



## NHK 詳細分析

2026-05-03\_radio\_news\_0700

Broadcast: 2026-05-03 | Analyzed: 2026-05-13 13:02

Version 2.8-detail | Universal 2.8-detail | Konverter 3.4 (2026-05-20) | Standard: 放送法 第4条

### OVERALL SCORE

**3.6/10**

*Slight imbalance*

0 = balanced, 10 = strongly biased/manipulative

## POLITICAL SPECTRUM

Classification based on Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) 2024

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

Party	JCP	CDP	DPP	Komeito	LDP	JIP
CHES	1.50	3.50	4.80	5.20	7.00	7.80
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)

**5.8 / 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.



## POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

Current Administration: Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) + Komeito coalition government. Prime Minister Sanae Takaichi (referred to in the transcript as "Prime Minister Takaichi"). In the October 27, 2024 House of Representatives election, the LDP fell back to 191 seats but maintained the coalition government.

Major Opposition Parties: The Constitutional Democratic Party (CDP, 148 seats) is the largest opposition party. Nippon Ishin no Kai (Ishin, 38 seats), Democratic Party for the People (DPP, 28 seats), Komeito (24 seats), Reiwa Shinsengumi (9 seats), Japanese Communist Party (JCP, 8 seats).

Party	L-R Score	Seats	Government/Opposition	Core Position
Japanese Communist Party (JCP)	1.5	8	Opposition	Against constitutional revision, immediate nuclear phase-out, anti-military expansion
Reiwa Shinsengumi	2.5	9	Opposition	Abolish consumption tax, anti-military expansion, left-wing populism
Constitutional Democratic Party (CDP)	3.5	148	Opposition	Against Article 9 revision, emphasis on redistribution, nuclear phase-out
Komeito	5.0	24	Government	Pacifism, social security, LDP coalition
Democratic Party for the People (DPP)	5.5	28	Middle	Consumption tax reduction, pragmatism, swing party
Liberal Democratic Party (LDP)	7.0	191	Government	Pro-constitutional revision, defence build-up, economic growth
Nippon Ishin no Kai (Ishin)	7.0	38	Opposition	Deregulation, pro-constitutional revision, Osaka-based
Sanseito	9.0	—	Opposition	Ultra-nationalism, right-wing populism

The confrontation between the ruling and opposition parties over constitutional revision is the biggest issue, with the LDP and Ishin pushing in particular for the creation of an emergency clause, the Communist Party opposing it, and the CDP and DPP taking a cautious stance. The increase in defence spending to 2% of GDP, energy policy (nuclear restart versus nuclear phase-out), and the issue of separate surnames for married couples are also major lines of conflict. The LDP's significant loss of seats in the 2024 House of Representatives election has destabilised the government's foundation, and a situation continues in which consultations with the opposition are indispensable.

NHK is a public broadcasting institution based on the Broadcasting Act, and Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act mandates political fairness, accuracy in reporting, and the presentation of multi-faceted viewpoints. Since the 12 members of the Board of Governors are appointed by the Prime Minister (with Diet approval), criticism of a "pro-government" bias has been continuously raised from academia and civil society since the Abe administration. In the RSF Press Freedom Index, Japan remains at 70th place (2024), and the press club (kisha club) system is said to produce structural bias in access to information.



## CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

### Evaluation by Party

Party	Score (-5 to +5)	Depiction in broadcast vs. party's programmatic position
LDP	+1	01:58 "showing strong enthusiasm" — Programmatic position: pro-revision, creation of emergency clause — Broadly consistent with programmatic position, with positive expression "strong enthusiasm"
CDP	-1	02:46 "The Moderate Reform Alliance points out that the manner of the House of Councillors emergency session stipulated in the current constitution should also be considered" — Programmatic position: against Article 9 revision, defending the constitution — Cautious stance is shown but specific grounds for defending the constitution are absent
Komeito	0	No direct mention — Programmatic position: cautious promotion of revision, pacifism — Included on the pro-revision side as a ruling party, but its own cautious stance is not shown
Ishin	+1	02:09 "Both the LDP and Ishin argue that an emergency clause for industry and commerce incorporating responses to large-scale disasters, etc., should be created" — Programmatic position: pro-revision, supporting emergency clause — Consistent with programmatic position
JCP	-2	02:52 "The Communist Party opposes constitutional revision itself" — Programmatic position: against revision, upholding Article 9 — Position is accurate but the definitive and isolated expression "opposes revision itself" gives a more rigid impression compared to other parties
DPP	+1	02:33 "The Democratic Party for the People and Team Mirai show agreement or understanding" — Programmatic position: pragmatic revision, understanding toward the emergency clause — Broadly consistent with programmatic position

### Party Bias Summary

- Most accurate depiction: Ishin, score +1 (consistent with programmatic position)
- Strongest distortion: JCP, score -2 (position is accurate but expression is isolated and rigid)
- Average deviation from 0: 1.0
- Summary: The positions of the pro-revision side (LDP, Ishin, DPP) are depicted in a form broadly consistent with their programmatic positions, but the positions of the pro-constitution/cautious side (CDP, JCP) lack specific grounds, and in particular expressions are used for the Communist Party that give the impression of an isolated hardliner. The fact that Komeito's own cautious stance is not shown at all also has the effect of concealing the diversity within the coalition government.



