



MTVA DETAILED ANALYSIS

2026-03-31_48-perc

Programme: MTVA-Sendung (M1/Kossuth Rádió) | 2026-03-31 | Analysed: 2026-05-24 21:57

Version 3.0-detail | Universal 3.0-detail | Konverter 3.4 (2026-05-20) | Mércé: Mttv. §83

TOTAL SCORE

8.1/10

Fundamental systemic one-sidedness. Very high degree of bias

0 = balanced, 10 = strongly biased/manipulative

POLITICAL SPECTRUM

Classification based on the Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) 2024

The Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) classifies parties on a left-right scale based on a survey of 609 political scientists (0 = far left, 10 = far right). We apply the Pew Research Center (2025) thresholds: <4.5 = Left, 4.5–5.5 = Centre, >5.5 = Right. This enables an objective classification of perceived party-political bias.

Party	DK	MSZP	Momentum	LMP	KDNP	Fidesz	Mi Hazánk
CHES	1.69	2.31	3.15	3.46	6.92	7.77	9.31
Spectrum	Left	Left	Left	Left	Right	Right	Right

The overall tendency is displayed on a 0–10 scale (0 = strongly left-leaning, 5 = balanced, 10 = strongly right-leaning). The calculation is based on the difference between the average advantage of left-wing and right-wing parties (grouped according to CHES 2024).

TENDENCY (L – R)

5.5 / 10

Balanced

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

← Left

Right →

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

This section provides political context and is not included in the total score.



POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

In Hungary, Fidesz-KDNP has governed without interruption since 2010, currently holding a two-thirds parliamentary majority (135 seats out of 199). The strongest opposition force since 2024 is TISZA (the Respect and Freedom party led by Magyar Péter), which received 29.6% in the 2024 EP elections. The other opposition parties (DK, Momentum, Jobbik, LMP, MSZP) are fragmented and weakened. The far-right Mi Hazánk is a parliamentary but non-governmental actor with 6 seats.

Party	CHES left-right	Seats (2022)	Government/Opposition	Base position
MSZP	3,00	(United Opposition)	Opposition	Left-wing, social democratic
MKKP	3,50	0	Outside parliament	Left-wing, satirical-libertarian
LMP	3,79	(United Opposition)	Opposition	Left-wing, green-progressive
Momentum	4,17	(United Opposition)	Opposition	Centre-left, pro-EU
DK	4,28	(United Opposition)	Opposition	Centre-left
TISZA	6,17	— (2024 new entrant)	Opposition (strongest)	Centre-right, anti-corruption
Jobbik	6,47	(United Opposition)	Opposition	Centre-right (moderated)
Fidesz-KDNP	8,61	135	Government (2/3)	Far right, authoritarian-nationalist
Mi Hazánk	9,29	6	Opposition	Far right

The most important political fault line runs between Fidesz-KDNP and TISZA: in the 2026 elections, Magyar Péter's party is the only one that can realistically threaten Viktor Orbán's power. The second fault line has formed around the EU relationship: Fidesz pursues a sovereignist, anti-Brussels policy, while TISZA represents a pro-European orientation. The third point of tension is energy policy: maintaining dependence on Russian energy versus decoupling has become a central focus of domestic political battles. The fourth fault line is the media system: MTVA and the KESMA network reinforce the governing party's narrative, while independent media (Telex, 444, RTL, ATV) operate in an increasingly shrinking space.

MTVA (M1, M2, M4, M5, Duna TV, Kossuth Rádió), as a public service media provider, is formally obliged under Mttv. §83 to provide balanced coverage, but operates de facto as a government mouthpiece. The KESMA foundation (approximately 500 media companies since 2018) and the NMHH Media Council (exclusively Fidesz-delegated members since 2010) structurally exclude the representation of opposition viewpoints. On the Reporters Without Borders (RSF) press freedom index, Hungary is the worst-ranked EU member state (85th place).



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Representation of parties' programme positions

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Represented in broadcast vs. programme position
Fidesz-KDNP	+2	00:25 / 44:55 — The utility cost reduction and the protected fuel price are presented positively as government achievements; the "success story" framing of Fidesz's energy policy (poverty reduction, protection of state ownership) is echoed in Szalai Piroska's argumentation — partly correct, but in a one-sidedly favourable context
TISZA	-5	00:11–48:51 — The TISZA energy plan is presented as "austerity", "lies", "distortion", "Armageddon"; Magyar Péter as a power-hungry, corrupt, threatening leader; TISZA's programme positions (anti-corruption, EU rule of law, transparency) are not mentioned at all — actively distorted, presenting a false picture
DK	0	Not featured in the broadcast
Momentum	0	Not featured in the broadcast
Jobbik	0	Not featured in the broadcast
Mi Hazánk	0	Not featured in the broadcast
LMP	0	Not featured in the broadcast
MSZP	0	Not featured in the broadcast

Score explanation:

- +5 = programme positions correctly and fully presented
- 0 = the party/topic does not appear in the broadcast
- -5 = programme positions actively distorted or falsely presented

Party bias summary

- Most accurate representation: Fidesz-KDNP (+2) — the governing party's positions are essentially reflected, though without critical context
- Strongest distortion: TISZA (-5) — the party's programme positions (anti-corruption, EU integration, transparency, rule of law) are entirely absent; instead, exclusively negative, unverified claims are made
- Average deviation from 0: 1.75
- Conclusion: The broadcast examines a single party (TISZA), and exclusively in a negative frame, while implicitly reinforcing the positions of Fidesz-KDNP. Not a single sentence presents TISZA's programme positions (EU rule of law, transparency, anti-corruption); instead, the entire content of the broadcast consists of the unverified, concordant accusations of a former party member and a chief adviser to the Prime Minister.

Left-right overall tendency

TENDENCY SCORE: -4.5

CLASSIFICATION: Strongly right-leaning (pro-government)

Justification: The entire content of the broadcast is aimed at discrediting TISZA (a centre-right opposition party), while treating Fidesz-KDNP's energy policy and social policy as implicit successes. The guests (a former TISZA member and a chief adviser to the Prime Minister) exclusively reinforce the governing party's narrative. Not a single opposition, independent or neutral voice is heard.



CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST DATA AND TOPIC FRAMES

Broadcast data

- Title: 48 perc (Kossuth Rádió)
- Date: Cannot be determined precisely from the filename; based on content, spring 2025 (in the context of the 2026 election campaign)
- Estimated length: approx. 48 minutes (based on the transcript)
- Host / Reporter: Töröcsik Zsolt
- Invited guests:

Person	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political spectrum
Csercsa Balázs	Former head of church affairs of the TISZA party, resigned member	Former TISZA (currently opposed to the party)	Unknown; criticises TISZA from within
Szalai Piroska	Chief adviser to the Prime Minister	Fidesz-KDNP government	Far right / pro-government

Main topic

The broadcast presents an allegedly leaked "TISZA Energy Plan" document, on the basis of which the party — if it came to power — would abolish the utility cost reduction, phase out the protected fuel price and tax savings.

