



## CBC DETAILED ANALYSIS

20220204\_Tensions rise as Ottawa protesters refuse to leave

Broadcast: MEDIA ANALYSIS REPORT | Analyzed: 2026-05-06 07:52

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

### OVERALL SCORE

**5.9/10**

*Significant imbalance*

0 = balanced, 10 = strongly biased/manipulative

## POLITICAL SPECTRUM

Classification based on Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) 2024

The Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES 2024) is an academic survey of 609 political scientists in 31 countries. Each party is rated on a scale from 0 (far left) to 10 (far right).

Party	NDP	GPC	LPC	BQ	CPC	PPC
CHES	2.0	2.5	4.5	5.0	7.5	9.0
Spectrum	<i>Left</i>	<i>Left</i>	<i>Center</i>	<i>Center</i>	<i>Right</i>	<i>Right</i>

The overall tendency is presented on a 0–10 scale (0 = strongly left-favoring, 5 = balanced, 10 = strongly right-favoring). The calculation is based on the difference in average favoritism of left vs. right parties (grouping per CHES 2024).

### TENDENCY (L – R)

**4.3 / 10**

*Balanced*

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 Information

Broadcast Title: The National — "Tensions rise as Ottawa protesters refuse to leave"

Network: CBC Television / CBC/Radio-Canada

Estimated Date: February 4, 2022 (Day 6 of the Freedom Convoy occupation, consistent with internal reference "this is day six")

**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

Approximate Length: Estimated 4–6 minutes of broadcast time based on transcript volume

Anchor/Presenter: "Ian" (referenced by name in the reporter handoff: "well ian organizers say...") — likely Ian Hanomansing, co-anchor of The National at that time

Reporter in field: "Ashley" (referenced in sign-off: "all right ashley thank you") — likely Ashley Burke, CBC Parliamentary reporter

### Guests / Interviewees Identified

Name/Role	Affiliation	Position Expressed
Restaurant worker / counter-protester	Unaffiliated civilian	Anti-convoy; wants to return to work
Unnamed convoy protester	Freedom Convoy	Pro-convoy; wants mandates ended
Unnamed convoy spokesperson/organizer	Freedom Convoy	Departure conditional on PM action
Conservative MP (unnamed)	Conservative Party of Canada	Called protesters "patriotic"
Government critic (unnamed)	Likely Liberal government or opposition critic	Called behavior "disgraceful"
Conservative interim leader	Conservative Party of Canada (Candice Bergen)	Called for "olive branch" from government
Prime Minister Justin Trudeau	Liberal Party of Canada	Condemned hateful symbols; no negotiations
Police officer (unnamed)	Southern Alberta law enforcement	Described evolving negotiations at border
Toronto Mayor (unnamed)	City of Toronto (John Tory)	Called for peaceful, respectful protests
Ashley (reporter)	CBC News	Reported on GoFundMe/parliamentary committee

### Main Topic

The broadcast covers Day 6 of the Freedom Convoy occupation of Ottawa, focusing on the standoff between protesters and authorities, political responses from federal parties, the GoFundMe funding dispute, and the spread of planned protests to other Canadian cities.

### Current Context (State of Public Debate — February 2022)

By February 4, 2022, the Freedom Convoy had occupied central Ottawa for six days, generating intense national and international debate. The protest had begun as opposition to a federal vaccine mandate for cross-border truckers but had expanded into a broader anti-mandate and anti-government movement. Public opinion was sharply divided: a significant portion of Canadians expressed sympathy with the underlying grievances about pandemic restrictions, while another significant portion — particularly Ottawa residents — expressed frustration and anger at the disruption, noise, and economic harm caused by the occupation. The federal government under Prime Minister Trudeau had refused to negotiate, characterizing some elements of the protest as extremist, while the Conservative opposition was internally divided between those who met with protesters and those who maintained distance. The GoFundMe platform's decision to freeze approximately \$10 million in donations had become a major flashpoint, raising questions about the role of private financial platforms in political protest movements.



## CHAPTER 1 — DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE 15 CRITERIA

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

#### 1. EXPERT SELECTION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

#### Finding 1:

- Location: Throughout broadcast
- Quote: N/A — absence finding
- Technique: No independent expert of any kind appears in this broadcast. There is no public health expert, no constitutional lawyer, no political scientist, no economist, and no historian of protest movements. The broadcast relies entirely on political actors, unnamed officials, and two civilians.
- Why problematic: For a story with significant public health, legal, economic, and democratic dimensions, the complete absence of independent expert voices means the broadcast functions as a relay of political statements rather than journalism that helps citizens understand a complex situation.

#### Finding 2:

- Location: GoFundMe segment
- Quote: "a parliamentary committee today they voted unanimously on an ndp motion to ask gofundme to appear before a public safety committee"
- Technique: The parliamentary committee's framing of GoFundMe as a potential "vehicle to fund extremism" is reported as authoritative without any independent legal or financial expert to assess whether this characterization is accurate or proportionate.
- Why problematic: Parliamentary motions are political acts, not expert findings. Reporting them without independent expert contextualization allows political framing to substitute for journalistic analysis.

#### Finding 3:

- Location: Alberta border segment
- Quote: "i don't have a line in the sand drawn right it's this is a constant state of evolving evaluation"
- Technique: The only "expert" voice on law enforcement strategy is an unnamed police officer whose vague, non-committal statement is presented without any independent policing or public order expert to assess whether the approach was appropriate.
- Why problematic: Unnamed sources with no independent verification or expert contextualization reduce journalistic accountability and prevent viewers from assessing the credibility of the information.



## 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: Throughout broadcast
- Technique: Source profile analysis:
- Government/political sources: PM Trudeau, unnamed government critic, Conservative interim leader, unnamed Conservative MPs, NDP (via parliamentary motion) — all partisan actors
- Law enforcement: unnamed Ottawa police (ticketing), unnamed Alberta officer — institutional actors with direct interest in the situation
- Civilian: one counter-protester, one convoy protester, one convoy organizer — anecdotal
- Independent/expert: zero
- Why problematic: A broadcast with zero independent expert sources on a story with significant legal, public health, economic, and democratic dimensions fails the basic journalistic standard of source diversity. All sources have direct stakes in the outcome of the situation being reported.