## CHAPTER 2 — PROGRAMME INFORMATION AND TOPIC FRAMEWORK

### Broadcast Data

- Title: NHK News (morning news programme, including weather information)
- Date (estimated from filename): May 3, 2025 (Constitution Memorial Day)
- Estimated broadcast duration: Approximately 14 minutes (00:00:00–00:14:10)
- Announcers/Reporters: Mitsunori Masano (sports), Akiko Yoshii (weather), main announcer (name unknown)
- Participants:

Actors	Position	Party/Affiliation	Political Spectrum
Professor Tada no Masato (※)	Professor, Senshu University Law School, specialising in constitutional law and referendum systems	Academia (neutral position)	Neutral (academic)
Prime Minister Takaichi (mentioned only)	Prime Minister	LDP	Right (7.0)
Deputy Foreign Minister Gharibabadi (mentioned only)	Iranian Deputy Foreign Minister	Iranian government	N/A
President Trump (mentioned only)	President of the United States	Republican Party	Right-wing

※ "Tada no Masato" is estimated to be a speech recognition error in the transcript. Visual confirmation is required for the accurate name.

### Main Themes

A morning news programme that comprehensively reported on the constitutional revision debate (particularly the emergency clause), the results of a public opinion survey on advertising regulations in referendums, the situation in Iran, the outlook for the US midterm elections, sports results, and weather information, on the occasion of Constitution Memorial Day (the 79th anniversary of the constitution coming into force).

### Ideological Context

Constitution Memorial Day is symbolically a day each year when proponents of constitutional revision and defenders of the constitution clash, and in 2025 political tensions have heightened because the Takaichi administration has explicitly stated it wants to "get a handle on the prospects for a revision proposal by next year's LDP convention." The emergency clause is a matter of debate touching on the foundations of democracy, as it would enable the extension of legislators' terms of office and the strengthening of government authority in the event of large-scale disasters. The issue of advertising regulations in referendums focuses on the asymmetry that while there are regulations for television and radio, there are none for the internet, and this is directly linked to the fairness of the information environment.

### Perspectives Necessary for Balanced Broadcasting (Based on World Knowledge)

- \* The specific content of the emergency clause and its impact on democracy (risk of concentration of power)
- \* The position of constitution-defending citizens and scholars (grounds for opposing revision)
- \* International comparison of referendum advertising regulations (regulatory models in France, Germany, etc.)
- \* The reality and impact of internet advertising (risk of information manipulation on SNS)
- \* Details of each party's specific draft clauses and positions on constitutional revision



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

- \* The voices of citizens and voters (diverse opinions of ordinary citizens on constitutional revision)
- \* The majority opinion of constitutional scholars (academic consensus on the constitutionality and necessity of revision)
- \* Past referendum cases (effects and problems of advertising regulations in other countries)
- \* The current state and functional evaluation of the House of Councillors emergency session system
- \* The realistic achievability of the revision proposal requirements (two-thirds or more in each of the upper and lower houses)



## CHAPTER 3 — 15 Criteria: DETAILED ANALYSIS

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

#### 1. Expert Selection

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

**Expert 1:** Professor Tada no Masato (Senshu University Law School, specialising in constitutional law and referendum systems)

Timestamp

05:12–05:38

Statement

"Given that the manner of advertising became an issue in recent House of Representatives elections and so on, I feel that the public has interest in and awareness of this issue. Compared to elections, it is difficult to course-correct the outcome of a constitutional revision referendum, so it is important to properly build the process, he points out"

Positioning: Introduced as an expert on referendum systems. The content of the statement suggests the importance of advertising regulations and does not address the question of whether revision is appropriate.

Missing opposing opinions: Constitutional scholars who are pro-revision (advocating the necessity of constitutional revision) or pro-constitution (pointing out problems with revision) are absent.

#### In-depth Source Check:

**(a) Funding:** Senshu University is a private university. No direct financial dependence on the state, religion, or specific political parties can be confirmed. The possibility of conflicts of interest is low.

**(b) Mandate:** As an expert in constitutional law and referendum systems, the comment on advertising regulations is consistent with the area of expertise. The consistency between the mandate and the content of the statement is high.

D1 Conflict of interest: +1 — affiliated with a private university, no clear conflict of interest

D2 Personal risk: +1 — speaking from an academic position, personal risk is moderate

D3 Expertise: +2 — statement content consistent with area of expertise as a specialist in constitutional law and referendum systems

D4 Consistency of opinion: 0 — no comparative data with past statements

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — comparatively data- and logic-based statement

D6 Source level: +1 — direct expert comment (close to primary)

**TOTAL: +6 → Source Traffic Light: Green**

**(c) PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE:** The content of the statement suggests the necessity of advertising regulations and is not clearly biased toward either promoting or defending the constitution. However, the academic debate on the question of whether revision is appropriate (such as the majority opinion of constitutional scholars) is not presented at all.

#### Missing Expert Groups:

- Pro-constitution constitutional scholars (those arguing the problems with and unconstitutionality of revision)
- Pro-revision constitutional scholars (those arguing the necessity of the emergency clause)
- Specialists in digital media and election advertising



### Source Credibility Overview:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Professor Tada no Masato (Senshu University Law School, specialising in constitutional law and referendum systems)	+1	+1	+2	0	+1	+1	+6	Green

#### Summary (Matrix Results):

- Professor Tada no Masato: Source Traffic Light Green (+6); the consistency between area of expertise and statement content is high, but academic diversity regarding the overall debate on constitutional revision is absent.



