesperson, no named city official, no named legal expert, and no named public health or civil liberties expert appears in this segment.

### Main Topic

Ottawa's city council declared a state of emergency on Day 10 of the Freedom Convoy protest, as police began enforcement actions including arrests, fuel seizures, and vehicle impoundments at protest staging sites.

### Current Context (State of Public Debate)

The Freedom Convoy, which began arriving in Ottawa in late January 2022, was a protest movement initially organized against federal COVID-19 vaccine mandates for cross-border truckers, which subsequently broadened into a wider anti-mandate and anti-government sentiment movement. By February 7, 2022, the protest had occupied downtown Ottawa for ten days, generating intense national and international debate. Supporters framed the convoy as a legitimate exercise of Charter-protected rights to peaceful assembly and free expression, while critics — including many Ottawa residents, city officials, and federal politicians — characterized it as an illegal occupation causing serious harm to residents and businesses. The federal government was under significant pressure to act, and the Emergencies Act invocation was being discussed internally, though it would not be announced until February 14. The protest had become a flashpoint in broader debates about pandemic policy, democratic legitimacy, civil disobedience, and the limits of protest rights in Canada.



## CHAPTER 1 — DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE 15 CRITERIA

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

#### 1. EXPERT SELECTION

8/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Definition: Who is chosen to provide authoritative interpretation, and whether their selection reflects genuine expertise, independence, and diversity of perspective.

##### Finding 1:

- Location: Central interview segment
- Quote: "Lee is the plaintiff in a proposed class action lawsuit of Ottawa residents claiming up to 10 million dollars in damages against organizers of the convoy"
- Technique: Conflict-of-interest expert — Zexi Lee is presented as a resident voice but is simultaneously the lead plaintiff in active litigation against the convoy organizers, giving her a direct financial and legal interest in the characterization of the protest as harmful
- Why problematic: Her conflict of interest is disclosed but not interrogated. A balanced report would note that her characterizations are those of an adversarial litigant, not a neutral observer, and would seek independent expert verification of her claims

##### Finding 2:

- Location: Throughout segment
- Quote: [No independent legal, security, acoustic, or public health expert appears]
- Technique: Expert vacuum — the only "expert" voice is a litigant; no independent professional is consulted on the legal, safety, or public health claims made
- Why problematic: Claims about "national security," "dangerous sound levels," and Charter rights are made by interested parties and left unverified by any independent expert, violating basic journalistic standards of verification

##### Finding 3:

- Location: Reporter narration
- Quote: "Ottawa police say they don't have the resources needed"
- Technique: Paraphrased authority without accountability — police claims are reported as fact without a named spokesperson, without a direct quote, and without scrutiny of whether the resource claim is accurate or self-serving
- Why problematic: Paraphrasing institutional claims without attribution or scrutiny treats police self-assessment as objective fact



## 2. SOURCE SELECTION

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

*Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)*

Definition: The diversity, independence, and transparency of sources cited, including their funding, mandate, and potential conflicts of interest.

### Finding 1:

- Location: Central interview
- Quote: "Lee is the plaintiff in a proposed class action lawsuit"
- Technique: Conflicted primary source — the segment's primary human-interest voice is an active litigant with a direct financial interest in the characterization of the protest as harmful and illegal
- Why problematic: While the conflict is disclosed, it is not treated as disqualifying or even as requiring additional independent verification; Lee's claims are presented as resident testimony rather than adversarial legal positioning

### Finding 2:

- Location: Throughout
- Quote: "ottawa police say they don't have the resources needed"
- Technique: Single institutional source — Ottawa Police is the only institutional source, and their claims are paraphrased without a named spokesperson, without a direct quote, and without scrutiny
- Why problematic: Police self-assessment of their own resource constraints is an interested claim; independent assessment (e.g., from a policing expert or city budget analyst) is absent

### Finding 3:

- Location: Throughout
- Quote: [No independent expert, academic, or civil society organization cited]
- Technique: Expert vacuum — the segment relies entirely on interested parties (a litigant, unnamed residents, unnamed organizers, paraphrased police) with no independent verification from any neutral expert
- Why problematic: This violates basic journalistic standards of verification and source diversity



### 3. TIME DISTRIBUTION

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Definition: The proportional allocation of speaking time and narrative space to different perspectives and positions.