### Finding 2:

- Location: GoFundMe segment
- Quote: "organizers say that they incorporated into a not for profit"
- Technique: Convoy organizers are cited as the sole source for information about their own legal restructuring. No independent legal expert, no GoFundMe spokesperson, and no financial regulator is cited to verify or contextualize this claim.
- Why problematic: Reporting a party's own characterization of their legal maneuvers without independent verification is a basic journalistic failure, particularly when the legal move is itself contested.

### Finding 3:

- Location: Parliamentary committee segment
- Quote: "a parliamentary committee today they voted unanimously on an ndp motion"
- Technique: The NDP motion is reported as a factual event with its embedded "extremism" framing intact. The NDP is not identified as a partisan actor with its own political interests in this framing, and no independent voice assesses whether the "extremism" characterization is legally or factually grounded.
- Why problematic: Parliamentary motions are political acts. Reporting them without identifying the partisan interest of the mover and without independent assessment of their factual claims treats political advocacy as neutral information.



### 3. TIME DISTRIBUTION

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

#### Finding 1:

- Location: Full transcript analysis
- Technique: Rough word-count analysis of direct quotes and attributed positions:
- Anti-convoy / government-aligned voices: approximately 65% of attributed content
- Pro-convoy / protester voices: approximately 20% of attributed content
- Neutral/procedural (police, mayor): approximately 15%
- Why problematic: A 65/20 split in a contested political situation does not reflect the balance required by CBC's JSP. The convoy at this point had significant public support in polling, and the political debate was genuinely contested.

#### Finding 2:

- Location: Ottawa political segment
- Quote: The PM receives a full direct quote; the Conservative interim leader receives a partial quote; convoy organizers receive one paraphrased statement and one direct quote.
- Technique: Hierarchical voice allocation. The PM's voice is presented with full context and emotional weight ("the people of Ottawa deserve to have their lives back"). The convoy's voice is presented as a conditional demand ("our departure will be based on...").
- Why problematic: The PM's framing is morally resonant and humanizing; the convoy's framing is presented as transactional and conditional. This asymmetry in how quotes are selected and contextualized shapes viewer sympathy.

#### Finding 3:

- Location: Spread-of-protests segment (final third of broadcast)
- Technique: The final segment covering protests in Alberta, Quebec, Winnipeg, and Toronto is notably brief and procedural, with no protester voice in any of these locations. All voices are from authorities (police officer, mayor).
- Why problematic: In a segment covering four separate protest events, the complete absence of any protester perspective reinforces the broadcast's overall pattern of treating protesters as a phenomenon to be managed rather than citizens to be heard.



#### 4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Relevant facts, context, or perspectives that are absent from the broadcast despite being material to audience understanding.

##### Finding 1:

- Location: Throughout broadcast
- Quote: N/A — absence finding
- Technique: The Canadian Trucking Alliance's public distancing from the convoy — a highly material fact given that the convoy was nominally a trucker protest — is entirely absent. By February 4, the CTA had already stated that the vast majority of Canadian truckers were vaccinated and working, and that the convoy did not represent the industry.
- Why problematic: This omission allows the convoy to retain its "trucker protest" identity unchallenged, which materially affects how viewers assess the legitimacy and representativeness of the movement.

##### Finding 2:

- Location: PM quote segment
- Quote: "showing hateful symbols of genocide of racism these are things that are absolutely unacceptable"
- Technique: The PM's reference to "hateful symbols" is reported without any specification of what symbols were observed, how prevalent they were, whether they were representative of the broader protest, or whether convoy organizers had condemned them. This is a significant omission that allows a sweeping characterization to stand unchallenged.
- Why problematic: Responsible journalism on this point would have noted the distinction between isolated incidents and the character of the broader protest — a distinction that was actively contested in public debate at the time.

##### Finding 3:

- Location: GoFundMe segment
- Quote: "organizers say that they incorporated into a not for profit that's a move to try and release about 10 million dollars in donations"
- Technique: The broadcast reports the GoFundMe situation without noting that GoFundMe had initially announced it would redistribute the funds to charities chosen by donors — a decision that itself generated significant controversy and was later reversed. This context is material to understanding the platform's conduct.
- Why problematic: Omitting GoFundMe's own controversial conduct in this matter presents the platform's freeze as a straightforward safety measure rather than a contested corporate decision with its own accountability questions.

#### Missing Voices

1. Public health experts — No epidemiologist or public health official explains the scientific rationale for the mandates being protested, leaving the protest's core grievance uncontested on its merits
2. Constitutional/civil liberties lawyers — No legal expert addresses the right to protest, its limits, or the legality of the occupation
3. Ottawa residents' associations or community organizations — Beyond one individual counter-protester, no organized community voice representing affected residents
4. Trucking industry representatives — The convoy originated as a trucker protest; no Canadian Trucking Alliance or independent trucker voice appears (notably, the CTA had publicly distanced itself from the convoy)



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

5. Economists or urban planners — No quantification of economic harm to Ottawa beyond a vague reference to police costs
6. GoFundMe representatives — Referenced but not interviewed; their rationale for freezing funds is absent
7. Racialized or Indigenous community members — Referenced obliquely through PM's mention of "hateful symbols of genocide" but given no direct voice
8. International protest/democracy scholars — No comparative context for how other democracies handle prolonged urban occupations



## 5. NUMERICAL MANIPULATION

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Definition: The selective, misleading, or decontextualized use of numbers and data.

### Finding 1:

- Location: GoFundMe segment
- Quote: "about 10 million dollars in donations that currently gofundme has under review"
- Technique: The \$10 million figure is presented without context: How many individual donors contributed? What was the average donation? What proportion of donors were Canadian vs. international? These figures were publicly available and material to assessing the claim that the funding represented a foreign-influenced or extremist operation.
- Why problematic: Presenting a large aggregate number without donor demographics allows the figure to seem more ominous than a per-donor breakdown might suggest.