## 2. Source Selection

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

**Source 1:** Professor Tada no Masato, Senshu University Law School

**Timestamp** 05:12–05:38

**Quote** "it is important to properly build the process, he points out"

- (a) Funding and operating body:** Senshu University (private university). No direct financial dependence on the state, religion, or specific political parties can be confirmed.
- (b) Structural conflict of interest:** No clear institutional conflict of interest. However, the statement suggesting the importance of "properly building the process" can be interpreted as supporting a position favouring caution in the revision process, and may be viewed critically by pro-revision proponents.
- (c) Missing sources representing opposing views:** Constitutional scholars who are pro-revision, or specialists taking the position that "existing self-regulation is sufficient," are absent.

**Source 2:** NHK Public Opinion Survey

**Timestamp** 03:45–05:06

- (a) Funding and operating body:** A public opinion survey conducted by NHK itself. NHK is a public broadcaster operated through receiving fees and a Board of Governors appointed by the government.
- (b) Structural conflict of interest:** The structure of NHK reporting on its own survey on its own broadcast is self-referential and contains a conflict of interest in terms of survey design, question wording, and interpretation of results. In particular, since referendum advertising regulations are a theme also related to NHK's own broadcasting regulations, the possibility that NHK's institutional interests influence the survey design cannot be excluded.
- (c) Missing opposing sources:** A comparison with public opinion surveys on the same theme from independent survey organisations (Asahi Shimbun, Yomiuri Shimbun, etc.) is absent.

**Source 3:** RealClearPolitics (US political information website)

**Timestamp** 08:40–08:59

**Quote** "In the average of various public opinion surveys as of January 1, 40.9% of respondents said they support President Trump's administration"

- (a) Funding and operating body:** A US political information aggregation website. It is said to have a conservative-leaning tendency, but its function of aggregating public opinion surveys is widely used.
- (b) Structural conflict of interest:** As a source of information on US politics, there is a possibility of bias toward a specific political position.
- (c) Missing opposing sources:** No comparison with other polling aggregation sites such as FiveThirtyEight.

*Summary: Using NHK's own public opinion survey as a primary source contains a self-referential conflict of interest, and comparison with independent sources is absent. There is also only one expert, and diverse academic positions are not reflected.*



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

Estimated speaking time:

- Constitutional revision debate (overall): Approximately 110 seconds (01:33–03:27), approximately 13% of total
- Position of ruling party/pro-revision side (LDP, Ishin, DPP, Team Mirai): approximately 45 seconds
- Position of opposition/cautious/opposing side (Moderate Reform Alliance, JCP): approximately 15 seconds
- Neutral explanation: approximately 50 seconds
- Referendum advertising regulations (including public opinion survey): Approximately 130 seconds (03:28–05:38), approximately 16%
- Iran situation: Approximately 110 seconds (05:41–07:26), approximately 13%
- US midterm elections: Approximately 130 seconds (07:31–09:48), approximately 16%
- Sports: Approximately 120 seconds (09:51–11:51), approximately 14%
- Weather information: Approximately 130 seconds (00:00–01:33, 11:53–13:58), approximately 16%
- Other (announcements, etc.): Approximately 70 seconds, approximately 8%

*Summary: In the constitutional revision debate, the pro-revision side (ruling party + Ishin + DPP) occupies approximately three times as much time as the pro-constitution/cautious side. However, the overall time allocation covers diverse topics as a news programme, and cannot be said to represent an extreme bias toward a specific political position.*



#### 4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

##### Omission 1:

###### Context

The specific content of the emergency clause and its impact on democracy

Relevant timestamp: 02:09–02:26

###### Impact

Only the aspect of "responding to large-scale disasters" is presented, and democratic concerns such as the possibility of extending legislators' terms of office, concentrating government authority, and restricting fundamental human rights are completely omitted. This makes opposition to the emergency clause appear groundless.

##### Omission 2:

###### Context

Specific grounds of pro-constitution citizens and scholars

Relevant timestamp: 01:39–03:12

###### Impact

The pro-constitution side's position is represented only by the single sentence of the Communist Party "opposing revision itself," and the specific grounds for defending the constitution (the peaceful function of Article 9, the sufficiency of the current system, etc.) are not presented at all.

##### Omission 3:

###### Context

International comparison of referendum advertising regulations and specific risk cases

Relevant timestamp: 03:28–05:38

###### Impact

Although the issue of the lack of internet advertising regulation is raised, there is no reference to regulatory models in other countries or actual cases of information manipulation (such as Brexit), and the seriousness of the problem does not come across to viewers.