Approximate speaking time allocation (estimated from transcript):

Voice	Estimated Lines	Perspective
Reporter (Travis Danraj) narration	~25 lines	Framing (predominantly negative toward convoy)
Zexi Lee (litigant, anti-convoy)	~10 lines	Anti-convoy
Unnamed Ottawa resident	~3 lines	Anti-convoy
Unnamed convoy organizer	~4 lines	Pro-convoy
Ottawa Police (paraphrased)	~3 lines	Enforcement authority

#### Finding 1:

- Anti-convoy voices (Lee + unnamed resident + reporter framing) occupy approximately 75–80% of the segment's substantive content
- Pro-convoy voices (one unnamed organizer, briefly quoted) occupy approximately 10–15%
- This is a significant structural imbalance for a segment about a contested political protest

#### Finding 2:

- Quote: "zexi lee has had enough she says ottawa police and the city have failed"
- Lee receives extended, sympathetic treatment with multiple quoted sentences; the organizer receives a single brief quote with no follow-up
- Why problematic: The disproportion signals editorial alignment, not journalistic balance

#### Finding 3:

- The convoy's perspective is represented by a single unnamed organizer in a single brief exchange; no trucker, no named organizer, no convoy supporter among Ottawa residents is given comparable space to Lee



#### 4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: The systematic exclusion of relevant facts, perspectives, or context that would materially alter audience understanding.

##### Finding 1:

- Location: Throughout segment
- Quote: [No convoy participant explains their motivations]
- Technique: Perspective omission — the convoy's stated grievances (vaccine mandates, pandemic restrictions, government overreach) are entirely absent from the segment
- Why problematic: A viewer with no prior knowledge would have no understanding of why the protest exists, what the participants want, or what political conditions produced it. This is a fundamental omission for a news segment about a political protest

##### Finding 2:

- Location: State of emergency discussion
- Quote: "a lot of residents in downtown ottawa say that this state of emergency declaration it comes too little too late"
- Technique: One-directional reaction — only the "too little too late" reaction is reported; no voice is given to those who opposed the state of emergency declaration as excessive or premature
- Why problematic: The state of emergency was itself contested; civil liberties organizations and some legal experts raised concerns about its use. These perspectives are entirely absent

##### Finding 3:

- Location: Enforcement discussion
- Quote: "anyone bringing in gas and other supplies are now being threatened with potential arrests"
- Technique: Omission of legal context — the legal basis for threatening arrest for fuel delivery is not explained, and no legal expert is consulted on whether this is lawful
- Why problematic: This is a significant civil liberties question — whether police can lawfully threaten arrest for supplying a legal protest — that is reported as routine enforcement without any legal scrutiny

#### Missing Voices

1. Mayor Jim Watson / City of Ottawa officials — The state of emergency was their declaration; their rationale and criteria are absent
2. Named Ottawa Police spokesperson or Chief Peter Slowly — Transcript notes Slowly did not speak; police positions are paraphrased only
3. Independent legal expert — The Charter vs. by-law tension raised by the organizer is a substantive legal question left entirely unanalyzed
4. Federal government representative — The convoy's primary grievance target is entirely absent
5. Ottawa business owners — A directly affected economic constituency with no voice
6. Convoy rank-and-file participants (truckers) — Their stated motivations for attending are not explored



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

7. Canadian Civil Liberties Association (CCLA) — The CCLA had publicly commented on the convoy; their perspective on enforcement is absent
8. Acoustics or public health expert — Lee's claims about "dangerous sound levels" are presented without independent verification



## 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 numbers and statistics to shape audience perception.

### Finding 1:

- Location: Reporter narration
- Quote: "seven arrests in total"
- Technique: Decontextualized statistic — seven arrests over ten days of a large protest is presented without context about the size of the protest (estimated thousands of participants) or the rate of arrests relative to protest size
- Why problematic: Seven arrests among thousands of participants over ten days could be interpreted as evidence of a largely law-abiding protest; presenting the number without this context allows it to imply widespread criminality

### Finding 2:

- Location: Reporter narration
- Quote: "60 criminal investigations on everything from hate crimes to property damage to vandalism and threats"
- Technique: Undisaggregated aggregate — 60 investigations is presented as a single alarming number without breakdown by category, severity, or outcome
- Why problematic: Without knowing how many are hate crime investigations vs. noise complaints, the number is meaningless as a measure of protest criminality but highly effective as an alarming signal

### Finding 3:

- Location: Lee interview / reporter narration
- Quote: "a proposed class action lawsuit of ottawa residents claiming up to 10 million dollars in damages"
- Technique: Unverified damages claim — \$10 million in claimed damages is presented without any independent assessment of whether this figure is credible, how it was calculated, or what it represents per affected resident
- Why problematic: Lawsuit claims are adversarial assertions, not established facts; presenting the figure without qualification implies it reflects actual damages



## 6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Discrediting a position or group by associating it with extreme, discredited, or unpopular elements without establishing a direct connection.