### Finding 2:

- Location: Police cost segment
- Quote: "the protest continues to cost ottawa police hundreds of thousands of dollars"
- Technique: "Hundreds of thousands of dollars" is vague and unanchored. No specific figure, no comparison to other major events (e.g., Canada Day celebrations, sports events), and no breakdown of what costs are included.
- Why problematic: Vague large numbers create an impression of harm without enabling the viewer to assess proportionality. This serves the "crisis" framing without providing verifiable information.

### Finding 3:

- Location: Protester quote
- Quote: "we're outnumbering the police"
- Technique: This protester claim is reported without any verification or context — no police spokesperson is asked to confirm or deny the numerical claim, and no crowd estimate is provided.
- Why problematic: While this quote may be intended to illustrate protester confidence, reporting an unverified numerical claim without challenge is a minor journalistic failure, particularly when the broadcast is otherwise willing to contextualize other claims.



## 6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Discrediting a position or group by associating it with extreme, discredited, or morally repugnant elements.

### Finding 1:

- Location: PM quote segment
- Quote: "showing hateful symbols of genocide of racism these are things that are absolutely unacceptable"
- Technique: The PM's characterization of the protest through its most extreme elements (hateful symbols) is reported without the broadcast noting that convoy organizers had themselves condemned some of these symbols, or that the symbols were not representative of the majority of participants. The association between "the protest" and "hateful symbols of genocide" is left intact.
- Why problematic: This is a textbook guilt-by-association technique: the actions of a minority of participants are used to characterize the entire movement. Responsible journalism would have noted the distinction.

### Finding 2:

- Location: GoFundMe / parliamentary committee segment
- Quote: "to question them about what they do to ensure that donations are not used as a vehicle to fund extremism"
- Technique: The NDP motion's language associating convoy donations with "extremism" is reported without challenge, effectively associating the 10 million donors with potential extremist financing.
- Why problematic: At the time of broadcast, no legal authority had designated the convoy or its organizers as extremist. Reporting this framing without challenge or qualification constitutes guilt by association at scale — implicating hundreds of thousands of donors.

### Finding 3:

- Location: Conservative MP segment
- Quote: "some conservative mps are facing criticism for meeting with them and calling them patriotic their behavior was disgraceful"
- Technique: Conservative MPs are associated with the protest's most controversial elements by implication — meeting with "them" (the protesters, already framed as disruptive and associated with hateful symbols) is presented as the source of the "disgraceful" conduct.
- Why problematic: The broadcast does not specify what the MPs actually said or did in those meetings, allowing the guilt-by-association with the protest's negative framing to attach to the MPs without specific evidence of wrongdoing.



## 7. TIMING & PLACEMENT

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

### Finding 1:

- Location: Opening of broadcast
- Quote: "i want them to stop holding ottawa hostage"
- Technique: Lead placement of the most emotionally charged anti-convoy statement. The "hostage" framing is the first thing viewers hear, establishing the emotional and moral baseline for everything that follows.
- Why problematic: Editorial decisions about what leads a broadcast are among the most powerful framing tools available. Opening with "hostage" rather than, for example, a neutral description of the standoff or a protester statement about their grievances is a significant editorial choice that shapes the entire viewing experience.

### Finding 2:

- Location: End of Ottawa political segment
- Quote: "the people of ottawa deserve to have their lives back"
- Technique: Closing placement of the PM's most humanizing and morally resonant statement. The segment ends on this note before transitioning to the GoFundMe discussion, leaving the PM's framing as the emotional conclusion of the political narrative.
- Why problematic: Closing a segment on a particular voice's most powerful statement is a standard rhetorical technique. Its use here consistently favors the government's framing over the protesters'.

### Finding 3:

- Location: Spread-of-protests segment
- Quote: "a demonstration threatens to erupt there"
- Technique: The word "erupt" — with its connotations of violence and uncontrolled force — is used to describe a planned, announced protest in Winnipeg. This language appears in the final segment, which covers protests across Canada, consistently framing them as threats.
- Why problematic: "Threatens to erupt" is threat language applied to a legal protest activity. The consistent use of threat language in the closing segment reinforces the broadcast's overall framing of the protest movement as dangerous and destabilizing.



## 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 outrage or strong normative language to some positions while equivalent positions on the other side receive neutral or sympathetic treatment.

### Finding 1:

- Location: Conservative MP segment vs. government refusal to negotiate
- Quote (outrage): "their behavior was disgraceful to be perfectly blunt" (re: Conservative MPs meeting protesters)
- Quote (neutral): "the prime minister earlier had said there won't be one" (re: government refusing to negotiate)
- Technique: The Conservative MPs' decision to meet with protesters is characterized as "disgraceful" (reported prominently). The PM's decision to refuse any engagement with tens of thousands of citizens is reported neutrally as a simple fact. Both are significant political choices; only one receives moral framing.
- Why problematic: This asymmetry in moral framing reflects selective outrage: engagement with protesters is "disgraceful"; refusal to engage is simply policy.

### Finding 2:

- Location: Protest spread segment
- Quote: "a demonstration threatens to erupt there" (Winnipeg) vs. no equivalent threat language for government enforcement actions
- Technique: Protest activity is consistently described in threat language ("threatens to erupt," "snarl traffic," "bracing for"). Government enforcement actions (ticketing, negotiating to clear highways) are described in neutral or procedural language.
- Why problematic: The asymmetric application of threat language to protest activity but not to state enforcement activity reflects a normative assumption that state action is legitimate and protest is threatening.

### Finding 3:

- Location: GoFundMe / "extremism" segment
- Quote: "to ensure that donations are not used as a vehicle to fund extremism"
- Technique: The possibility that protest donations could fund "extremism" is treated as a serious concern worthy of parliamentary attention. The possibility that government enforcement actions could infringe on constitutional protest rights receives no equivalent moral scrutiny.
- Why problematic: Selective outrage about one category of potential harm (protest funding) while ignoring an equivalent category (state overreach) reflects a consistent directional bias in the broadcast's moral framework.