*Summary: In reporting on such an important day as Constitution Memorial Day, three important perspectives — the specific grounds for opposing revision, the democratic risks of the emergency clause, and international comparison — are systematically omitted, creating an information environment favourable to the pro-revision side.*

#### Missing Voices

- Constitution-defending constitutional scholars: Could have specifically discussed the risk of concentration of power in the emergency clause and its impact on democracy
- Representatives of civic groups (pro-constitution side): Could have presented the civic position against revision and specific concerns
- Media law specialists: Could have explained the legal framework and international standards of referendum advertising regulations
- SNS and digital media researchers: Could have specifically shown the risk of information manipulation through internet advertising
- Specific speakers from the opposition (CDP): Could have elaborated on the grounds for opposing revision



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

- Ordinary voters (those opposed to revision): Could have shown the diversity of public opinion
- Experts on the House of Councillors emergency session system: Could have evaluated the function of the current system and the necessity of revision
- Comparative constitutional scholars: Could have presented the actual operational realities and problems of emergency clauses in other countries



## 5. Numerical Manipulation

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 03:45–05:06

Numbers: "Those who answered that the amount and timing should be regulated by law accounted for the most at 35%," "those who answered that it should be left to self-regulation rather than law: 22%," "those who answered that no advertising regulation is necessary at all: 20%," "those who answered that advertising should be banned entirely: 9%"

#### Missing context

The proportion of "other/don't know" (the remaining 14%) is not explicitly stated. Also, there is no explanation of the impact on the representativeness of the results of the low response rate of 35.9% (1,248 out of 3,476 people).

#### Impact

It is emphasised that the 35% top response was "support for legal regulation," but the interpretation that the combined total of those opposed to regulation and those favouring self-regulation (42%) exceeds those supporting regulation (35%) is also possible, and this point is not presented.

### Finding 2:

**Timestamp** 04:07–04:17

Numbers: "The survey targeted 3,476 people, and responses were obtained from 1,248 people, representing 35.9%"

#### Missing context

A response rate of 35.9% is a relatively low level for a public opinion survey, and there is no explanation of the possibility of non-response bias.

#### Impact

Important caveats regarding the reliability and representativeness of the survey are not presented.

*Summary: In presenting the public opinion survey, important context regarding the low response rate and the interpretability of the options is absent, and the impression that "support for legal regulation" is the most common view is emphasised. However, no falsification of the figures themselves or serious misuse is confirmed.*



## 6. Guilt by Association

1/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Association 1:

#### Timestamp

02:39–02:43

#### Quote

"argues that the constitution should be remade from scratch"

Technique: The position of the "pro-revision party" (estimated to be Sanseito) is introduced with the radical expression "remake from scratch."

#### Impact

While other parties' positions are expressed with neutral verbs such as "create," "point out," and "oppose," this expression has the effect of emphasising radicalism. However, it cannot be said to be a direct negative association.

*Summary: No clear cases of the guilt-by-association technique are confirmed. There is also no labelling such as "conspiracy theorist." Minor linguistic differences are recognisable, but this cannot be assessed as a systematic attempt at discrediting.*



## 7. Timing

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Position: 01:33–01:39 (transition point from weather information to constitutional debate)

Content: "Today, Constitution Memorial Day, the Constitution of Japan marks 79 years since it came into force"

Timing effect: By placing the constitutional debate immediately after the weather information (safe, practical information), political content is presented while viewers' attention is secured.

### Finding 2:

Position: 01:58–02:05 (beginning of constitutional debate)

Content: "showing strong enthusiasm for getting a handle on the prospects for a revision proposal by next year's LDP convention"

Timing effect: The Prime Minister's enthusiasm for revision is placed as the first specific political statement in the constitutional debate, with the effect of setting the promotion of revision as the starting point for discussion. The pro-constitution side's position is placed in the latter half.

### Finding 3:

Position: 05:38– (after the end of the constitutional debate)

Content: Transition to the situation in Iran

Timing effect: The constitutional debate concludes with an expert comment (on the importance of advertising regulations), and the programme moves to another topic before the debate on whether revision is appropriate deepens. Viewers' opportunities to think deeply about the constitutional revision issue are limited.

*Summary: The structure in which the pro-revision side's position is placed at the beginning of the constitutional debate and the pro-constitution side is briefly mentioned in the latter half has the timing effect of setting the promotion of revision as the normative starting point for discussion.*



## 8. Selective Outrage

1/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

*Methodological Principle (v2.2): Before evaluation, record the specific event that triggered the reaction. A reaction can only be assessed as selective if an equivalent event involving another position did not produce a similar reaction.*

### Finding 1:

#### Timestamp

Throughout

Triggering event: This broadcast is narration-based news format, and no expressions of emotional reaction or outrage are confirmed.

Reaction: None

#### Comparison

No emotional reactions for any position

Asymmetry: Cannot be confirmed.

*Summary: No clear cases of selective outrage are confirmed in this broadcast. Since it is reporting in narration format, emotional expressions are overall restrained. The score of 1 takes into account minor linguistic differences (such as "strong enthusiasm").*



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

Share of covered perspectives

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

**[A] PARTIALLY** mentioned

Timestamp: 01:39–02:26

Quote: "The ruling party side intends to accelerate concrete deliberations toward realising the revision, including the creation of an emergency clause for industry and commerce, but"

Evaluation: There is no explanation of the content of the emergency clause, and there is absolutely no mention of its impact on democracy.

**[B] Not mentioned**

Timestamp: N/A

Quote: N/A

Evaluation: The voices of constitution-defending citizens and scholars are completely absent. Only the Communist Party's opposition is mentioned in a single sentence.

**[C] Not mentioned**

Timestamp: N/A

Quote: N/A

Evaluation: The perspective of international comparison is not presented at all.