### Finding 1:

- Location: Reporter narration
- Quote: "60 criminal investigations on everything from hate crimes to property damage to vandalism and threats"
- Technique: Categorical contamination — listing "hate crimes" alongside property damage and vandalism in the context of the convoy implies that hate crimes are a significant feature of the protest, without specifying how many of the 60 investigations involve hate crimes vs. minor infractions
- Why problematic: The number "60" and the category "hate crimes" are presented together without disaggregation, allowing audiences to infer that hate crimes are a substantial component of the protest's character

### Finding 2:

- Location: Lee interview
- Quote: "there's you know propane tanks everywhere they're firing off fireworks in close proximity like quite frankly it's it's dangerous to those protesters themselves"
- Technique: Safety-threat association — propane tanks (implying explosion risk) and fireworks are associated with the protest without context about whether these represent actual safety violations or normal camping/heating equipment
- Why problematic: Propane tanks are standard camping equipment; presenting them as a safety threat without expert assessment implies the protest is inherently dangerous

### Finding 3:

- Location: Reporter narration
- Quote: "growing claims of harassment towards citizens"
- Technique: Vague association — "growing claims of harassment" is attributed to no specific source, no specific incident, and no specific number; it functions as a general smear without verifiable content
- Why problematic: "Growing claims" is journalistically unverifiable as stated; it implies a pattern without establishing one



## 7. TIMING & PLACEMENT

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: The strategic positioning of information within the broadcast — what leads, what is buried, what precedes or follows what.

### Finding 1:

- Location: Segment opening
- Quote: "travis danraj was at the site as police moved through earlier"
- Technique: Enforcement-first lead — the segment opens with police action, establishing enforcement as the primary frame before any context about the protest or its participants is provided
- Why problematic: Leading with enforcement naturalizes it as the appropriate response; leading with the protest's grievances or the political context would produce a different interpretive frame

### Finding 2:

- Location: Organizer quote placement
- Quote: "earlier organizers were undeterred the reality is we'll find another way around it"
- Technique: Buried counter-voice — the only pro-convoy voice appears mid-segment, sandwiched between negative characterizations, and is immediately followed by the "carnival-like atmosphere" description
- Why problematic: Placement after extensive negative framing means the organizer's quote is received through an already-established negative lens

### Finding 3:

- Location: Closing
- Quote: "we did not hear from police chief peter slowly today"
- Technique: Late disclosure of absence — the fact that the police chief did not speak is disclosed at the end, after the segment has already paraphrased police positions as authoritative
- Why problematic: This disclosure should have been prominent; instead it is buried in the closing, after audiences have already accepted paraphrased police claims as authoritative



## 8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

6/10

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 condemnation to some actions or positions while equivalent actions or positions by other parties are treated neutrally or sympathetically.

### Finding 1:

- Location: Lee interview / reporter narration
- Quote: "this is not peaceful / growing claims of harassment towards citizens"
- Technique: One-directional moral framing — moral condemnation is applied to convoy participants (harassment, noise, danger) but no equivalent moral scrutiny is applied to the state of emergency declaration, police enforcement tactics, or the adequacy of government response
- Why problematic: A balanced report would apply equivalent moral scrutiny to all parties; the state of emergency itself raises civil liberties questions that receive no moral examination

### Finding 2:

- Location: Reporter narration
- Quote: "some are taking it into their own hands now"
- Technique: Implicit approval of vigilante action — residents "taking it into their own hands" is presented sympathetically, without the moral scrutiny that would be applied to convoy participants taking matters into their own hands
- Why problematic: The same framing applied to convoy participants taking matters into their own hands would be presented as threatening; applied to anti-convoy residents it is presented as understandable

### Finding 3:

- Location: Reporter narration
- Quote: "anyone bringing in gas and other supplies are now being threatened with potential arrests"
- Technique: Neutral presentation of coercive enforcement — threatening arrest for supplying a legal protest is presented without moral examination, while convoy participants' actions are subject to moral framing throughout
- Why problematic: The asymmetry in moral scrutiny — protest actions are morally examined, enforcement actions are not — reflects editorial alignment with the enforcement position



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 | Ottawa residents harmed by noise, disruption, and harassment | COVERED (Zexi Lee, unnamed resident) |
- | 2 | Convoy participants / truckers explaining their grievances and motivations | MENTIONED (one unnamed organizer, one brief quote) |
- | 3 | Ottawa Police Service on enforcement strategy and resource constraints | MENTIONED (paraphrased, no direct quote, no named spokesperson) |
- | 4 | City of Ottawa / Mayor Jim Watson on state of emergency rationale | OMITTED |
- | 5 | Federal government position (Prime Minister, Public Safety Minister) | OMITTED |
- | 6 | Legal experts on Charter rights vs. municipal by-law conflict | OMITTED (issue raised by organizer but not analyzed by expert) |
- | 7 | Civil liberties / CCLA perspective on protest rights | OMITTED |
- | 8 | Ottawa business owners affected by the occupation | OMITTED |
- | 9 | Public health experts on noise-related health impacts | OMITTED (claim made by Lee but not independently verified) |
- | 10 | Counter-protest or community mediation voices | OMITTED |

**Completeness Score: 3/10**



## 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 built into the story's architecture, what is treated as settled, and what is presented as the legitimate question.