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

*Share of covered perspectives*

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

- | #  | Perspective   | Status   |
|----|---|--|
| 1  | Ottawa residents directly harmed by noise, road closures, and business disruption (restaurant worker counter-protester) | COVERED  |
| 2  | Convoy protesters' stated political grievances (vaccine mandates, restrictions)   | MENTIONED (briefly, one quote)   |
| 3  | Federal government position (Trudeau/Liberals)  | COVERED (PM quote on hateful symbols)  |
| 4  | Official Conservative opposition response   | COVERED (Bergen's olive branch plea; unnamed MP criticism)   |
| 5  | Law enforcement perspective on managing the protest   | MENTIONED (Alberta officer; ticketing in Ottawa)   |
| 6  | Small business owners and workers economically harmed   | PARTIALLY COVERED (restaurant worker, but framed as counter-protester rather than economic victim) |
| 7  | Civil liberties / constitutional rights perspective on protest rights   | OMITTED  |
| 8  | Public health experts on the scientific basis for the mandates being protested  | OMITTED  |
| 9  | GoFundMe / private platform accountability perspective  | MENTIONED (parliamentary committee motion)   |
| 10 | Indigenous, racialized, or marginalized community perspectives on the protest's symbols and conduct                     | OMITTED (PM references "hateful symbols" but no community voice)                                   |

**Completeness Score: 4/10**

The broadcast covers the surface-level political conflict adequately but omits substantial context: no public health voice, no civil liberties voice, no independent legal analysis, no community organization representing Ottawa residents collectively, no voice from trucking industry stakeholders (the original mandate target), and no international comparative context despite reference to the US.



## Soft Facts — 6 qualitative techniques

### 10. FRAMING

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: How the broadcast constructs the fundamental nature of the story — what is treated as given, normal, or beyond question.

#### Finding 1:

- Location: Opening segment, first 30 seconds
- Quote: "this is day six the downtown of a g7 capital still shut down roads impassable businesses closed"
- Technique: Crisis framing / normative baseline establishment. The phrase "still shut down" implies an ongoing abnormality that demands resolution. The "g7 capital" designation elevates the stakes rhetorically, framing the protest not as a democratic exercise but as an international embarrassment or security failure.
- Why problematic: This framing predisposes the viewer to see the protest as a problem to be solved rather than a political event to be understood. A balanced frame would acknowledge both the disruption and the democratic legitimacy of protest simultaneously.

#### Finding 2:

- Location: Mid-segment
- Quote: "as demonstrators dig in"
- Technique: Military/siege metaphor. "Dig in" is a phrase drawn from warfare, implying entrenchment, stubbornness, and adversarial positioning against an implied legitimate authority.
- Why problematic: This language frames the protesters as an occupying force resisting legitimate authority rather than citizens exercising protest rights. It subtly delegitimizes their presence without making an explicit editorial judgment.

#### Finding 3:

- Location: Closing Ottawa segment
- Quote: "the people of ottawa deserve to have their lives back"
- Technique: Victim framing attributed to the Prime Minister but presented without challenge or counter-framing. The broadcast does not offer a protester rebuttal to this specific characterization.
- Why problematic: By ending the Ottawa political segment on this quote without a balancing protester response to the "deserve their lives back" framing, the broadcast implicitly endorses the government's moral framing of the situation.



## 11. WORD CHOICE & TERMINOLOGY

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: The use of loaded, connotative, or asymmetrically applied language that shapes audience perception.

### Finding 1:

- Location: Parliamentary committee segment
- Quote: "to question them about what they do to ensure that donations are not used as a vehicle to fund extremism"
- Technique: Unchallenged loaded terminology. The word "extremism" is introduced through the NDP motion framing and reported without qualification, challenge, or definition. The broadcast does not note that no convoy organizer had been charged with or convicted of any extremism-related offense at this point.
- Why problematic: Presenting "extremism" as a live, credible characterization of the convoy's funding without legal or evidentiary grounding is prejudicial. CBC's own JSP requires that such characterizations be attributed and contextualized, not normalized through passive reporting.

### Finding 2:

- Location: Opening segment
- Quote: "i want them to stop holding ottawa hostage"
- Technique: Hostage metaphor — a term with strong criminal and terrorist connotations — is given prominent placement as the broadcast's opening statement. While attributed to the counter-protester, it is editorially chosen as the lead.
- Why problematic: The editorial decision to open with the word "hostage" sets a tone that frames the protesters in quasi-criminal terms before any protester voice is heard. A balanced editorial choice might have opened with a more neutral description of the situation.

### Finding 3:

- Location: Conservative MP segment
- Quote: "their behavior was disgraceful to be perfectly blunt"
- Technique: Strong pejorative language ("disgraceful") applied to Conservative MPs who met with protesters is reported without a direct rebuttal from those MPs or from the protesters themselves about the nature of those meetings.
- Why problematic: The asymmetry is notable: the counter-protester's "hostage" language and this critic's "disgraceful" language are both given prominent placement, while protester language is largely paraphrased or given less emotive framing.



## 12. MODERATION BEHAVIOR

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Asymmetries in how the anchor or reporter treats different guests or positions through questioning style, follow-up, or sympathy signals.

### Finding 1:

- Location: Counter-protester opening
- Quote: "they're trying to disrupt this interview obviously"
- Technique: The reporter editorially characterizes the protesters' behavior as deliberate disruption ("obviously") rather than simply noting that noise was present. This is an editorial judgment inserted into what should be neutral field reporting.
- Why problematic: The word "obviously" signals the reporter's interpretation as fact, aligning the reporter's perspective with the counter-protester's and against the convoy protesters. This violates the principle of reporter impartiality.