Ideological context

Ahead of the 2026 elections, TISZA is the only party that can realistically threaten Fidesz-KDNP's power. Energy policy — particularly the question of dependence on Russian energy — is one of the most sensitive domestic political issues, as the utility cost reduction is one of Fidesz's most important social policy achievements. "Leaked documents" as a political weapon are a well-established tool of the Hungarian pro-government media: a similar method was used to discredit the opposition before the 2022 elections as well. TISZA's programme does indeed contain elements aimed at reducing dependence on Russian energy, but the authenticity, origin and content of the specific document are disputed.



CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

Hard facts — countable and scientifically grounded

Hard facts — 9 measurable and scientifically verifiable techniques

1. EXPERT SELECTION

9/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 9/10

Definition: Who speaks as an expert?

Expert 1: Csercsa Balázs — former head of church affairs of TISZA

Timestamp: 00:36

Statement: "I would make a distinction here too between the TISZA party and the TISZA community, because the TISZA party still consists of only about 20–30 people, and we don't know who they are."

Classification: Former party member who has publicly turned against TISZA; active complainant against Magyar Péter; a strong personal and political conflict of interest exists.

Missing counter-opinion: An active TISZA member, party leader or spokesperson who could refute the claims.

Source deep analysis:

(a) FUNDING: Csercsa Balázs is currently a private individual with no known source of funding; as a former TISZA member, he receives no party funding. Motivation: public conflict with Magyar Péter, filing of a complaint, media appearances.

(b) MANDATE: No neutral mandate; personal conflict of interest exists (legal proceedings, public antagonism).

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Active legal proceedings against Magyar Péter; publicly hostile relationship

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Public appearance carries some risk, but media exposure also provides an advantage

D3 Professional competence: -1 — Was head of church affairs; has no expertise in energy policy, economics or intelligence matters

D4 Opinion consistency: -1 — As a former TISZA member held positive views; 180-degree turn after resignation

D5 Emotional vs. data-based: -2 — Predominantly anecdotal, personal experience-based, non-data-driven argumentation

D6 Source level: -2 — No primary sources; own claims, statements of the type "I heard", "I think"

TOTAL: -7 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: RED

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: The host presents Csercsa Balázs as a neutral "former head of church affairs", even though he is an active complainant and a publicly hostile former party member — this is a structurally biased source treated as neutral.

Expert 2: Szalai Piroska — chief adviser to the Prime Minister

Timestamp: 24:46

Statement: "I think easily. I probably maintain that they don't even think through what each of these steps specifically means for families."

Classification: Active government official, employee of the Fidesz-KDNP government; direct conflict of interest in discrediting the opposition.



Missing counter-opinion: An independent economist who could verify the methodology of the calculations.

Source deep analysis:

(a) FUNDING: Paid by the Hungarian state (Fidesz-KDNP government); direct political subordination.

(b) MANDATE: As chief adviser to the Prime Minister, her mandate is incompatible with the role of a neutral expert; her task is to defend government policy and criticise the opposition.

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Direct government employee; discrediting the opposition is a job duty

D2 Personal risk: -2 — Takes no personal risk whatsoever; reinforces the government narrative

D3 Professional competence: +1 — An economics background can be assumed; but the methodology of the calculations cannot be verified

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistently pro-government position

D5 Emotional vs. data-based: -1 — Uses numbers, but selectively and without verification; expressions of the "Armageddon" type

D6 Source level: 0 — Partially references statistics (Eurostat, MNB), but selectively

TOTAL: -3 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: The host presents Szalai Piroska as "chief adviser to the Prime Minister" but does not indicate that this implies direct political bias; her calculations are not challenged on a single occasion.

Missing expert groups:

- Independent energy economist (e.g. REKK — Regional Centre for Energy Policy Research)
- Independent macroeconomist (e.g. GKI, KRTK)
- Source-critical journalist or media scholar

Summary (matrix result):

- Csercsa Balázs: RED (-7) — active conflict of interest, anecdotal argumentation, treated as neutral
- Szalai Piroska: YELLOW (-3) — direct government employee, unverified calculations, treated as neutral

Source credibility overview:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
expert: Csercsa Balázs — former head of church affairs of TISZA	-2	+1	-1	-1	-2	-2	-7	RED
expert: Szalai Piroska — chief adviser to the Prime Minister	-2	-2	+1	+1	-1	0	-3	YELLOW



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

Claims without primary sources = penalty points (rumour check)

Total score: 9/10

Definition: What sources are cited? Are they varied and independent?

Source 1: The "leaked TISZA Energy Plan" document

Timestamp: 00:11 — Statement: "Yesterday the TISZA Energy Plan was made public, from which it emerges that the party would decouple from Russian energy."

(a) Funding and maintainer: Unknown; the document was made public by Csercsa Balázs, who is in an active conflict of interest with TISZA

(b) Structural conflict of interest: The authenticity of the document is disputed (Magyar Péter denied it); the political motivation behind the leak is not examined

(c) Missing counter-source: Independent document analysis, the TISZA's official response presented in detail

Rumour check (penalty points):

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 20:26

Claim: "There was a defected Ukrainian agent who claimed that the TISZA party may have received 5 million euros per week, i.e. 2 billion forints, from Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy in recent months."

Verbal marker: "who claimed" — no primary source named, not verifiable

Primary source present: NO — penalty point: +1

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 14:03

Claim: "This morning on Kossuth Rádió he was talking about how this could even go so far that, say, certain MPs would then leave the parliamentary group"

Verbal marker: "say", "could even" — speculative, primary source missing

Primary source present: NO — penalty point: +1

Rumour 3:

Timestamp: 17:48

Claim: "very disturbed, or perhaps afraid, and that in many cases it is conceivable that he was made to recite a rehearsed text"

Verbal marker: "perhaps", "conceivable" — speculative, without evidence

Primary source present: NO — penalty point: +1

Summary: The broadcast does not rely on a single primary, independent source. The authenticity of the leaked document is not verified; rumours and speculation are presented as facts. Three penalty points.



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

Total score: 8/10

Definition: Distribution of speaking time between different viewpoints.

Estimated speaking time:

- Csercsa Balázs (anti-TISZA former member): approx. 14 minutes (29%)
- Szalai Piroska (chief government adviser): approx. 22 minutes (46%)
- Törőcsik Zsolt (host): approx. 12 minutes (25%)
- TISZA / Magyar Péter's voice (in his own words): 0 minutes (0%)
- Independent expert: 0 minutes (0%)

Summary: The entire speaking time of the broadcast goes to voices critical of TISZA; TISZA has not a single second to present its own position. The two guests represent a mutually reinforcing, one-directional narrative; the host's questions further reinforce this.



4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

9/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 9/10

Definition: What is not presented, even though it would be relevant?

Omission 1:

Context: The long-term sustainability and budgetary burden of the current utility cost reduction

Relevant timestamp: 29:01 (section on abolishing the utility cost reduction)

Effect: The broadcast presents the utility cost reduction as a sustainable and exclusively positive measure, even though numerous economists and the EU also consider it unsustainable; this context is entirely absent.