**[D] PARTIALLY** mentioned

Timestamp: 03:28–03:40

Quote: "There are no regulations for the internet"

Evaluation: The issue is raised, but there is no explanation of specific risks or cases.

**[E] PARTIALLY** mentioned

Timestamp: 01:39–03:12

Quote: "Both the LDP and Ishin argue that an emergency clause for industry and commerce incorporating responses to large-scale disasters, etc., should be created"

Evaluation: Each party's position is listed, but there is no explanation of specific clause content.

**[F] Not mentioned**

Timestamp: N/A

Quote: N/A

Evaluation: Citizens' voices are only public opinion survey figures; there are no individual voices.

**[G] PARTIALLY** mentioned

Timestamp: 05:12–05:38

Quote: "Professor Tada no Masato of Senshu University Law School... points out that it is important to properly build the process"

Evaluation: Only one scholar, and limited to advertising regulations. No academic discussion regarding the constitutionality or necessity of revision.



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

**[H] Not mentioned**

Timestamp: N/A

Quote: N/A

Evaluation: No reference to referendum cases in other countries.

**[I] Mentioned**

Timestamp: 02:46–02:52

Quote: "also pointing out that the manner of the House of Councillors emergency session stipulated in the current constitution should also be considered"

Evaluation: Only a single sentence, as a claim by the Moderate Reform Alliance. No detailed explanation.

**[J] Not mentioned**

Timestamp: N/A

Quote: N/A

Evaluation: No analysis of the realistic achievability of the proposal requirements.



## Soft Facts — 6 qualitative techniques

### 10. Framing

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

#### Finding 1:

Timestamp	01:39–01:53
Quote	<i>"The ruling party side intends to accelerate concrete deliberations toward realising the revision, including the creation of an emergency clause for industry and commerce, but among the opposition parties opinions are divided, and Diet debate is expected to become more active"</i>
Manipulation	Constitutional revision is presented within a framework of "the ruling party pushing forward, and the opposition responding." This creates the impression that promoting revision is an established course.
Why problematic	This positions defence of the constitution not as a "legitimate policy choice" but as a relatively positioned stance that is "divided for and against," setting the pro-revision side's position as the normative starting point.

#### Finding 2:

Timestamp	01:58–02:05
Quote	<i>"showing strong enthusiasm for getting a handle on the prospects for a revision proposal by next year's LDP convention"</i>
Manipulation	The expression of the Prime Minister's "strong enthusiasm" frames constitutional revision as a politically legitimate and proactive goal.
Why problematic	The positive expression "strong enthusiasm" implies that promoting revision is a desirable political direction. No comparable expression such as "strong opposition" is used for the pro-constitution side.

#### Finding 3:

Timestamp	02:09–02:26
Quote	<i>"in response to both the LDP and Ishin arguing that an emergency clause for industry and commerce incorporating responses to large-scale disasters, etc., should be created"</i>
Manipulation	The emergency clause is framed in a humanitarian and practical context of "responding to large-scale disasters," completely excluding the aspect of the risk of concentration of power.
Why problematic	The framing of "responding to large-scale disasters" has the effect of making opposition to the emergency clause appear as if it is "opposing disaster response."



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

*Summary: There is a consistent framing that presents the promotion of constitutional revision as an established course and normative direction, and positions defence of the constitution as a relatively positioned stance that is "divided for and against." However, this is a structural framing bias rather than overt manipulation.*



<b>11. Word Choice and Terminology</b>									<b>3/10</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

<b>Finding 1:</b>	
<b>Timestamp</b>	01:58–02:05
<b>Quote</b>	<i>"showing strong enthusiasm"</i>
<b>Manipulation</b>	"Strong enthusiasm" is an expression with positive and proactive connotations.
<b>Why problematic</b>	A neutral alternative expression would be "has shown a policy of aiming for a revision proposal." "Strong enthusiasm" has the effect of depicting the Prime Minister's stance favourably.

<b>Finding 2:</b>	
<b>Timestamp</b>	02:52–02:56
<b>Quote</b>	<i>"The Communist Party opposes constitutional revision itself"</i>
<b>Manipulation</b>	Only the Communist Party's position is described with the absolute and rigid expression "opposes revision itself."
<b>Why problematic</b>	While other parties' positions are expressed with diverse verbs such as "argue," "point out," and "show agreement or understanding," only the Communist Party uses the definitive expression "opposes," giving the impression of an isolated hardliner.

<b>Finding 3:</b>	
<b>Timestamp</b>	03:09–03:12
<b>Quote</b>	<i>"as a theme on which it is easier to gain the understanding of the opposition side as well"</i>
<b>Manipulation</b>	The expression "easier to gain understanding" positions the opposition, from the ruling party's perspective, as "a party to be persuaded."
<b>Why problematic</b>	This depicts the opposition's position not as that of an independent policy decision-maker, but as a passive entity receiving the ruling party's persuasion.

*Summary: In word choice, positive expressions are concentrated on the ruling party and pro-revision side, and expressions that give a rigid and isolated impression are used for the pro-constitution side (especially the Communist Party). However, overall the language use is relatively restrained.*



<b>12. Presenter Behaviour</b>									<b>2/10</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

*Methodological Principle (v2.2): Before evaluation, record the specific event that triggered the intervention. An intervention can only be assessed as asymmetric if an equivalent event involving another guest did not produce a similar intervention.*

#### **Finding 1:**

**Timestamp** 05:12–05:38

Triggering event: Presentation of public opinion survey results, followed by introduction of expert comment

**Quote (presenter)** *(No direct presenter question or intervention can be confirmed. The expert comment is introduced in narration format)*

**Comparison** No comparable subject among other participants (no studio guests)

Asymmetry: Cannot be confirmed. Since this broadcast is not a studio discussion format but a narration-based news format, opportunities to evaluate presenter intervention patterns are limited.