### Finding 2:

- Location: Reporter-anchor exchange on GoFundMe
- Quote: "all right ashley thank you / thank you"
- Technique: The anchor's sign-off is warm and collegial, which is standard, but notably there is no follow-up question challenging any of the framing in Ashley's report — including the "extremism" characterization embedded in the NDP motion.
- Why problematic: An impartial anchor would probe the "extremism" framing: "Has any legal authority designated the convoy as extremist?" The absence of such a question allows the political framing to pass as established fact.

### Finding 3:

- Location: Conservative MP segment
- Quote: "some conservative mps are facing criticism for meeting with them and calling them patriotic their behavior was disgraceful"
- Technique: The framing presents Conservative MPs meeting with protesters as inherently problematic ("facing criticism") without presenting the MPs' own rationale for those meetings. The critical voice ("disgraceful") is given without a rebuttal from the MPs themselves.
- Why problematic: This is asymmetric moderation: the government's refusal to meet with protesters is not described as "facing criticism" in equivalent terms, though it was equally contested in public debate.



### 13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Whether hard, probing questions are applied asymmetrically to different sides of a debate.

#### Finding 1:

- Location: Throughout broadcast
- Technique: No direct interview questions are visible in the transcript for any political figure. All political content is presented as statements or quotes. However, the reporter's framing of the Conservative MPs' conduct ("facing criticism," "disgraceful") functions as an implicit editorial question directed at the Conservative position without equivalent scrutiny of the Liberal position.
- Why problematic: The government's refusal to negotiate — itself a significant political choice — is reported neutrally ("the prime minister earlier had said there won't be one") without the critical framing applied to Conservative conduct.

#### Finding 2:

- Location: GoFundMe segment
- Quote: "what's happening with that gofundme page"
- Technique: The anchor's question to the reporter about GoFundMe is procedural and neutral. However, the reporter's answer embeds the "extremism" framing from the NDP motion without the anchor following up with a probing question about the evidentiary basis for that characterization.
- Why problematic: A probing question — "Has GoFundMe or any authority provided evidence that these funds were used for extremist purposes?" — would have served the public interest. Its absence allows a serious allegation to circulate without scrutiny.

#### Finding 3:

- Location: Protester quote segment
- Quote: "all the restrictions two years ago are are more more dangerous than the noise that we heard today"
- Technique: This protester quote — which makes a substantive public health claim — is presented without any follow-up or challenge. By contrast, the counter-protester's "hostage" framing is presented as the broadcast's emotional anchor without challenge either, but it aligns with the broadcast's overall framing.
- Why problematic: The asymmetry is not in challenging the protester's claim (which would be appropriate) but in the fact that pro-government claims are equally unchallenged while the overall framing disadvantages the protester position.



## 14. FALSE BALANCE

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: The presentation of artificial equivalence that misrepresents the actual state of evidence or consensus, or conversely, the failure to present genuine balance where it exists.

### Finding 1:

- Location: Conservative opposition segment
- Quote: "some conservative mps are facing criticism for meeting with them and calling them patriotic their behavior was disgraceful to be perfectly blunt don't just call them a bunch of radicals and that's what this government has done they haven't come out and talked to them"
- Technique: The broadcast presents two Conservative voices — one criticizing MPs for meeting protesters, one criticizing the government for not meeting them — as if this represents balanced Conservative coverage. In fact, both quotes are critical of different actors; neither represents the pro-convoy Conservative position sympathetically.
- Why problematic: Presenting internal Conservative division as "balance" obscures the fact that the broadcast does not include a sympathetic or neutral presentation of the Conservative MPs who met with protesters and their rationale for doing so.

### Finding 2:

- Location: Protester grievance segment
- Quote: "protesters say they just want to be heard all the restrictions two years ago are are more more dangerous than the noise that we heard today"
- Technique: The protester's substantive public health claim — that restrictions are more dangerous than the protest — is presented as a "protester says" statement without any engagement with its merits. This creates a false equivalence between a political claim and a factual one, while simultaneously dismissing the factual claim by attributing it only to protesters.
- Why problematic: The claim about restriction harms was a live scientific and policy debate in February 2022. Treating it as merely a protester talking point rather than a contested empirical question misrepresents the state of public health debate.

### Finding 3:

- Location: Overall broadcast structure
- Technique: The broadcast presents the conflict as "protesters vs. Ottawa residents/government" without acknowledging that a significant portion of the Canadian public expressed sympathy with the convoy's underlying grievances in polling conducted at the time. The "balance" presented is between the government position and the protest position, not between the full range of public opinion.
- Why problematic: Structuring balance around institutional actors (government vs. protesters) rather than public opinion (which was more divided) creates a false impression of where Canadian society stood on the underlying issues.



## 15. AGENDA-SETTING

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: What the broadcast defines as "the issue" and what it excludes from the frame of legitimate discussion.

### Finding 1:

- Location: Overall broadcast structure
- Technique: The broadcast's agenda is set around three sub-issues: (1) the disruption caused by the protest, (2) the political fallout for the Conservative Party, and (3) the GoFundMe funding dispute. Notably absent from the agenda: (a) the substantive merits of the protesters' grievances about mandates, (b) the government's own record on pandemic policy, and (c) the constitutional dimensions of the protest and the government's response.
- Why problematic: By setting the agenda around disruption, Conservative political damage, and funding, the broadcast implicitly defines the "real" story as one of law and order and political embarrassment rather than a substantive policy debate about pandemic restrictions.

### Finding 2:

- Location: GoFundMe segment
- Quote: "to question them about what they do to ensure that donations are not used as a vehicle to fund extremism"
- Technique: The GoFundMe story is framed entirely around the risk of protest funding enabling extremism. The equally significant story — a private American corporation unilaterally freezing \$10 million donated by Canadians for political reasons — is not framed as a free speech, financial sovereignty, or corporate accountability issue.
- Why problematic: The agenda-setting choice to frame GoFundMe as a potential extremism-enabler rather than as a corporate actor making a contested political decision reflects a directional editorial choice that advantages the government's preferred framing.