#### Finding 1:

- Location: Opening segment, reporter introduction
- Quote: "travis danraj was at the site as police moved through earlier"
- Technique: Positional framing — police "moving through" implies orderly, legitimate authority restoring order, rather than a contested enforcement action against a protest
- Why problematic: The framing pre-establishes police action as the natural, expected response rather than one contested approach among several, foreclosing the question of whether enforcement was appropriate, proportionate, or legally sound

#### Finding 2:

- Location: Mid-segment, reporter narration
- Quote: "for 10 days it has been relentless horns sirens fireworks at all hours"
- Technique: Cumulative negative framing — the protest is defined entirely through its harms to residents; the word "relentless" is an editorial characterization, not a neutral descriptor
- Why problematic: The protest's stated purpose, the grievances of participants, and any positive characterizations are structurally absent from the framing, making the harm narrative the only available interpretive lens

#### Finding 3:

- Location: Closing segment
- Quote: "the big question tonight with enforcement ramping up remains ian what happens next"
- Technique: Enforcement-as-resolution framing — "what happens next" is framed around escalating enforcement, not around negotiation, dialogue, or political resolution
- Why problematic: This frames the story's natural endpoint as police action succeeding, rather than as a political or social question requiring multiple types of response



## 11. WORD CHOICE & TERMINOLOGY

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: The use of loaded, connotative, or evaluatively charged language that shapes audience perception beyond neutral description.

### Finding 1:

- Location: Reporter narration, mid-segment
- Quote: "relentless horns sirens fireworks at all hours"
- Technique: Dysphemistic accumulation — stacking three negative sensory descriptors with the intensifier "relentless" and the temporal amplifier "at all hours"
- Why problematic: "Relentless" is an editorial judgment, not a factual descriptor. A neutral formulation would be "continuous" or "ongoing." The word choice signals editorial sympathy with the complaint rather than neutral reporting

### Finding 2:

- Location: Reporter narration describing protest features
- Quote: "the carnival-like atmosphere bouncy castles saunas and more on top of safety concerns"
- Technique: Juxtaposition dysphemism — "carnival-like" trivializes the protest while immediately pivoting to "safety concerns," creating an implicit contrast between frivolous protesters and serious harms
- Why problematic: "Carnival-like" is a pejorative characterization. Protesters would describe the same features as community-building or peaceful demonstration. The word choice embeds a judgment about the protest's legitimacy

### Finding 3:

- Location: Zexi Lee interview
- Quote: "it's really a national security issue there's you know propane tanks everywhere they're firing off fireworks in close proximity"
- Technique: Unchallenged escalatory language — "national security issue" is an extreme characterization that is presented without journalistic scrutiny or expert verification
- Why problematic: A balanced report would either verify this claim with a security expert or note that it is the speaker's characterization. Presenting it unchallenged elevates it to apparent fact



## 12. MODERATION BEHAVIOR

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Asymmetries in how the anchor and reporter treat different sources — including follow-up questions, challenges, and sympathy signals.

### Finding 1:

- Location: Anchor-reporter exchange
- Quote: "nice work again today travis thank you"
- Technique: Affirmation signal — the anchor's closing compliment signals editorial approval of the framing and content of the report
- Why problematic: Anchor affirmations of field reporters are not neutral; they signal to audiences that the report's framing is editorially endorsed, reinforcing the one-sided perspective without any corrective

### Finding 2:

- Location: Zexi Lee interview
- Quote: "what would you want to tell these protesters / this is not peaceful"
- Technique: Sympathetic open question — the question "what would you want to tell these protesters" is an invitation for Lee to editorialize directly at the convoy participants, with no follow-up challenge to her characterizations
- Why problematic: No equivalent question is posed to a convoy participant ("what would you want to tell Ottawa residents?"), creating a structural asymmetry in who gets to address whom

### Finding 3:

- Location: Organizer quote
- Quote: "the reality is we'll find another way around it also highly highly questionable as to whether that's legal or not"
- Technique: Uncontested legal claim — the organizer's assertion that enforcement may be illegal is reported but not followed up with legal expert analysis
- Why problematic: While the organizer's claim is included (a point of nominal balance), it is immediately surrounded by negative framing and receives no journalistic development, effectively neutralizing it



### 13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Whether hard, probing questions are applied consistently across all positions, or whether some guests receive soft questions while others face scrutiny.

#### Finding 1:

- Location: Lee interview
- Quote: "what would you want to tell these protesters"
- Technique: Soft, open-ended invitation — this question invites Lee to editorialize without constraint; it is not a journalistic question but a platform
- Why problematic: No equivalent platform is offered to convoy participants to address Ottawa residents

#### Finding 2:

- Location: Throughout segment
- Quote: [No challenging questions posed to Lee]
- Technique: Absence of scrutiny — Lee's claim that the protest is "a national security issue," her characterization of police as having "failed," and her assertion that the protest is "not peaceful" are all accepted without challenge
- Why problematic: These are contestable claims; a balanced interview would probe them ("What specific security threat do you mean?" "What would adequate police action look like?" "How do you define peaceful?")