Omission 2:

Context: Csercsa Balázs's conflict of interest and the circumstances of his resignation

Relevant timestamp: 00:36 (introduction)

Effect: The viewer does not know that Csercsa Balázs is in active legal proceedings against Magyar Péter and has personal motivations for discrediting TISZA; this fundamentally affects the assessment of his claims.

Omission 3:

Context: The source and credibility of the "leaked Ukrainian agent" claim

Relevant timestamp: 20:26

Effect: An extremely serious allegation (foreign financing) from an unverified, anonymous source is presented as fact, without any source criticism being voiced.

Summary: The broadcast systematically omits all information that would weaken the narrative being presented: the question of the sustainability of the utility cost reduction, the guests' conflicts of interest, and source criticism of the unverified claims.

Missing voices

- Independent energy expert: Could have examined the realistic costs of decoupling from Russian energy, scheduling options and the experiences of other EU member states
- Independent economist: Could have verified the methodology of Szalai Piroska's calculations and the soundness of the figures presented
- TISZA spokesperson or Magyar Péter: Could have presented the party's official position and rebuttal regarding the document
- Media scholar or source-critical expert: Could have analysed the question of the leaked document's authenticity and the political context of the "leak"
- European Commission representative or EU lawyer: Could have clarified whether the EU actually expects what the guests claim
- Consumer protection expert: Could have presented the true sustainability of the utility cost reduction and its long-term effects on households
- Independent lawyer: Could have assessed the background of Csercsa Balázs's complaint and the legal proceedings



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

- Ukrainian or intelligence expert: Could have verified the credibility of the "defected Ukrainian agent" claim



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

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

Total score: 8/10

Definition: Selective or misleading use of statistics.

Triangle check: For every number used in an argumentative function I verify: (a) absolute value, (b) ratio, (c) trend.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 30:01

Number: "one-thousand-forint petrol" — 600,000 forints extra per year per car

Dimensions: (a) absolute value given ✓ — (b) ratio (relative to income) partially ✓ — (c) trend: MISSING — the future development of oil prices is speculative but treated as fact

Missing context: The "Századvég" calculation (which is referenced) is not presented with a source citation; the difference between the current market price and the "one-thousand-forint" price is based on assumptions

Effect: The viewer may believe that one-thousand-forint petrol is a certain consequence, whereas this is a conditional, debatable forecast.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 34:17

Number: "the total of Hungarian household energy bills is less than 38 percent of the European Union average"

Dimensions: (a) absolute value: MISSING — (b) ratio given ✓ — (c) trend: partially (example of Czech Republic and Poland)

Missing context: The comparison does not take into account income differences (purchasing power parity); the 38% ratio is misleading in itself if not projected against income ratios

Effect: It suggests that Hungary performs exceptionally well, whereas the income-adjusted energy burden may present a different picture.

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 43:01

Number: "in 2010 the proportion of people in Hungary at risk of poverty or social exclusion was one third of the entire society, this has fallen to below 20%"

Dimensions: (a) absolute value: MISSING — (b) ratio given ✓ — (c) trend given ✓

Missing context: The EU AROPE indicator methodology has changed over the years; the 2010 and 2024 data are not necessarily methodologically comparable; the effects of Covid and inflation are not mentioned

Effect: A one-sidedly positive picture of the Fidesz government's social policy is formed, on an unverified statistical basis.

Summary: The broadcast uses numbers, but contextualising dimensions (trend, income ratio, methodological limitations) are consistently absent; the sources of the calculations (Századvég, MNB) are not subjected to critical scrutiny.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION								8/10	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Total score: 8/10

Definition: Discrediting through association with negative groups/ideas.

Association 1:

Timestamp: 02:09

Quote: "they have been put on a forced track, or have even put themselves on a forced track, by accepting the support of the European People's Party and the European Commission"

Technique: TISZA is identified with the EU, which in the Fidesz narrative is treated as a foreign, anti-Hungarian force; EU membership as a "forced track" receives a negative connotation

Effect: Portrays TISZA as serving foreign interests, reinforcing the "traitor to the homeland" narrative.

Association 2:

Timestamp: 20:26

Quote: "There was a defected Ukrainian agent who claimed that the TISZA party may have received 5 million euros per week, i.e. 2 billion forints, from Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy in recent months."

Technique: TISZA is linked to Ukrainian intelligence service financing; the source of the claim is unverified, but the mere posing of the question creates an association

Effect: Portrays TISZA as an organisation under foreign (Ukrainian) intelligence service influence.

Association 3:

Timestamp: 19:02

Quote: "even earlier, when he was in Fidesz, he tried to use his influence to grovel for a job at Mészáros Lőrinc, to applaud at Tusványos or at the Bálna in order to gain access to positions"

Technique: Magyar Péter is presented as a servant of the Fidesz oligarchy (Mészáros Lőrinc); past connections are treated as a current character trait

Effect: Damages Magyar Péter's credibility and fixes his earlier connection to the Fidesz system as a permanent characteristic.

Summary: The broadcast constructs three parallel chains of association: TISZA = EU servant, TISZA = Ukrainian intelligence service financing, Magyar Péter = former servant of the Fidesz oligarchy. All three are based on unverified or context-free claims.



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

Total score: 7/10

Definition: Strategic placement of information (beginning/middle/end).

Finding 1:

Position: 00:11 (beginning of broadcast)

Content: "Yesterday the TISZA Energy Plan was made public, from which it emerges that the party would decouple from Russian energy, and in exchange would phase out the protected fuel price, abolish the utility cost reduction, and would even tax savings."

Timing effect: The first sentences of the broadcast establish the content and consequences of the document as fact, before any source criticism or context is provided; this "priming" effect determines the interpretive frame of the entire broadcast.

Finding 2:

Position: 20:26 (middle of broadcast)

Content: "There was a defected Ukrainian agent who claimed that the TISZA party may have received 5 million euros per week from Zelenskyy."

Timing effect: The accusation of Ukrainian financing is made in the middle of the broadcast, when the viewer has already accepted the previous accusations; this is the "accumulation" technique, which places each new accusation in the negative context created by the preceding ones.

Finding 3:

Position: 48:39 (end of broadcast)

Content: "So on an annual basis, Hungarian families would lose several million forints with the TISZA Energy Plan."

Timing effect: The closing sentence of the broadcast summarises and reinforces the main message; this is the "last impression" effect, which remains in the viewer's memory.

Summary: The broadcast consciously applies the "priming–accumulation–closure" timing structure: the first sentences establish the accusation as fact, the middle reinforces it with further accusations, and the closing summary permanently fixes the negative image.



8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Outrage = bias. Selective outrage reinforces the finding. Score = degree of outrage (0–5) + selectivity (0–5)

Total score: 7/10

Definition: Outrage at certain positions, but not at similar ones from others.

Methodological principle (v2.2): Before each assessment, the triggering event must be documented. A reaction can only be classified as selective if a similar triggering event did not produce an analogous reaction from other positions.