### Finding 3:

- Location: Spread-of-protests segment
- Technique: The broadcast's coverage of protests in Alberta, Quebec, Winnipeg, and Toronto focuses exclusively on the logistical and security challenges they pose for authorities. The question of why protests were spreading — what grievances were motivating citizens in multiple provinces to organize — is entirely absent from the agenda.
- Why problematic: Covering the spread of a national protest movement without asking why it is spreading treats the phenomenon as a security problem rather than a political signal. This agenda-setting choice systematically excludes the protesters' perspective from the national conversation the broadcast is shaping.



## CHAPTER 2 — OVERALL EVALUATION

### A) Summary Table: 15 Criteria

#	Criterion	Score (0–10)	Key Finding
1	Framing	6	Protest framed as crisis/occupation rather than democratic exercise; "g7 capital still shut down" establishes disruption as the primary lens
2	Word Choice & Terminology	6	"Hostage," "dig in," "extremism," and "threatens to erupt" applied asymmetrically to protest activity
3	Expert Selection	7	Zero independent experts in a broadcast touching public health, law, economics, and democracy
4	Selective Omission	7	Canadian Trucking Alliance distancing, prevalence of "hateful symbols," GoFundMe's own controversial conduct all omitted
5	Moderation Behavior	5	Reporter editorially characterizes protesters as deliberately disruptive ("obviously"); no probing follow-up on "extremism" framing
6	Time Distribution	6	Anti-convoy/government-aligned voices receive approximately 65% of attributed content vs. 20% for pro-convoy voices
7	Question Asymmetry	5	Government's refusal to negotiate reported neutrally; Conservative engagement with protesters framed as "facing criticism"
8	Guilt by Association	7	Convoy associated with "hateful symbols of genocide," "extremism" funding, and "disgraceful" conduct without proportionality or rebuttal
9	Numerical Manipulation	4	Vague figures ("hundreds of thousands," "10 million") without context; unverified protester numerical claim reported unchallenged
10	Timing & Placement	6	"Hostage" leads broadcast; PM's most humanizing quote closes political segment; threat language closes national spread segment
12	Source Selection	7	All sources are partisan actors or institutional stakeholders; zero independent sources; GoFundMe and CTA absent
13	Selective Outrage	6	Conservative engagement "disgraceful"; government refusal to engage reported neutrally; protest "threatens to erupt"; enforcement is procedural
14	False Balance	4	Internal Conservative division presented as balance; protester public health claim dismissed as mere opinion
15	Agenda-Setting	7	Agenda set around disruption, Conservative damage, and funding risk; substantive policy debate, constitutional dimensions, and protest motivations excluded

### B) Overall Scores

Criteria Score (average of 15):  $(6+6+7+7+5+6+5+7+4+6+5+7+6+4+7) \div 15 = 88 \div 15 = 5.9$

- Criteria:  $5.9 \times 0.70 = 4.13$



- Completeness:  $4.0 \times 0.30 = 1.20$

### C) Top 3 Manipulation Techniques Observed

#### 1. Guilt by Association Through Selective Quotation (Score contribution: Criteria 8, 2, 13)

The broadcast consistently associates the convoy movement with its most extreme elements — "hateful symbols of genocide," potential "extremism" funding, "disgraceful" conduct — without proportionality, rebuttal, or acknowledgment that these characterizations were contested. This technique allows the broadcast to delegitimize the protest movement without making an explicit editorial judgment, maintaining a veneer of objectivity while embedding a clear moral verdict.

#### 2. Agenda Capture Through Crisis Framing (Score contribution: Criteria 1, 10, 15)

By defining the story's agenda around disruption ("g7 capital still shut down," "roads impassable," "holding ottawa hostage") and security risk ("threatens to erupt," "bracing for"), the broadcast systematically excludes the substantive policy debate that motivated the protest. This technique is particularly effective because it appears factual — roads were indeed blocked — while the editorial choice to foreground disruption over grievance is invisible to the casual viewer.

#### 3. Source Homogeneity Masking as Objectivity (Score contribution: Criteria 3, 12, 4)

The broadcast presents a range of voices — a counter-protester, a convoy protester, the PM, the Conservative leader, a police officer, a mayor — creating the appearance of diverse sourcing. However, all sources are either partisan actors or direct stakeholders, and zero independent experts appear. This creates the illusion of balance while ensuring that all information is filtered through actors with direct interests in the outcome, and that no independent voice can challenge the dominant framing.

### D) 3 Core Messages Embedded in the Broadcast

Content Message (What the viewer learns):

*"The Freedom Convoy is an illegal occupation of a G7 capital that is harming Ottawa residents, potentially funded by extremist networks, and supported only by fringe Conservative politicians."*

- Technique: Agenda-setting + guilt by association + selective omission
- Evidence: "g7 capital still shut down" + "vehicle to fund extremism" + "their behavior was disgraceful" + absence of CTA distancing or public health debate

Personal Message (Who is presented positively/negatively):

*"Justin Trudeau is a principled leader defending Ottawa residents from an unacceptable occupation; Conservative MPs who engaged with protesters behaved disgracefully; convoy protesters are intransigent occupiers with extremist associations."*

- Technique: Asymmetric moral framing + selective quote placement + guilt by association
- Evidence: PM's closing quote ("people of ottawa deserve to have their lives back") vs. "disgraceful" Conservative MPs vs. "dig in" protesters associated with "hateful symbols of genocide"

Societal Message (What worldview is reinforced):

*"Protest that disrupts urban life and challenges government authority is a threat to social order rather than a legitimate democratic exercise; state institutions (government, police) are the appropriate arbiters of acceptable dissent."*

- Technique: Consistent threat language for protest activity + neutral/procedural language for state enforcement + complete absence of civil liberties or constitutional framing
- Evidence: "threatens to erupt" (Winnipeg protest) vs. "police started ticketing" (neutral enforcement framing); "bracing for a protest" (Quebec) vs. no equivalent "bracing for" language about government enforcement measures

### E) Classification

**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

Classification: 4.1–6.0 — CLEAR ONE-SIDEDNESS

This broadcast exhibits clear, systematic directional bias against the convoy protest movement and in favor of the government's framing of events. The bias is not the result of individual errors but of consistent editorial choices across framing, source selection, word choice, agenda-setting, and time distribution that collectively produce a one-sided account of a genuinely contested political situation.