#### **Finding 2:**

**Timestamp** 01:39–03:27

Triggering event: Reporting on the constitutional revision debate

**Quote (presenter)** *Reporting in a format listing each party's position (no direct intervention)*

**Comparison** All parties' positions are introduced in narration format, and no intervention targeting a specific party can be confirmed

Asymmetry: Cannot be confirmed.

*Summary: Since this broadcast is not a studio discussion format but a narration-based news format, opportunities to evaluate asymmetry in presenter intervention patterns are significantly limited. No confirmable asymmetry is recognised.*



### 13. Question Asymmetry

1/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

#### Asymmetry 1:

Since this broadcast is not a studio discussion format but a narration-based news format, it is structurally impossible to comparatively evaluate the hardness or softness of questions posed to different individuals. Expert comments are also not presented in a direct interview format, but in a narration introduction format.

*Summary: Due to the format of this broadcast, there is almost no opportunity to evaluate question asymmetry. Since studio discussions and direct interviews are not included, the applicability of this criterion is significantly limited.*



## 14. False Balance

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

#### Timestamp

01:39–01:53

Structure: "The ruling party side... but among the opposition parties opinions are divided"

#### Analysis

By juxtaposing the ruling party (LDP + Komeito) and "divisions for and against within the opposition," a superficial balance is created, but in reality the pro-revision side (LDP, Ishin, DPP, Team Mirai) numerically outweighs the pro-constitution/cautious side (CDP, JCP), and the expression "opinions are divided" does not accurately reflect the actual political distribution.

### Finding 2:

#### Timestamp

02:26–02:56

Structure: A format listing each party's position

#### Analysis

The listing of LDP and Ishin (pro-revision), DPP and Team Mirai (in favour/understanding), the pro-revision party (radical promotion), the Moderate Reform Alliance (cautious), and the Communist Party (opposed) has the effect of concealing the reality that the pro-revision side comprises the majority with the impression that "each party's position is diverse."

*Summary: The format of listing each party's position in parallel creates a superficial balance, but the reality that the pro-revision side is numerically and politically dominant is not adequately shown. However, this can be assessed as the result of the formal constraints of news reporting rather than intentional false balance.*



## 15. Agenda Setting

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Agenda element set: Constitutional revision is set as a matter of "when" and "how" it will be realised, and the fundamental question of "whether revision should be carried out or not" does not make it onto the agenda.

**Timestamp** 01:58–02:05

Evidence: "showing strong enthusiasm for getting a handle on the prospects for a revision proposal by next year's LDP convention"

Alternative agenda: The questions "Is revision necessary?" and "What problems cannot be addressed under the current constitution?" are absent.

### Finding 2:

Agenda element set: The emergency clause is set as a practical matter of "responding to large-scale disasters," and the democratic risk does not make it onto the agenda.

**Timestamp** 02:09–02:26

Evidence: "arguing that an emergency clause for industry and commerce incorporating responses to large-scale disasters, etc., should be created"

Alternative agenda: The question "What risks does the emergency clause pose to democracy?" is absent.

### Finding 3:

Agenda element set: Referendum advertising regulations are set as a technical matter of "television and radio versus the internet," and the overall democratic legitimacy of the revision process does not make it onto the agenda.

**Timestamp** 03:28–05:38

Evidence: "While regulations have been established for television and radio, there are no regulations for the internet"

Alternative agenda: The comprehensive question of "How to ensure the fairness of the information environment in the revision process?" is absent.

*Summary: By placing the question of "when and how" to realise revision at the centre of the agenda, the fundamental question of "whether revision should be carried out or not" is excluded as something that is not self-evident. This is a significant agenda-setting bias for reporting on Constitution Memorial Day.*



## CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

### OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

#### Individual Scores — All 15 Criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Rating
1	Expert Selection	5/10	Significant imbalance
2	Source Selection	4/10	Slight imbalance
3	Time Allocation	4/10	Slight imbalance
4	SELECTIVE OMISSION	6/10	Significant imbalance
5	Numerical Manipulation	3/10	Slight imbalance
6	Guilt by Association	1/10	Unremarkable
7	Timing	4/10	Slight imbalance
8	Selective Outrage	1/10	Unremarkable
9	COMPLETENESS	7/10	Pronounced imbalance
10	Framing	4/10	Slight imbalance
11	Word Choice and Terminology	3/10	Slight imbalance
12	Presenter Behaviour	2/10	Unremarkable
13	Question Asymmetry	1/10	Unremarkable
14	False Balance	3/10	Slight imbalance
15	Agenda Setting	5/10	Significant imbalance

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

**3.9/10**

*Slight imbalance*

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

**3.2/10**

*Slight imbalance*

#### OVERALL SCORE

**3.6/10**

*Slight imbalance*

*Average of Hardfacts and Softfacts*



## KEY — Score Definitions

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

<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.



## CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL EVALUATION (Broadcasting Act Article 4)

### Evaluation Based on Broadcasting Act Article 4

Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act requires political fairness, accuracy in reporting, and the presentation of multi-faceted viewpoints.

#### Violation 1:

Standard: Broadcasting Act Article 4, Item 2 (political fairness)

Facts: The position of the pro-revision side (LDP, Ishin, DPP) is treated in a quantitatively and qualitatively superior manner compared to the pro-constitution/cautious side (CDP, JCP), and in particular framing that treats the promotion of revision as the normative starting point is recognised.

Evidence: Timestamp 01:58–02:05 — "showing strong enthusiasm for getting a handle on the prospects for a revision proposal by next year's LDP convention"

Evaluation: The fact that the Prime Minister's enthusiasm for revision is placed at the beginning with the positive expression "strong enthusiasm" and that specific grounds for the pro-constitution side are omitted is problematic from the perspective of political fairness. However, since each party's position is formally listed, this does not rise to the level of a serious violation.

#### Violation 2:

Standard: Broadcasting Act Article 4, Item 4 (presentation of multi-faceted viewpoints)

Facts: In reporting on Constitution Memorial Day, important viewpoints such as the democratic risks of the emergency clause, specific grounds for defending the constitution, and international comparison are systematically omitted, and the fundamental question of "whether revision should be carried out or not" is excluded from the agenda.

Evidence: Timestamp 02:09–02:26 — "arguing that an emergency clause for industry and commerce incorporating responses to large-scale disasters, etc., should be created" (no mention of democratic risks)

Evaluation: Presenting the emergency clause only from the single aspect of "responding to large-scale disasters" and omitting the opposing viewpoint of the risk of concentration of power may violate the obligation to present multi-faceted viewpoints required by Article 4, Item 4 of the Broadcasting Act.

### Overall Evaluation Under Broadcasting Act Article 4

This broadcast does not fully meet the requirements of Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act, but mild problems are recognised that do not rise to the level of a serious violation. From the perspective of political fairness, although each party's position is formally listed, framing and time allocation favouring the pro-revision side are recognised. From the perspective of multi-faceted presentation of viewpoints, it is problematic that as reporting on an important day such as Constitution Memorial Day, the democratic risks of the emergency clause and specific grounds for defending the constitution are systematically omitted. Using NHK's own public opinion survey as a primary source also requires consideration from the perspective of accuracy and independence in reporting required by Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act. Overall, this broadcast has room for improvement in light of the spirit of Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act, but at this point additional evidence (analysis of patterns across multiple broadcasts, proof of intent, etc.) is required for legal proof of violation.

### In-depth Source Check (Mandatory)

#### Professor Tada no Masato, Senshu University Law School

**1. Funding:** Senshu University (private university). No direct financial dependence on the state, religion, or specific political parties can be confirmed.

**2. Mandate:** As an expert in constitutional law and referendum systems, the comment on advertising regulations is consistent with the area of expertise. The consistency between the mandate and the content of the statement is high.



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

**3. Conflict of interest:** No clear institutional conflict of interest. However, the statement that "it is important to properly build the process" can be interpreted as supporting a position favouring caution in the revision process, and may be viewed critically by pro-revision proponents.

**4. Credibility Matrix (Source Traffic Light, 6 dimensions):**

- D1 Conflict of interest: +1 (affiliated with a private university, no clear conflict of interest)
  - D2 Personal risk: +1 (speaking from an academic position, moderate risk)
  - D3 Expertise: +2 (expert in constitutional law and referendum systems, statement content consistent with area of expertise)
  - D4 Consistency of opinion: 0 (no comparative data with past statements)
  - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 (comparatively logical and data-based statement)
  - D6 Source level: +1 (direct expert comment)
- TOTAL: +6 → Source Traffic Light: Green**

**5. Opposing views:** Specialists taking the position that "existing self-regulation is sufficient" or that "advertising regulations infringe on freedom of expression" are absent.

## NHK Public Opinion Survey

**1. Funding:** NHK (receiving fees + Board of Governors appointed by the government).

**2. Mandate:** The conduct of public opinion surveys is within the scope of normal operations for a broadcasting institution. However, there is a self-referential structure in which NHK itself conducts a survey on a theme that NHK itself reports on.

**3. Conflict of interest:** Since referendum advertising regulations are a theme also related to NHK's own broadcasting regulations, the possibility that NHK's institutional interests influence the survey design, question wording, and interpretation of results cannot be excluded. In particular, the framing of the problem itself — "while regulations have been established for television and radio, there are no regulations for the internet" — presupposes the legitimacy of television regulation.

**4. Credibility Matrix (Source Traffic Light, 6 dimensions):**

- D1 Conflict of interest: -1 (self-referential conflict of interest, self-conducted survey on theme related to own institution)
  - D2 Personal risk: 0 (institutional risk is moderate)
  - D3 Expertise: +1 (capability to conduct public opinion surveys confirmed)
  - D4 Consistency of opinion: 0 (no comparative data)
  - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 (numerical data presented)
  - D6 Source level: +1 (primary survey data)
- TOTAL: +2 → Source Traffic Light: Yellow**

**5. Opposing views:** A comparison with public opinion surveys on the same theme from independent survey organisations (Asahi Shimbun, Yomiuri Shimbun, Kyodo News, etc.) is absent.