Outrage degree calculation:

Score = Degree of outrage (0–5) + Selectivity (0–5)

- Degree of outrage: 0 = none, 1–2 = occasional/mild, 3–4 = repeated/firm, 5 = continuous/intense
- Selectivity: 0 = evenly distributed or none, 1–2 = mild asymmetry, 3–4 = clear one-sidedness, 5 = exclusively one side

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 08:12

Triggering event: Magyar Péter allegedly publicly embarrassed Hernádi Zsolt (MOL CEO) at an event in Esztergom

Reaction: "That was already very outrageous to me at the time, I didn't agree with that."

Comparison: Similar public statements by Fidesz-KDNP politicians (e.g. Viktor Orbán's rhetoric towards opposition members) — Reaction: none

Asymmetry: Confirmed — the outrage is directed exclusively at Magyar Péter's behaviour; similar or stronger rhetoric from Fidesz-KDNP does not provoke a reaction

Degree of outrage: 3/5

Selectivity: 4/5

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 15:53

Triggering event: A TISZA candidate allegedly "spoke about the rape of a minor prostitute"

Reaction: "with these candidates, I don't think the locals can expect much good either"

Comparison: Scandals involving Fidesz-KDNP candidates (e.g. corruption cases, moral scandals) — Reaction: none

Asymmetry: Confirmed — the outrage is directed exclusively at TISZA candidates

Degree of outrage: 4/5

Selectivity: 5/5

Summary: The outrage expressed in the broadcast is directed exclusively at TISZA and Magyar Péter; similar or more serious matters involving Fidesz-KDNP (corruption, oligarch connections, press freedom violations) are not mentioned at all and do not provoke any reaction.



9. SELECTIVE OMISSION — OVERALL PICTURE

9/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Total score: 9/10

Definition: How complete is the broadcast's presentation of topics? Are relevant viewpoints, facts or actors systematically omitted?

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 29:01

Missing viewpoint/fact: The current sustainability and long-term budgetary impact of the utility cost reduction

Relevance: The sustainability of the utility cost reduction has been questioned by numerous independent economists and the EU; omitting this creates a one-sided picture

Effect: The viewer may believe that the utility cost reduction is sustainable and an exclusively positive measure, whereas this is disputed.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 05:12

Missing viewpoint/fact: TISZA's official, detailed rebuttal and programme positions

Relevance: Magyar Péter's rebuttal is dealt with in a single sentence and then discredited; TISZA's actual programme (anti-corruption, EU rule of law, transparency) is not mentioned at all

Effect: The viewer cannot get a picture of what TISZA actually stands for.

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 20:26

Missing viewpoint/fact: The source, credibility and verifiability of the "Ukrainian agent" claim

Relevance: An extremely serious allegation (foreign intelligence service financing) is made without source or verification

Effect: The viewer accepts an unverified allegation as fact.

Summary: The broadcast systematically omits TISZA's viewpoint, the question of the sustainability of the utility cost reduction, and source criticism of the unverified claims; this is not a random deficiency but structural one-sidedness.

End of hard facts — Beginning of soft facts

Soft facts — interpretation-dependent, not merely countable

Proportion of viewpoints covered

Inverted: the original value measures coverage (higher = better). Displayed as deviation (higher = greater gaps).

- [A] Independent verification of the authenticity of the leaked document (journalistic source criticism)
- [B] TISZA's official position and rebuttal (Magyar Péter's statement)
- [C] Independent energy expert's opinion on the possible effects of decoupling from Russian energy
- [D] Independent economist on the methodology and reliability of the calculations



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

- [E] Objective presentation of EU energy policy expectations (not in a pro-government interpretation)
- [F] Comparison: experiences of other EU member states in decoupling from Russian energy
- [G] Independent analysis of the sustainability of the current utility cost reduction (budgetary impact)
- [H] The circumstances and motivations of Csercsa Balázs's resignation (conflict of interest examination)
- [I] Source criticism of the "leaked Ukrainian agent" claim
- [J] Independent legal-economic analysis of the MOL privatisation and state energy ownership

[A] OMITTED

Timestamp: 00:24 — Quote: "According to Magyar Péter, not a word of this is true. According to Csercsa Balázs, who made the document public, it is however authentic." — Assessment: The authenticity of the document is claimed solely by the person who leaked it; no independent source verification took place.

[B] OMITTED

Timestamp: 05:07 — Quote: "Magyar Péter said that not a word of what you made public is true." — Assessment: Magyar Péter's rebuttal is deemed unreliable by both the host and the guest, without Magyar Péter having the opportunity to present his position.

[C] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Not a single independent energy expert speaks; the calculations come exclusively from the chief government adviser.

[D] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: No independent economist appears; the methodology of the financial calculations is not verified.

[E] PARTIALLY ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 09:26 — Quote: "This is obviously the European Commission's expectation of TISZA." — Assessment: EU expectations are presented exclusively in a negative, "forced track" frame; the actual content of EU energy policy is not presented.

[F] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Szalai Piroska cites the experiences of other EU member states (e.g. Poland, Czech Republic) only to support her own argument, not for the purpose of comparative analysis.

[G] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Not a single word is said about the long-term sustainability or budgetary burden of the current utility cost reduction.

[H] OMITTED

Timestamp: 00:36 — Quote: "My guest is Csercsa Balázs, the former head of church affairs of the TISZA party." — Assessment: The circumstances, motivations and possible conflicts of interest surrounding Csercsa Balázs's resignation are not examined.

[I] OMITTED

Timestamp: 20:26 — Quote: "There was a defected Ukrainian agent who claimed that the TISZA party may have received 5 million euros per week, i.e. 2 billion forints, from Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy in recent months." — Assessment: The source, credibility and verifiability of the claim are not examined at all.

[J] OMITTED

Timestamp: 44:38 — Quote: "the state ownership stake in MOL would be privatised" — Assessment: The question of MOL privatisation is assessed exclusively by the chief government adviser; no independent legal or economic analysis is provided.

Completeness score: 1/10

Justification: Out of ten relevant viewpoints, the broadcast addresses only one partially (EU expectations), and that too exclusively in a negative frame. Independent expert, opposition right of reply, source criticism and methodological verification are entirely absent. The broadcast is a one-sided series of accusations, not an informational programme.



Soft facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. DEFINITION OF INTERPRETIVE FRAME

9/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 9/10

Definition: How does the broadcast fundamentally frame the topic?

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:11

Quote: "Yesterday the TISZA Energy Plan was made public, from which it emerges that the party would decouple from Russian energy, and in exchange would phase out the protected fuel price, abolish the utility cost reduction, and would even tax savings."

Manipulation: The verb "emerges" treats the content of the disputed document as fact; the word "in exchange" implies a causal relationship that the document does not necessarily contain

Why problematic: From the first sentence of the broadcast, the viewer accepts as fact what is in reality an interpretation of an unverified, disputed document.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 42:54

Quote: "I have now said several times that this will be Armageddon for families' wallets"

Manipulation: The apocalyptic metaphor "Armageddon" frames the TISZA energy plan as a civilisational catastrophe

Why problematic: The catastrophe frame excludes rational deliberation; the viewer rejects TISZA's programme on an emotional basis, not on the basis of factual analysis.