## F) Summary

---

This broadcast of The National falls measurably short of the standards established by CBC's Journalistic Standards and Practices, which require accuracy, fairness, balance, and impartiality in the coverage of controversial public affairs. The broadcast's consistent use of crisis framing, asymmetric moral language, guilt-by-association techniques, and the complete absence of independent expert voices produces coverage that functions more as an endorsement of the government's position than as the impartial public interest journalism mandated by Section 3(1)(l) of the Broadcasting Act, which requires the public broadcaster to "provide a reasonable opportunity for the public to be exposed to the expression of differing views on matters of public concern." The broadcast's completeness score of 4/10 reflects a significant failure to represent the full range of perspectives that a story of this national importance demanded, including the substantive policy debate about pandemic mandates, the constitutional dimensions of the protest and the government's response, and the voices of independent experts in public health, law, and economics. While individual elements of the broadcast — such as including a convoy protester's voice and the Conservative opposition's call for dialogue — reflect an attempt at balance, these are insufficient to offset the systematic directional bias embedded in framing, agenda-setting, and source selection. The CRTC's condition of licence requiring a "high standard of journalistic ethics" was not met in this broadcast, and the cumulative effect of the identified techniques is a broadcast that reinforces rather than interrogates the government's preferred narrative about a major national political event.



## CHAPTER 3 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

### Party Bias Scores

Party	Bias Score (-5 to +5)	Evidence
NDP	+2	The NDP's parliamentary motion framing GoFundMe as a potential "vehicle to fund extremism" is reported uncritically and without partisan identification, effectively laundering a partisan political move as a neutral public safety measure. Quote: "a parliamentary committee today they voted unanimously on an ndp motion to ask gofundme to appear before a public safety committee" — the NDP's political interest in this framing is not identified.
Green Party	0	Not mentioned; no evidence of favorable or unfavorable treatment.
Liberal Party (LPC)	+3	The PM receives the broadcast's most humanizing and morally resonant quote as the closing statement of the political segment. His refusal to negotiate is reported neutrally while Conservative engagement is framed as "disgraceful." Quote: "the people of ottawa deserve to have their lives back" — presented without challenge or counter-framing, functioning as an effective political advertisement.
Bloc Québécois	0	Not mentioned; no evidence of favorable or unfavorable treatment.
Conservative Party (CPC)	-3	Conservative MPs are described as "facing criticism" for meeting protesters and their conduct characterized as "disgraceful." The interim leader's call for an "olive branch" is presented sympathetically but immediately undercut by the PM's refusal. The overall framing of Conservative engagement with protesters as problematic disadvantages the party. Quote: "some conservative mps are facing criticism for meeting with them and calling them patriotic their behavior was disgraceful to be perfectly blunt"
People's Party (PPC)	-2	Not mentioned by name, but the convoy movement — with which the PPC was associated in public discourse — is consistently framed negatively. The "extremism" framing of convoy funding implicitly disadvantages any party associated with the movement. The absence of any voice defending the convoy's political legitimacy disadvantages the PPC by omission.

### Political Bias Summary

Most Favored Party: Liberal Party of Canada (+3)

Most Disadvantaged Party: Conservative Party of Canada (-3)

Average Deviation from 0 (absolute values):

$$|NDP| + |GPC| + |LPC| + |BQ| + |CPC| + |PPC| = 2 + 0 + 3 + 0 + 3 + 2 = 10 \div 6 = 1.67$$



## CHAPTER 4 — LEGAL CLASSIFICATION

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

#### ACCURACY

Finding	Standard	Evidence	Violation	Severity
"Extremism" characterization reported without evidentiary basis	JSP: Accuracy requires that facts be presented correctly and allegations be clearly identified as such	"to ensure that donations are not used as a vehicle to fund extremism" — reported as a legitimate concern without noting that no legal authority had designated the convoy as extremist	Presenting an unproven allegation as a credible factual concern without qualification	Moderate
"Hateful symbols of genocide" reported without specification or prevalence data	JSP: Accuracy requires context sufficient for audience understanding	PM's quote reported without specifying which symbols, how prevalent, or whether organizers condemned them	Incomplete factual reporting that allows a sweeping characterization to stand without verification	Moderate

#### FAIRNESS

Finding	Standard	Evidence	Violation	Severity
Convoy protesters' substantive grievances not engaged on their merits	JSP: Fairness requires that all relevant sides be heard and their positions represented accurately	Protester's public health claim ("all the restrictions two years ago are more dangerous than the noise") dismissed as opinion without engagement	Failure to represent a contested position fairly	Moderate
Conservative MPs characterized as "disgraceful" without their own voice	JSP: Fairness requires that those criticized be given opportunity to respond	"their behavior was disgraceful" reported without any Conservative MP rebuttal	Failure to seek response from those criticized	Moderate

#### BALANCE

Finding	Standard	Evidence	Violation	Severity
Approximately 65/20 split in attributed content favoring anti-convoy voices	JSP: Balance requires that coverage not unduly favor one side of a	Full transcript analysis shows systematic imbalance in voice allocation	Failure to achieve balance in a genuinely contested political situation	Significant



	controversial public issue			
Zero independent expert voices in a multi-dimensional story	JSP: Balance includes balance of expertise and perspective, not just political voices	No public health, legal, economic, or democratic theory expert appears	Structural failure of balance through source homogeneity	Significant

#### IMPARTIALITY

Finding	Standard	Evidence	Violation	Severity
Reporter editorially characterizes protesters as deliberately disruptive	JSP: Reporters must maintain impartiality and not insert personal editorial judgments	"they're trying to disrupt this interview obviously"	Reporter abandons impartiality by characterizing protester behavior as deliberate and obvious	Moderate
Anchor fails to probe "extremism" framing	JSP: Anchors must exercise editorial judgment to ensure accuracy and fairness	No follow-up question on the evidentiary basis for the "extremism" characterization	Failure of editorial oversight allowing a serious unproven allegation to circulate unchallenged	Moderate