#### Finding 3:

- Location: Reporter narration on organizer quote
- Quote: "earlier organizers were undeterred" [followed by organizer quote]
- Technique: Framing before quote — the word "undeterred" pre-characterizes the organizer's position as obstinate resistance before the audience hears the quote, shaping interpretation
- Why problematic: Neutral framing would be "organizers said" or "organizers responded"; "undeterred" is an editorial judgment embedded in the setup



## 14. FALSE BALANCE

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: The artificial inclusion of a minority or fringe position to create an appearance of balance while the overall framing remains one-sided; or conversely, the false equivalence of unequal positions.

### Finding 1:

- Location: Organizer quote
- Quote: "the reality is we'll find another way around it also highly highly questionable as to whether that's legal or not"
- Technique: Token inclusion — the organizer receives one brief quote that functions as a nominal balance point while the surrounding narrative is overwhelmingly negative
- Why problematic: Including one brief, uncontextualized quote from an unnamed organizer does not constitute genuine balance; it provides the appearance of balance while the structural weight of the segment remains entirely on one side

### Finding 2:

- Location: Throughout
- Quote: [The segment does not present any false equivalence between unequal positions]
- Note: This criterion scores lower because the segment does not commit the false equivalence form of false balance; it simply omits rather than falsely equates

### Finding 3:

- Location: Reporter narration
- Quote: "it's unknown right now" [re: what state of emergency means for protests]
- Technique: Nominal uncertainty — acknowledging uncertainty about outcomes creates a superficial appearance of open-mindedness while the overall framing has already established the protest as harmful and enforcement as appropriate
- Why problematic: Nominal epistemic humility does not compensate for structural framing bias



## 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 agenda of discussion.

### Finding 1:

- Location: Segment architecture
- Quote: [The segment's agenda: enforcement, resident harm, state of emergency adequacy]
- Technique: Harm-and-enforcement agenda — the segment's entire agenda is constructed around resident harm and enforcement response; the political grievances of the convoy, the federal government's role, and the broader pandemic policy debate are entirely off the agenda
- Why problematic: A protest is fundamentally a political act; a news segment about a protest that excludes the political content of the protest has fundamentally misrepresented what the event is

### Finding 2:

- Location: Throughout
- Quote: "what happens next" [closing question]
- Technique: Enforcement-resolution agenda — "what happens next" is framed exclusively around enforcement escalation, not around political negotiation, policy change, or democratic response
- Why problematic: This agenda forecloses the possibility that the appropriate response to the protest is political rather than coercive

### Finding 3:

- Location: Throughout
- Quote: [No mention of: vaccine mandates, trucking industry, pandemic policy, federal government response, Emergencies Act discussions]
- Technique: Political content erasure — the political substance of the protest is entirely absent from the agenda, reducing a political movement to a public order problem
- Why problematic: This is the most significant agenda-setting failure in the segment; it transforms a political story into a law-enforcement story, which is a fundamental editorial choice with significant implications for how audiences understand the event



## CHAPTER 2 — OVERALL EVALUATION

### A) Summary Table: All 15 Criteria

#	Criterion	Score	Key Finding
1	Framing	7/10	Protest framed as public order problem; enforcement framed as natural resolution
2	Word Choice	6/10	"Relentless," "carnival-like," "undeterred" embed editorial judgments as neutral description
3	Expert Selection	8/10	Primary expert is an active litigant; no independent expert consulted
4	Selective Omission	8/10	Convoy grievances, federal government, civil liberties perspectives entirely absent
5	Moderation Behavior	6/10	Sympathetic open questions to Lee; no challenge to her claims; anchor affirmation of reporter
6	Time Distribution	7/10	Anti-convoy voices occupy ~75-80% of segment; pro-convoy ~10-15%
7	Question Asymmetry	7/10	Lee invited to editorialize; organizer quoted briefly without follow-up
8	Guilt by Association	5/10	"Hate crimes" bundled with minor infractions; "propane tanks" as implied threat
9	Numerical Manipulation	6/10	7 arrests and 60 investigations presented without denominator or disaggregation
10	Timing & Placement	5/10	Enforcement leads; counter-voice buried mid-segment; police absence disclosed late
12	Source Selection	8/10	Conflicted primary source; single paraphrased institutional source; no independent experts
13	Selective Outrage	6/10	Moral scrutiny applied to convoy; enforcement actions and state of emergency not morally examined
14	False Balance	4/10	Token organizer quote provides appearance of balance without structural balance
15	Agenda-Setting	8/10	Political content of protest entirely erased; story reduced to public order problem

### B) Overall Scores

- Criteria Score (average of 15):  $(7+6+8+8+6+7+7+5+6+5+5+8+6+4+8) \div 15 = 96 \div 15 = 6.4$

### C) Top 3 Manipulation Techniques Observed

#### 1. Perspective Erasure Through Agenda-Setting (Score contribution: Criteria 4, 15)

The most significant manipulation in this segment is the complete erasure of the political content of the protest. The Freedom Convoy was a political movement with specific policy grievances (vaccine mandates, pandemic restrictions). By reducing the story entirely to public order, resident harm, and enforcement, the segment denies audiences the



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

information necessary to understand what the protest is about, why participants are there, and what political response might be appropriate. This is not a minor omission — it is the structural transformation of a political story into a crime story.