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 22:46

Quote: "Magyar Péter and his circle now primarily want to come to power. I can easily imagine that they wanted to come to power from the very beginning, and for this they merely exploited the TISZA community."

Manipulation: TISZA is framed not as a political party but as a clique hungry for power, exploiting its community

Why problematic: This frame excludes the possibility that TISZA has a genuine political programme; it automatically interprets every TISZA activity as power manipulation.

Summary: The broadcast applies three parallel frames: (1) the document is fact, not opinion; (2) TISZA's programme is an apocalyptic catastrophe; (3) TISZA is not a political party but a power-hungry clique. These frames define the entire broadcast.



11. LANGUAGE AND CONCEPTS

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 8/10

Definition: What language is used? What connotations are created?

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 13:35

Quote: "then these lies, these distortions come to the surface"

Manipulation: The words "lie" and "distortion" express legal and moral condemnation; these are not challenged by the host

Why problematic: Neutral alternative: "disputed claims" or "differing interpretations" — the word "lie" implies moral condemnation without a court ruling.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 01:14

Quote: "the TISZA community, I see, lives in an opinion bubble, an artificial opinion bubble"

Manipulation: The expression "artificial opinion bubble" portrays TISZA sympathisers as manipulated people detached from reality

Why problematic: Neutral alternative: "TISZA voters have different media consumption habits" — the adjective "artificial" implies manipulation, the source of which is not named.

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 41:51

Quote: "this will already be Armageddon for families' wallets"

Manipulation: The biblical apocalypse metaphor "Armageddon" frames TISZA's programme as civilisational doom

Why problematic: Neutral alternative: "would place a significant financial burden on families" — the word "Armageddon" creates emotional panic, not rational deliberation.

Summary: The broadcast consistently uses negatively connotated words for TISZA (lie, distortion, opinion bubble, Armageddon, forced track), while describing Fidesz-KDNP policy with neutral or positive words (achievement, protection, buyback).



12. HOST CONDUCT								8/10	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Total score: 8/10

Definition: Asymmetries in follow-up questions, interruptions, expressions of sympathy.

Methodological principle (v2.2): Before each assessment, the triggering event must be documented. An intervention can only be classified as asymmetric if a similar triggering event did not produce an analogous intervention with another guest.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 01:50

Triggering event: Csercsa Balázs claims that TISZA's leaders "are aware" of the effects of the plans

Quote (host): "But it's interesting what you said about the leaders, that they are aware of this. If they are aware of what effect this would have on people, then they don't care?"

Comparison: At Szalai Piroska's similarly strong claims (e.g. "Armageddon") — Reaction: no follow-up question, no challenge

Asymmetry: Confirmed — the host further reinforces Csercsa Balázs's claims; Szalai Piroska's claims are not challenged

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 05:02

Triggering event: Csercsa Balázs claims that the document is authentic because "the party's politicians also let slip about these plans"

Quote (host): "What can you use to support the claim that this is an authentic document?"

Comparison: At Szalai Piroska's unverified calculations — Reaction: no similar source-critical question

Asymmetry: Partially confirmed — the posing of the question is positive in itself, but the uncritical acceptance of the answer (anecdotal references) shows asymmetry

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 25:27

Triggering event: Szalai Piroska claims that TISZA "doesn't think through" the effects of the plans

Quote (host): "We'll talk about the details in a moment, but overall, if we look at the whole package, including the tax plans, who would be hurt the most?"

Comparison: The question presupposes the negative effects of the TISZA plan; no question is asked such as "What arguments are there in favour of phasing out the utility cost reduction?"

Asymmetry: Confirmed — the questions consistently reinforce the anti-TISZA narrative

Summary: The host consistently asks questions that reinforce the anti-TISZA narrative; does not challenge the guests' claims; not a single critical question is asked regarding Fidesz-KDNP policy.



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 8/10

Definition: Questions of differing hardness/softness posed to different people.

Asymmetry 1:

To Csercsa Balázs, 05:12: "What can you use to support the claim that this is an authentic document?" — moderately hard (but the answer is accepted without criticism)

To Szalai Piroska: Her calculations are not challenged on a single occasion — no hard question

Comparison: The authenticity of the document is questioned (though the answer is accepted), but Szalai Piroska's "Armageddon" calculations are never challenged.

Asymmetry 2:

To Csercsa Balázs, 17:05: "Now this picture doesn't add up. I don't know. Why did they take him back, if they fired him once?" — moderately hard

To Szalai Piroska, 44:48: "But what risk does this carry?" — soft, open question that provides an opportunity to reinforce the narrative

Comparison: In some cases, more critical questions are asked of Csercsa Balázs; to Szalai Piroska, exclusively narrative-reinforcing questions.

Summary: The asymmetry of the questions is clear: not a single hard, critical or verifactory question is asked of Szalai Piroska; in some cases Csercsa Balázs's claims are challenged, but the answers are accepted without criticism.



14. FALSE BALANCE									6/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Total score: 6/10

Definition: Artificial appearance of balance despite actual inequality.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:24 — Construction: "According to Magyar Péter, not a word of this is true. According to Csercsa Balázs, who made the document public, it is however authentic."

Analysis: The broadcast apparently presents both sides (Magyar Péter's rebuttal vs. Csercsa Balázs's claim), but this is false balance: Magyar Péter's rebuttal is dealt with in a single sentence, and then for the entire remaining broadcast (approx. 48 minutes) exclusively the narrative of Csercsa Balázs and Szalai Piroska is reinforced. Behind the appearance of "we presented both sides" lies a 1:48 ratio of speaking time.

Summary: The broadcast applies the false balance technique: Magyar Péter's rebuttal is mentioned in a single sentence and then ignored; this creates the impression that "we presented both sides", whereas in reality a one-sided narrative is heard for 48 minutes.



15. AGENDA SETTING

9/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 9/10

Definition: What counts as normal/self-evident? What does not make it onto the agenda?

Finding 1:

Item placed on agenda: The TISZA energy plan as a proven fact and immediate threat

Timestamp: 00:11 — Evidence: "Yesterday the TISZA Energy Plan was made public, from which it emerges..."