#### INDEPENDENCE

Finding	Standard	Evidence	Violation	Severity
NDP parliamentary motion framing adopted without partisan identification	JSP: Independence requires that CBC not allow political actors to set the journalistic agenda	NDP motion's "extremism" framing reported as a public safety concern rather than a partisan political act	Failure to maintain independence from political actors' framing	Moderate

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

Section 3(1)(l): "provide a reasonable opportunity for the public to be exposed to the expression of differing views on matters of public concern"

Finding	Evidence	Assessment	Severity
Substantive policy debate about pandemic mandates excluded from broadcast	No public health expert, no policy analyst, no protester voice on the merits of mandates	The broadcast does not provide a reasonable opportunity for viewers to be exposed to the substantive arguments motivating the protest movement	Significant
Constitutional dimensions of protest rights entirely absent	No legal expert, no civil liberties voice, no Charter analysis	A broadcast about a major protest movement that does not engage with the constitutional right to	Significant



protest fails to expose viewers to a material differing view

Section 3(1)(d)(i): "safeguard, enrich and strengthen the cultural, political, social and economic fabric of Canada"

Finding	Evidence	Assessment	Severity
Broadcast reinforces social division by consistently framing protesters as threats rather than citizens	Consistent use of "hostage," "dig in," "threatens to erupt," "extremism" without proportionality	A public broadcaster that frames a significant citizen movement exclusively as a threat to social order does not strengthen the social fabric	Moderate

### C) CRTC Conditions of Licence

#### High Standard of Journalistic Ethics

Finding	Evidence	Assessment	Severity
Complete absence of independent expert sources	Zero independent experts in a broadcast touching public health, law, economics, and democracy	A high standard of journalistic ethics requires that complex public affairs stories be informed by independent expertise; this broadcast fails that standard	Significant
Unverified allegations reported without qualification	"Extremism" framing from NDP motion reported without legal or evidentiary grounding	CRTC's high standard requires that serious allegations be clearly identified as unproven; this broadcast does not meet that standard	Moderate

### Source Credibility Assessment

Source	Funding/Affiliation	Conflicts of Interest	Credibility Assessment	Counter-Voice Offered?
Prime Minister Justin Trudeau	Government of Canada / Liberal Party	Direct political interest in framing convoy as illegitimate	Low (as objective source) — high as political actor	No — PM's characterization of "hateful symbols" not challenged
Conservative interim leader (Candice Bergen)	Conservative Party of Canada	Direct political interest in differentiating CPC from convoy while maintaining base support	Low (as objective source) — high as political actor	No — her "olive branch" call not probed



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

Unnamed government critic	Unknown — likely Liberal or NDP-aligned	Direct political interest in criticizing Conservative engagement	Low (as objective source)	No — "disgraceful" characterization not challenged
Unnamed convoy organizer	Freedom Convoy	Direct interest in presenting convoy favorably	Low (as objective source)	No — departure conditions not probed
Restaurant worker / counter-protester	Unaffiliated civilian	Direct personal interest as affected Ottawa resident	Medium (as affected civilian)	No — "hostage" framing not challenged
Unnamed convoy protester	Freedom Convoy	Direct interest in presenting convoy favorably	Low (as objective source)	No — public health claim not engaged
Unnamed Alberta police officer	Alberta law enforcement	Institutional interest in presenting enforcement as measured	Medium (as institutional actor)	No — approach not independently assessed
Toronto Mayor (John Tory)	City of Toronto	Institutional interest in managing protest without political damage	Medium (as institutional actor)	No — his framing not challenged
NDP (via parliamentary motion)	New Democratic Party	Direct political interest in framing convoy funding as extremist	Low (as objective source)	No — "extremism" framing not challenged
GoFundMe	Private US corporation	Commercial and reputational interest in appearing responsible	Not interviewed — absent source	No — their conduct not independently assessed

### Overall Regulatory Assessment

This broadcast of The National presents a pattern of regulatory concern that, while not rising to the level of deliberate propaganda, reflects systematic failures in the application of CBC's Journalistic Standards and Practices and the public interest mandate established by the Broadcasting Act. The most significant regulatory concern is the broadcast's failure to provide "a reasonable opportunity for the public to be exposed to the expression of differing views on matters of public concern" as required by Section 3(1)(l) of the Broadcasting Act: the substantive policy debate about pandemic mandates — the central grievance motivating the protest — is entirely absent from the broadcast, and no independent expert voice of any kind appears to help citizens understand the legal, public health, or democratic dimensions of the situation. The broadcast's adoption of the NDP's "extremism" framing without partisan identification or evidentiary qualification, and the reporter's editorial characterization of protesters as deliberately disruptive, constitute specific violations of the impartiality and accuracy standards in CBC's JSP that are individually moderate but collectively significant in their directional consistency. The CRTC's condition of licence requiring a high standard of journalistic ethics is not met by a broadcast that relies exclusively on partisan and institutional sources, omits material context (including the Canadian Trucking Alliance's distancing from the convoy and the contested nature of the "hateful symbols" characterization), and applies asymmetric moral framing to the actions of different political actors in a genuinely contested national debate.



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

*Analysis Version: 1.0-cbc | Prepared by: Senior Media Analysis Unit | Date of Analysis: Based on broadcast of approximately February 4, 2022 | Methodology: Transcript-based qualitative and quantitative analysis against CBC JSP, Broadcasting Act S.C. 1991 c. 11, and CRTC conditions of licence*



## OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

### Individual Scores — All 15 Criteria

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

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

**6.2/10**

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

#### SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

**5.5/10**

*Significant imbalance*

#### OVERALL SCORE

**5.9/10**

*Significant imbalance*

*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.

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

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.