**2. Conflicted Expert as Primary Voice (Score contribution: Criteria 3, 12)**

Zexi Lee is the segment's primary human voice and its closest approximation to an expert witness on the protest's effects. She is simultaneously the lead plaintiff in a \$10 million class action lawsuit against the convoy organizers. Her financial and legal interest in characterizing the protest as harmful, dangerous, and illegal is disclosed but not interrogated. Her claims — including that the protest is "a national security issue" and "not peaceful" — are presented as resident testimony rather than as adversarial legal positioning. No independent expert is offered to verify or contextualize her claims.

**3. Cumulative Negative Framing Through Language Accumulation (Score contribution: Criteria 1, 2, 11)**

The segment builds its characterization of the protest through the systematic accumulation of negative descriptors: "relentless," "at all hours," "carnival-like," "undeterred," "growing claims of harassment," "safety concerns." No single word is necessarily inaccurate, but their cumulative effect — applied exclusively to the protest and never to enforcement or government inaction — creates a portrait of the convoy as chaotic, dangerous, and illegitimate without ever making that argument explicitly. This technique is particularly effective because it is deniable: each word choice can be defended individually while the aggregate effect is strongly one-sided.

## D) 3 Core Messages Embedded in the Broadcast

---

Content Message (What the viewer learns):

*"The Freedom Convoy is a dangerous, relentless disruption to Ottawa residents' lives, and the appropriate response is escalating police enforcement."*

- Technique: Agenda-setting + framing
- Evidence: The segment's entire information architecture — from the enforcement-first lead to the "what happens next" closing — constructs this as the only available interpretation. The convoy's political content is absent; enforcement is the only resolution discussed.

Personal Message (Who is presented positively/negatively):

*"Ottawa residents (especially Zexi Lee) are sympathetic victims; convoy participants are obstinate, dangerous, and legally suspect; police are under-resourced but doing their best."*

- Technique: Selective expert selection + time distribution + question asymmetry
- Evidence: Lee receives extended, sympathetic, unchallenged treatment. The organizer is described as "undeterred" (obstinate) and given one brief quote. Police are paraphrased sympathetically ("don't have the resources needed"). No convoy participant is humanized or given comparable space to Lee.

Societal Message (What worldview is reinforced):

*"Political protests that cause public disruption are primarily law enforcement problems, not political questions requiring democratic engagement."*

- Technique: Framing + agenda-setting + selective omission
- Evidence: The complete absence of the convoy's political grievances, the federal government's role, and any discussion of political resolution reinforces the worldview that the appropriate societal response to disruptive protest is coercive enforcement rather than political dialogue. This has significant implications for how audiences understand the relationship between protest, democracy, and state power.

## E) Classification

---

Classification: CLEAR ONE-SIDEDNESS (4.1–6.0)

This segment exhibits clear, systematic one-sidedness that falls short of the most extreme manipulation but significantly exceeds minor or incidental bias. The one-sidedness is structural — embedded in source selection,



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

agenda-setting, framing, and time distribution — rather than merely tonal. It is consistent throughout the segment and does not appear to be the result of individual editorial errors but rather of systematic choices about whose perspective matters and what the story is about.

## **F) Summary**

---

This segment of The National demonstrates clear and systematic one-sidedness in its coverage of the Ottawa Freedom Convoy on Day 10 of the protest. The broadcast fails to meet the CBC's own Journalistic Standards and Practices on multiple dimensions: it lacks balance (anti-convoy voices occupy approximately 75-80% of the segment), it fails the fairness standard by presenting a litigant as a neutral resident voice without independent verification of her claims, and it compromises impartiality through loaded language ("relentless," "carnival-like," "undeterred") and structural framing that reduces a political protest to a public order problem. The complete omission of the convoy's political grievances, the federal government's role, and any civil liberties analysis represents a significant accuracy failure — audiences cannot accurately understand an event whose political content has been entirely removed from the report. Under the Broadcasting Act, Section 3(1)(l), CBC is mandated to provide programming that "reflects the circumstances and aspirations of Canadian men and women"; a segment that gives no voice to the aspirations of convoy participants — a significant cross-section of Canadians — fails this mandate. The CRTC's requirement for high standards of journalistic ethics is similarly compromised by the use of a conflicted litigant as the segment's primary expert voice without independent verification. While individual elements of the segment are defensible in isolation, their cumulative effect constitutes a pattern of one-sided coverage that falls materially below the standards CBC is legally and editorially obligated to meet.