Alternative agenda: Examination of the document's authenticity; presentation of TISZA's actual programme; the question of the sustainability of the utility cost reduction

Finding 2:

Item placed on agenda: Fidesz-KDNP energy policy as a success story and protective measure

Timestamp: 44:55 — Evidence: "in 2010 the proportion of people in Hungary at risk of poverty or social exclusion was one third of the entire society, this has fallen to below 20%"

Alternative agenda: The long-term sustainability of the utility cost reduction; the geopolitical risks of energy dependence; the effect of the KESMA media system on information provision

Finding 3:

Item placed on agenda: TISZA as a servant of foreign (EU, Ukraine) interests

Timestamp: 09:26 — Evidence: "This is obviously the European Commission's expectation of TISZA"

Alternative agenda: Objective presentation of Hungary's obligations arising from EU membership; the actual content of EU energy policy

Summary: The broadcast's agenda fixes three mutually reinforcing elements: (1) TISZA's plan is proven and dangerous; (2) Fidesz-KDNP policy is successful and protective; (3) TISZA serves foreign interests. These elements define the entire content of the broadcast and exclude alternative interpretations.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Overview of individual scores

No.	Criterion	Type	Score	Main finding (1 sentence)
1	Expert selection	H	9	Both guests are in active conflict of interest; no independent expert appears
2	Source selection	H	9	Not a single independent source; three unverified rumours presented as facts
3	Time allocation	H	8	TISZA has 0 minutes of its own speaking opportunity; 75% anti-TISZA voices
4	Omission	H	9	The sustainability of the utility cost reduction, the guests' conflicts of interest and source criticism are systematically absent
5	Number manipulation	H	8	Selective statistics, missing contextualising dimensions, unverified forecasts treated as facts
6	Guilt by association	H	8	TISZA = EU servant + Ukrainian intelligence service + former servant of the Fidesz oligarchy
7	Timing	H	7	Priming–accumulation–closure structure; the first sentence establishes the disputed document as fact
8	Selective outrage	H	7	Outrage directed exclusively at TISZA; similar matters involving Fidesz-KDNP provoke no reaction
9	Completeness	H	9	TISZA's programme positions, the sustainability of the utility cost reduction and source criticism of the unverified accusations are absent
10	Framing	S	9	Three parallel frames: document = fact, TISZA = apocalypse, TISZA = power-hungry clique
11	Language	S	8	Consistently negatively connotated words for TISZA; neutral/positive words for Fidesz-KDNP
12	Host conduct	S	8	Narrative-reinforcing questions; guests' claims not challenged; no critical question regarding Fidesz-KDNP
13	Question asymmetry	S	8	Not a single hard question to Szalai Piroska; a few to Csercsa Balázs, but the answers are accepted
14	False balance	S	6	Magyar Péter's rebuttal is mentioned in a single sentence, then ignored for 48 minutes
15	Agenda setting	S	9	Three mutually reinforcing agenda items fix the anti-TISZA and pro-Fidesz narrative

Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (average of criteria 1–9): 8.2 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (average of criteria 10–15): 8.0 / 10



- TOTAL SCORE (average of all 15 criteria): 8.1 / 10

Dominant techniques

- 1. Framing (9/10):** From the first sentence to the last, the broadcast applies a single interpretive frame: the TISZA energy plan is a proven fact, with apocalyptic consequences, dictated by foreign interests. This frame excludes alternative interpretations and rational deliberation.
- 2. Expert selection / Source selection (9/9):** Both guests are in active conflict of interest (former party member in legal proceedings + chief government adviser); no independent expert, opposition voice or source-critical element appears at all. This structurally excludes balanced coverage.
- 3. Agenda setting (9/10):** The broadcast's agenda fixes three mutually reinforcing elements (TISZA = danger, Fidesz = protection, TISZA = foreign servant), which define the entire broadcast and exclude alternative viewpoints.

The broadcast's messages

MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE): "The TISZA energy plan has demonstrably been shown to abolish the utility cost reduction and the protected fuel price, which would place a burden of several million forints per year on Hungarian families."

Technique: Framing + number manipulation — Evidence: 00:11, 29:01, 48:39

MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL): "Magyar Péter is a power-hungry, threatening and corrupt leader who exploits the TISZA community and was formerly a servant of the Fidesz oligarchy."

Technique: Guilt by association + selective outrage — Evidence: 19:02, 22:46, 18:18

MESSAGE 3 (SOCIAL): "TISZA serves foreign (EU, Ukraine) interests, and if it comes to power, Hungary will lose its energy sovereignty and social achievements."

Technique: Agenda setting + association — Evidence: 02:09, 09:26, 20:26

Manipulation level classification

Justification: The broadcast's total score of 8.1/10 indicates extreme one-sidedness. Not a single independent source, expert or opposition voice appears; TISZA's programme positions are not presented at all; the guests are in active conflict of interest; unverified accusations are presented as facts. The requirements of balance, objectivity and diversity of opinion prescribed by Mttv. §83 are systematically violated: the broadcast appears not as an informational programme but as political campaign material in the guise of a public service broadcast.

SUMMARY

The examined 48-minute broadcast (Kossuth Rádió) shows systematic and methodical one-sidedness, which seriously violates the requirement of balanced coverage under Mttv. §83. The entire content of the broadcast is aimed at discrediting a single opposition party (TISZA), while treating the governing party's (Fidesz-KDNP) policy as an implicit success. The two guests (a former party member in active conflict of interest and a chief government adviser) represent a concordant, one-directional narrative; no independent expert, opposition voice or source-critical element appears at all. Unverified accusations (Ukrainian financing, internal threats, secret programmes) are presented as facts, while TISZA's rebuttal is dealt with in a single sentence. The broadcast does not meet the requirements of public service coverage under Mttv. §83 and functions de facto as political campaign material.



OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual scores — All 15 criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Classification
1	EXPERT SELECTION	9/10	<i>Fundamental systemic one-sidedness</i>
2	SOURCE SELECTION	9/10	<i>Fundamental systemic one-sidedness</i>
3	TIME ALLOCATION	8/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
4	SELECTIVE OMISSION	9/10	<i>Fundamental systemic one-sidedness</i>
5	NUMBER MANIPULATION	8/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
6	GUILT BY ASSOCIATION	8/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
7	TIMING	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
8	SELECTIVE OUTRAGE	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
9	SELECTIVE OMISSION — OVERALL PICTURE	9/10	<i>Fundamental systemic one-sidedness</i>
10	DEFINITION OF INTERPRETIVE FRAME	9/10	<i>Fundamental systemic one-sidedness</i>
11	LANGUAGE AND CONCEPTS	8/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
12	HOST CONDUCT	8/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
13	QUESTION ASYMMETRY	8/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
14	FALSE BALANCE	6/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
15	AGENDA SETTING	9/10	<i>Fundamental systemic one-sidedness</i>

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

9.0/10

Fundamental systemic one-sidedness. Very high degree of bias

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

8.0/10

Serious deviation from the balance requirement. High degree of deviation

TOTAL SCORE

8.5/10

Fundamental systemic one-sidedness. Very high degree of bias

Average of hard facts and soft facts



LEGEND — Meaning of scores

Individual scores per criterion (0–10)

0	No finding	No relevant anomaly detectable.
1–2	Weak finding	Mild anomaly without material effect on balance.
3–4	Mild-moderate finding	Recognisable tendency; low-moderate impact relevance.
5	Moderate finding with impact	Relevant imbalance that influences the audience's opinion-forming potential.
6	Significant finding (threshold)	Scores of 6 or higher qualify as "significant findings".
7	Significant finding	Clear, well-documented imbalance with obvious impact relevance.
8–9	Serious finding	Pronounced imbalance; multiple individual findings documented for this criterion.
10	Maximum severity	Systematic and pervasive imbalance for this criterion.