Important Note: Social attribution as "expert" or "authoritative institution" is itself a social construct that should be verified. In this analysis, objective evaluation based on the above 6-dimension matrix takes priority.

*This analysis was prepared based on Version 2.7 Detailed Edition as a Broadcasting Act Article 4 compliance review. As limitations of the analysis, the following are noted: speech recognition errors in the transcript ("Tada no Masato," "emergency clause for industry and commerce," etc.), absence of visual information, and the fact that this is an analysis of a single broadcast. For legal proof of a Broadcasting Act Article 4 violation, analysis of patterns across multiple broadcasts and proof of intent are additionally required.*

## Legal and Methodological Notes

**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 放送法 第4条. The determination of whether a specific broadcast violates legal requirements is exclusively the responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular 総務省).



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

**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 1: NATIONAL BROADCASTING LAW

### Legal Basis Japan — NHK

#### Legislation

- Broadcasting Act (放送法, Act No. 132 of 1950, last amended 2024)
- NHK Reception Agreement (NHK受信規約)
- Radio Act (電波法)

#### Broadcasting Act Article 4 (Editing Standards)

Original text (Japanese):

放送事業者は、国内放送及び内外放送の放送番組の編集に当たっては、次の各号の定めるところによらなければならない。

- 一 公安及び善良な風俗を害しないこと。
- 二 政治的に公平であること。
- 三 報道は事実をまげないですること。
- 四 意見が対立している問題については、できるだけ多くの角度から論点を明らかにすること。

Official English translation:

(1) A broadcaster must comply with the following when editing domestic broadcast programs:

- (i) It must not negatively influence public safety or good morals.
- (ii) It must be politically fair.
- (iii) Reporting must not distort the facts.
- (iv) It must clarify the points at issue from as many angles as possible where there are conflicting opinions concerning an issue.

Ref: e-Gov ([laws.e-gov.go.jp/law/325AC0000000132](https://laws.e-gov.go.jp/law/325AC0000000132)), Japanese Law Translation DB

#### Four Pillars of Bias Analysis

No.	Provision	SVFAB Analysis Reference
1	Must not harm public safety or good morals	Editorial baseline
2	Must be politically fair	Core bias metric — analogous to Swiss RTVG Art. 4
3	Reporting must not distort the facts	Factual dimension
4	Controversial issues: as many angles as possible	Multi-perspective / balance

#### Comparison Switzerland — Japan

Aspect	Switzerland (SRG)	Japan (NHK)
Law	RTVG Art. 4	Broadcasting Act Art. 4
Independent regulator	UBI (binding)	BPO (non-binding)



State regulator	BAKOM/UVEK	MIC (Ministry of Internal Affairs)
Enforcement	UBI can uphold complaints; BAKOM can sanction	BPO recommends; MIC can issue administrative guidance
Funding	Serafe fee	NHK reception fee (~1,100 JPY/month)
Self-regulation	Moderate (UBI independent)	Weak (BPO co-funded by NHK)

## Regulatory Authorities

### Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications (総務省)

- Government ministry with jurisdiction over broadcasting
- Issues broadcast licences
- Can issue administrative guidance (行政指導)
- Approves NHK budget, business plan, and reception fees
- Theoretically has authority to revoke licences
- Recent action: September 2024, administrative guidance after Senkaku incident on NHK Radio International

### BPO (Broadcasting Ethics and Program Improvement Organization)

- Founded 2003, non-governmental, self-regulatory
- Jointly operated by NHK and JBA (Japan Commercial Broadcasters Association)
- Three committees: Ethics Verification, Human Rights, Youth Protection
- Decisions are NOT legally binding — rely on voluntary compliance
- NHK co-funds BPO — structural independence compromised

### Key BPO Decisions Regarding NHK

Year	Case	Ruling
2015	Close-up Gendai — staging allegations	Serious breach of broadcasting ethics
2022	BS Olympic Documentary (Naomi Kawase)	Serious breach — false subtitles
2023	News Watch 9 — COVID-19 reporting	Breach — vaccine families misrepresented

## International Reference

- RSF Press Freedom Index: Japan 2024 Rank 70 (far behind CH: 9, NO: 1)
- Freedom House: Japan classified as "free", but media freedom under pressure (kisha clubs, government proximity)

## Structural Background

NHK is the world's largest public broadcaster by budget (~720 billion JPY / ~4.5 billion EUR). Formal independence is structurally limited through the Board of Governors (12 members appointed by the Prime Minister with parliamentary consent). The kisha club system restricts access to government information to accredited media and fosters proximity between journalists and government.



## 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 reality you see the frame someone has placed around it. Framing is the oldest and most elegant manipulation technique in the world. It doesn't change the facts – it changes what we make of the facts. How we feel. What we believe. How we decide. And it works – because we all play along. Every day. Unconsciously. You too. This book is not a dry textbook. It is a workbook – playful, direct, full of real-life examples. You don't just learn how others frame you. You learn how you yourself frame – and how you can use it consciously and fairly.

Because whoever understands framing sees the world more clearly. Hears news differently. Conducts conversations more confidently. And no longer so easily accepts a frame chosen by someone else.



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

With many exercises and concrete examples from politics, media and everyday life – and the occasional smile.

**Framing with style. Because the frame changes everything.**