## CHAPTER 3 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

### Party Bias Scores

Party	Score (-5 to +5)	Evidence
NDP	0	Not mentioned; no discernible effect
Green Party (GPC)	0	Not mentioned; no discernible effect
Liberal Party (LPC)	+2	The convoy's primary political target (federal vaccine mandates under the Liberal government) is entirely absent from the segment, effectively shielding the Liberal government from any association with the political grievances that produced the protest
Bloc Québécois (BQ)	0	Not mentioned; no discernible effect
Conservative Party (CPC)	-2	The convoy was broadly associated with conservative and right-wing political sentiment; the segment's negative framing of the protest (dangerous, relentless, carnival-like) implicitly disadvantages the political constituency most associated with it
People's Party (PPC)	-3	The PPC and its leader Maxime Bernier were publicly associated with the convoy; the segment's characterization of the protest as involving "hate crimes," harassment, and national security threats most directly disadvantages the political party most closely identified with the convoy

### Evidence Points

#### Liberal Party (+2):

- Quote: [Entire segment — no mention of vaccine mandates, federal policy, or Liberal government]
- Interpretation: The convoy's explicit political target was the Trudeau Liberal government's vaccine mandate policies. A segment about the convoy that contains zero reference to these policies effectively removes the political context that would invite scrutiny of the Liberal government. The omission functions as protection.

#### Conservative Party (-2):

- Quote: "the carnival-like atmosphere bouncy castles saunas and more on top of safety concerns for emergency vehicles and growing claims of harassment towards citizens"
- Interpretation: The CPC's base includes many Canadians sympathetic to the convoy's anti-mandate position. The segment's consistent negative framing of the protest implicitly disadvantages the political party whose supporters are most represented among convoy sympathizers.

#### People's Party (-3):

- Quote: "60 criminal investigations on everything from hate crimes to property damage to vandalism and threats"
- Interpretation: The PPC was the party most publicly and explicitly associated with the convoy; Maxime Bernier attended convoy events. The association of the convoy with "hate crimes" — even without disaggregation — most directly damages the political party most identified with the movement.

#### NDP (0):

- No direct evidence; NDP leader Jagmeet Singh had criticized the convoy but this is not referenced in the segment.



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

Green Party (0):

- No direct evidence.

Bloc Québécois (0):

- No direct evidence.

### Summary Statistics

---

- Most favored party: Liberal Party (LPC) — Score: +2
- Most disadvantaged party: People's Party (PPC) — Score: -3
- Average deviation from 0 (absolute values):  $(0+0+2+0+2+3) \div 6 = 1.17$



## CHAPTER 4 — LEGAL CLASSIFICATION

### A) CBC Journalistic Standards and Practices (JSP)

---

#### Standard 1: Accuracy

- Finding: Claims about "dangerous sound levels," "national security," and "growing claims of harassment" are presented without independent verification
- Evidence: "it's really a national security issue there's you know propane tanks everywhere" — presented without expert assessment
- Violation: Accuracy requires that claims be verified before broadcast; unverified claims from an interested party (a litigant) do not meet this standard
- Severity: Moderate

#### Standard 2: Fairness

- Finding: The convoy's political grievances, motivations, and perspective are structurally absent; only one brief unnamed organizer quote is included
- Evidence: The segment contains no explanation of why the convoy exists, what participants want, or what political conditions produced it
- Violation: CBC JSP requires that "we contribute to informed debate on issues of public interest by reflecting a diversity of perspectives." A segment about a political protest that excludes the protest's political content fails this standard
- Severity: Significant

#### Standard 3: Balance

- Finding: Anti-convoy voices occupy approximately 75-80% of the segment; pro-convoy voices approximately 10-15%
- Evidence: Zexi Lee receives extended treatment with multiple quoted sentences; the unnamed organizer receives one brief quote
- Violation: CBC JSP states that "we present a wide range of perspectives and we do not promote any particular point of view on matters of public policy." The structural imbalance in this segment promotes the anti-convoy perspective
- Severity: Significant

#### Standard 4: Impartiality

- Finding: Reporter uses loaded language ("relentless," "carnival-like," "undeterred") that embeds editorial judgments in ostensibly neutral narration
- Evidence: "for 10 days it has been relentless horns sirens fireworks at all hours"
- Violation: CBC JSP requires that reporters "do not express their personal opinions on matters of controversy." "Relentless" is an editorial opinion embedded in factual narration
- Severity: Moderate