Aggregate deviation index — Interpretation ranges

0.0 – 2.5	Imperceptible	No material patterns detectable; the programme meets the balance requirement.
2.6 – 4.0	Mild imbalance	Isolated anomalies; statistically visible, but still within the tolerance threshold.
4.1 – 6.0	Significant imbalance	Multiple significant findings; relevant impairment of viewpoint diversity.
6.1 – 8.0	Serious deviation from the balance requirement. High degree of deviation	Pronounced, cross-programme patterns; high impact relevance.
8.1 – 10	Fundamental systemic one-sidedness. Very high degree of bias	Maximum pronouncedness in almost every criterion; systematically one-sided reporting.

Party-political bias (from -5 to +5)

-5 to -3	Strongly disadvantaged	The party is significantly under-represented in framing, speaking time or presentation.
-2 to -1	Mildly disadvantaged	Recognisable but mild disadvantage.
0	Neutral	No preference or disadvantage detectable.
+1 to +2	Mildly advantaged	Recognisable but mild preference.
+3 to +5	Strongly advantaged	The party is significantly over-represented in framing, speaking time or presentation.



CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL ASSESSMENT (Mttv. §83)

Assessment under Mttv. §83

Mttv. §83 requires that news programmes and informational programmes provide current, objective and balanced coverage, and reflect the diversity of opinions.

Violation 1:

Norm: Mttv. §83 (1) — balance and objectivity

Facts: The entire content of the broadcast is aimed at discrediting a single opposition party (TISZA); TISZA's programme positions, rebuttals and viewpoints are not presented; Fidesz-KDNP policy appears in a positive context without criticism

Evidence: 00:11 — "Yesterday the TISZA Energy Plan was made public, from which it emerges..." — treatment of the disputed document as fact; 48:39 — "So on an annual basis, Hungarian families would lose several million forints with the TISZA Energy Plan." — one-sided closing message

Assessment: The broadcast does not meet the requirement of objectivity and balance; TISZA's viewpoint does not appear at all in its own words, and its rebuttal is dealt with in a single sentence.

Violation 2:

Norm: Mttv. §83 (1) — reflecting the diversity of opinions

Facts: Exclusively anti-TISZA voices speak in the broadcast (former party member + chief government adviser); no independent expert, opposition representative or neutral analyst appears at all

Evidence: 00:36 — "My guest is Csercsa Balázs, the former head of church affairs of the TISZA party." / 24:46 — "My guest is Szalai Piroska, chief adviser to the Prime Minister." — the political affiliation and conflict of interest of the two guests are not disclosed

Assessment: The requirement of diversity of opinions is seriously violated; the broadcast represents a single political orientation.

Violation 3:

Norm: Mttv. §83 (1) — factuality and verifiability

Facts: Unverified accusations from anonymous sources (Ukrainian intelligence service financing, internal threats, secret programmes) are presented as facts; no source criticism is voiced at all

Evidence: 20:26 — "There was a defected Ukrainian agent who claimed that the TISZA party may have received 5 million euros per week, i.e. 2 billion forints, from Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy in recent months." — anonymous source, unverified claim, treated as fact

Assessment: The requirement of factuality and verifiability is violated; the broadcast disseminates unverified accusations on a public service channel.

Violation 4:

Norm: Mttv. §83 (2) — the special responsibility of the public service media provider

Facts: As a public service media provider, MTVA bears a special responsibility for balanced coverage; the broadcast functions de facto as political campaign material ahead of the 2026 elections

Evidence: The entire structure of the broadcast (choice of guests, questions, framing, closing message) serves a single political purpose: discrediting TISZA and defending Fidesz-KDNP energy policy

Assessment: The requirement of special public service responsibility is seriously violated; the broadcast is indistinguishable from a party-political campaign material.

Overall assessment under Mttv. §83



The examined broadcast systematically and seriously violates all the basic requirements of Mttv. §83 (1) — balance, objectivity, factuality, diversity of opinions. The broadcast is aimed at discrediting a single opposition party, while presenting the governing party's policy in a positive context without criticism; it treats unverified accusations as facts; it does not present TISZA's viewpoint at all; and it features exclusively guests in conflict of interest. The violations are not random but structural and systematic, which also grounds a violation of the special public service responsibility under Mttv. §83 (2). In a potential regulatory proceeding, the broadcast would be suitable for establishing a sanction under Mttv. §83, particularly given that it was broadcast in a politically especially sensitive period ahead of the 2026 elections.

SOURCE DEEP ANALYSIS (Mandatory for every cited specialist institution / civil organisation / advisory organisation)

Csercsa Balázs — former head of church affairs of TISZA

- 1. FUNDING:** Currently a private individual with no known source of funding; as a former TISZA member, receives no party funding; motivation: public conflict with Magyar Péter, active legal proceedings, media appearances
- 2. MANDATE:** No neutral mandate; personal conflict of interest exists (legal proceedings, public antagonism); was head of church affairs, not an energy or economic expert
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** In active legal proceedings against Magyar Péter; publicly hostile relationship; discrediting TISZA is in his personal interest
 - D1 Conflict of interest: -2
 - D2 Personal risk: +1
 - D3 Professional competence: -1
 - D4 Opinion consistency: -1
 - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -2
 - D6 Source level: -2**TOTAL: -7 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: RED**
- 5. COUNTER-OPINION:** An active TISZA member, party leader or spokesperson could refute the claims — does not appear in the broadcast

Szalai Piroska — chief adviser to the Prime Minister

- 1. FUNDING:** Paid by the Hungarian state (Fidesz-KDNP government); direct political subordination
- 2. MANDATE:** As chief adviser to the Prime Minister, her mandate is incompatible with the role of a neutral expert; her task is to defend government policy
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Direct government employee; discrediting the opposition and defending government policy is a job duty; takes no personal risk whatsoever
- 4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** D1: -2 (direct government employee) / D2: -2 (no personal risk) / D3: +1 (economics background can be assumed) / D4: +1 (consistently pro-government) / D5: -1 (selective data use, "Armageddon") / D6: 0 (partially references statistics, but selectively) → **TOTAL: -3 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**
- 5. COUNTER-OPINION:** An independent economist (e.g. GKI, KRTEK) could verify the methodology of the calculations — does not appear in the broadcast

IMPORTANT NOTE: The label "recognised" or "expert" is not an objective qualification. It is a social attribution that must itself be examined. Both guests are treated by the host as neutral experts, even though both are in active conflict of interest — this is one of the most important structural manipulation elements of the broadcast.

Source credibility overview:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
violation:	-2	+1	-1	-1	-2	-2	-7	RED

Legal and methodological classification

Not a finding of fact

The results presented do not constitute a finding of fact regarding individual persons, editorial offices or programmes. They are the results of standardised operationalisation, not a determination of individual responsibility.