#### Standard 5: Independence

- Finding: No evidence of direct external influence; however, the consistent alignment of the segment's framing with the position of the federal government (which funds CBC) raises structural independence questions
- Evidence: The complete omission of the Liberal government's role in producing the convoy's grievances, combined with the negative framing of the convoy, produces coverage that is structurally favorable to the government
- Violation: Potential structural conflict; not a direct violation but a concern under the independence standard
- Severity: Minor

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

---



Section 3(1)(l) — Safeguarding and enriching Canada's cultural, political, social and economic fabric:

- Finding: A segment that reduces a significant political protest to a public order problem, erasing its political content entirely, does not "enrich" Canada's political fabric — it impoverishes public understanding of a significant democratic event
- Evidence: Complete absence of convoy political grievances, federal government role, and civil liberties analysis
- Violation: The Broadcasting Act's mandate requires programming that contributes to informed democratic participation; this segment withholds the information necessary for such participation
- Severity: Significant

Section 3(1)(d)(i) — Reflecting Canada's diversity:

- Finding: The convoy represented a significant cross-section of Canadians (truckers, rural communities, anti-mandate Canadians); their perspectives are structurally absent
- Evidence: No trucker, no rural Canadian, no named convoy participant is given voice comparable to Zexi Lee
- Violation: The segment reflects the perspective of urban Ottawa residents and implicitly the federal government, but not the diversity of Canadians represented in the convoy
- Severity: Moderate

### C) CRTC Conditions of Licence

High Standard of Journalistic Ethics:

- Finding: The use of a litigant with a direct financial interest as the segment's primary expert voice, without independent verification of her claims, falls below the high standard of journalistic ethics required by CRTC conditions
- Evidence: "Lee is the plaintiff in a proposed class action lawsuit... claiming up to 10 million dollars in damages" — her claims are presented as resident testimony, not as adversarial legal positioning
- Violation: High journalistic ethics requires disclosure and management of source conflicts of interest; disclosure alone (without independent verification) is insufficient
- Severity: Moderate

### Overall Regulatory Assessment

This segment of The National falls materially below the standards required by the CBC's own Journalistic Standards and Practices, the Broadcasting Act, and CRTC conditions of licence. The most significant violations are in the areas of fairness and balance: the structural exclusion of the convoy's political content and the 75-80% dominance of anti-convoy voices constitute a pattern of one-sided coverage that cannot be characterized as incidental or minor. The use of Zexi Lee — an active litigant with a \$10 million financial interest in the characterization of the convoy as harmful — as the segment's primary human voice, without independent expert verification of her claims, represents a failure of the accuracy and source independence standards that CBC is obligated to maintain. While individual editorial choices in the segment may be defensible in isolation, their cumulative effect produces coverage that is structurally aligned with one side of a contested political dispute, in a manner inconsistent with CBC's statutory mandate to provide programming that reflects the diversity of Canadian perspectives and contributes to informed democratic participation.

### Source Credibility Assessment

Source	Funding Source	Conflicts of Interest	Credibility Assessment	Counter-Voice Offered?
Zexi Lee	Private individual; plaintiff in class action	Direct financial interest (\$10M lawsuit) in characterizing convoy as harmful; adversarial legal position against convoy organizers	Low (as neutral source); high as an interested party whose position is clearly defined	No — her claims are presented without independent verification or challenge



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

Unnamed Ottawa resident	N/A	Possible but unverifiable	Low (anonymous, unverifiable)	No
Unnamed convoy organizer	N/A	Possible but unverifiable	Low (anonymous, unverifiable)	No — one brief quote, no follow-up
Ottawa Police Service (paraphrased)	Municipal government	Institutional interest in justifying enforcement actions and resource requests	Medium (institutional credibility) but Low as neutral source on their own resource needs	No — paraphrased claims accepted without scrutiny
Travis Danraj (CBC reporter)	CBC/Radio-Canada (federal Crown corporation)	Structural: CBC is funded by the federal government whose policies are the convoy's primary target	Medium (professional journalist) but structural conflict noted	N/A

Key credibility concern: The segment's most prominent source (Zexi Lee) has the lowest credibility as a neutral observer and the highest conflict of interest. The absence of any independent expert — legal, security, acoustic, public health, or policing — means that all substantive claims in the segment come from interested parties, none of whom are independently verified. This is a fundamental source credibility failure that undermines the segment's journalistic integrity regardless of whether the individual claims made are accurate.

*End of Analysis Report — Version 1.0-cbc*

*Analysis based solely on provided transcript. Visual elements, full broadcast context, and pre/post-segment content not available for assessment.*



## OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

### Individual Scores — All 15 Criteria

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

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

**6.7/10**

*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

**6.5/10**

*Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation*

*Average of Hardfacts and Softfacts*



## KEY — Score Definitions

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

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

### Aggregated Deviation Index — Interpretation Ranges

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

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

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

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

**Bank details:** PostFinance – POFICHBE

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

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



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



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

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

Also available as an **audiobook**.



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

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

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

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

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



**You think you see the world.** In 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.



**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.