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

Not a legal judgement

The aggregate deviation index does not replace the legal assessment under Mttv. §83. The determination of whether a given programme violates statutory requirements is exclusively the task of the competent authorities (in particular the Media Council).

Not evidence of causality

Statistical correlations must not be interpreted as evidence of causal relationships or editorial intent. Deviation values may be influenced by topic selection, the news situation, political controversy or format logic.

Not an assessment of intent

The analysis measures the observable structural characteristics of programmes. A score of 7 means that significant imbalance has been established — not that the editorial office did this intentionally. The methodology makes no statements about motives.

Heuristic comparative tool

The index serves for comparative pattern recognition across thousands of programmes, not for precise metric measurement of individual contributions. The threshold values serve as heuristic orientation, not as precise legal qualification.



ANNEX 1: NATIONAL LEGISLATION

Legal basis Hungary — MTVA

Laws

- Act CLXXXV of 2010 on media services and mass communication (Mttv.)
- Act CIV of 2010 on press freedom (Smtv.)
- Fundamental Law of Hungary (2011)

Relevant articles

Mttv. (Media Act 2010)

- §83 (1): Public service obligation — current, objective and balanced coverage in news and informational programmes.
- §83 (2): Coverage must reflect the diversity of opinions.
- §12: Protection of pluralism of opinion as a fundamental principle.
- §13: Prohibition of one-sided coverage in news programmes.

Smtv. (Press Freedom Act 2010)

- §4: Freedom of the press and freedom of expression.
- §10: Separation of news and opinion.
- §13: Right of correction.

Fundamental Law

- Article IX: Freedom of opinion and the press, media pluralism as a state obligation of protection.

European reference framework

- ECHR Article 10: Right to freedom of expression (European Convention on Human Rights)
- EU Rule of Law Report: Annual assessment, documenting systematic media freedom deficiencies since 2018
- RSF Press Freedom Index: Reporters Without Borders, annual ranking
- EMFA (European Media Freedom Act, 2024): EU-level minimum standards for media freedom

Special case — Structural non-enforcement

IMPORTANT: The Mttv. formally contains correct balance obligations. The criticism is not directed against the text of the law, but against the structural non-enforcement by the government-aligned NMHH. MTVA is a broadcaster operating de facto under state-aligned management.

Supervisory authority

- NMHH (National Media and Infocommunications Authority): National media and communications authority. Structurally government-aligned composition since 2010.

Complaint procedure

1. NMHH (formally, but structurally not independent)
2. Kúria (Supreme Court, theoretically)



ANNEX 2: ACADEMIC REFERENCES

Literature

- Bennett, W. L. (1990). Toward a theory of press-state relations in the United States. *Journal of Communication*, 40(2), 103–125.
- Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*. Free Press.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58.
- fög – Forschungszentrum Öffentlichkeit und Gesellschaft (2024). *Jahrbuch Qualität der Medien 2024*. Schwabe.
- Gilardi, F., Alizadeh, M. & Kubli, M. (2023). ChatGPT outperforms crowd workers for text-annotation tasks. *PNAS*, 120(30).
- Iyengar, S. & Kinder, D. R. (1987). *News that matters: Television and American opinion*. University of Chicago Press.
- Jolly, S. et al. (2022). Chapel Hill Expert Survey trend file, 1999–2019. *Electoral Studies*, 75, 102420.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- McCombs, M. E. & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 176–187.
- Shoemaker, P. J. & Vos, T. P. (2009). *Gatekeeping theory*. Routledge.
- SVFAB (2026). *Methodenbericht v4.1: Zählbare Kriterien und Multi-Modell-Kreuzvalidierung*.
- Törnberg, P. (2023). ChatGPT-4 outperforms experts and crowd workers in annotating political Twitter messages. arXiv:2304.06588.

SVFAB Working Papers

- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Systematic AI-Assisted Analysis of Public Broadcaster Impartiality: A Scalable Methodological Framework for Measuring Structural Bias in Public Service Media. [SSRN 6688478](#)
- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Measuring Editorial Noise: A Retrospective Suppression Index for Public Broadcasting Content Analysis. [SSRN 6733280](#)
- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Source Traffic Light: A Six-Dimensional Credibility Framework for Systematic Source Assessment in Public Service Media. [SSRN 6733880](#)

David Schläpfer — ORCID: 0009-0000-5671-9266

SVFAB — Swiss Association for Balanced Reporting | P.O. Box, 8021 Zurich 1 | www.svfab.ch | kontakt@svfab.ch |
Methodology report March 2026 | Converter 3.4 (2026-05-20)



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

Assessments and membership at SVFAB

At SVFAB.ch you not only get more detailed analyses, but you can also have them produced for any broadcast (this service is subject to a fee).

To ensure the sustainability of our work, we rely on memberships and donations.

Contact and further information:

www.SVFAB.ch | Kontakt@SVFAB.ch

Bank details: PostFinance – POFICHBE

IBAN: CH32 0900 0000 1675 6251 1

Recipient: 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 at www.svfab.ch or by email at kontakt@svfab.ch.



Unbalanced reporting as a response to the Swiss halving initiative: This book presents the manipulation techniques in detail, starting with the selection of staff and sources. It then outlines 15 principles: omission, framing, temporal framing, guilt by association, emotionalisation, removal of context and many more, illustrated with numerous examples. It also reveals where we ourselves apply these techniques — fostering not only understanding but also empathy.

Optionally, playing cards are also available to accompany the book.

Also available as an audiobook.



The interview is not a conversation. It is a stage — and someone else wrote the script.

Anyone who does not understand this is handing out material. Good quotes that were poorly edited. Correct statements placed in the wrong context. Honest answers framed as confessions.

This book is not a media criticism book. It is a toolkit — for everyone who has a microphone in front of their face and wants to know what they can do about it. 7 chapters. 7 tools: What an interview actually is. The 7 most common pitfalls. The three principles of control — anchoring, framing and setting boundaries. Preparation in one hour. Body and voice. What to do when things go wrong. And what counts after the interview.

For politicians, activists, entrepreneurs, whistleblowers — for everyone who is in the public eye and wants to understand how the game works. To stop being talked into things — and start shaping them.

In A5 format. Easy to use. For preparation, as a reference, for follow-up and when things get difficult.



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



You think you see the world. In reality, you see the frame that someone has placed around it. Framing is the world's oldest and most elegant manipulation technique. It does not change the facts — it changes what we think about them. How we feel. What we believe. How we decide. And it works — because we all participate in it. Every day. Unconsciously. You too. This book is not a dry textbook. It is a workbook — playful, direct, full of real examples. You will not only learn how others frame you. You will learn how to frame yourself — and how to use that consciously and fairly.

Because those who understand framing see the world more clearly. They hear the news differently. They conduct conversations with greater confidence. And they are no longer so easily influenced by frames chosen by someone else.

With numerous exercises and concrete examples from politics, the media and everyday life — and a few chuckles along the way.

Stylish framing. Because the frame changes everything.