



## NHK 詳細分析

2026-05-03\_radio\_news\_0900

Broadcast: 2026-05-03 | Analyzed: 2026-05-13 13:10

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

### OVERALL SCORE

**3.2/10**

*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 Government: Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) + Komeito coalition government. Continuous since 2012 (excluding the Democratic Party government period from 2009 to 2012). In the House of Representatives election on 27 October 2024, LDP fell back to 191 seats, dropping below an absolute majority. Current Prime Minister is Sanae Takaichi (as of 2025).

Major Opposition Parties: Constitutional Democratic Party (CDP, 148 seats) is the largest opposition party, followed by Japan Innovation Party (Ishin, 38 seats), Democratic Party for the People (DPP, 28 seats), Komeito (24 seats), Reiwa Shinsengumi (9 seats), and Japanese Communist Party (JCP, 8 seats).

Party	L-R Score	Seats	Government/Opposition	Key Policies
Japanese Communist Party (JCP)	1.5	8	Opposition	Uphold Article 9, immediate nuclear phase-out, anti-rearmament
Social Democratic Party (SDP)	2.5	1	Opposition	Pacifism, nuclear phase-out, constitutionalism
Reiwa Shinsengumi	2.5	9	Opposition	Abolish consumption tax, MMT, anti-rearmament
Constitutional Democratic Party (CDP)	3.5	148	Opposition	Constitutionalism, renewable energy, separate surnames for married couples
Komeito	5.0	24	Government	Pacifism, social security, coalition brake role
Democratic Party for the People (DPP)	5.5	28	Middle	Consumption tax 5%, realistic security, separate surnames for married couples
Liberal Democratic Party (LDP)	7.0	191	Government	Constitutional revision, defence spending increase, nuclear restart
Japan Innovation Party (Ishin)	7.0	38	Opposition	Deregulation, regional autonomy system, constitutional revision
Sanseito	9.0	3	Opposition	Ultra-nationalism, anti-globalism

*Pew threshold: below 4.5 = left-wing, 4.5–5.5 = centrist, above 5.5 = right-wing*

Japan's political fault lines are primarily concentrated in four areas. First, the confrontation between constitutionalists (CDP, JCP, SDP) and constitutional revisionists (LDP, Ishin) over amendment of Article 9 of the Constitution. Second, the divide between those advocating immediate decommissioning and those promoting restarts in nuclear energy policy. Third, the security policy divide over achieving GDP ratio of 2% for defence spending and acquiring counter-strike capabilities. Fourth, the conservative-progressive cleavage over social values such as separate surnames for married couples and LGBTQ rights. With LDP falling below an absolute majority in the 2024 House of Representatives election, the stability of the government and its ability to implement policies are being called into question.



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

NHK is a public broadcaster based on the Broadcasting Act, and Broadcasting Act Article 4 mandates political fairness, accuracy in reporting, and presentation of multifaceted viewpoints. Because the 12 members of the Board of Governors are appointed by the Prime Minister (with Diet consent), criticism that NHK is "close to the Prime Minister's Office" has been continuously raised by academia and civil society since the Abe government era (2012–2020). In the press freedom ranking of Reporters Without Borders (RSF), Japan remains at 70th place (2024), and the kisha club system has created a structural imbalance in information access.



## CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

### Party-by-Party Scores

Party	Score (-5 to +5)	Representation in Broadcast vs Party Platform
LDP	+2	00:00:03 "Prime Minister Takaichi" — Party platform: FOIP, energy security, critical minerals procurement — Reported in a manner consistent with the party platform, but without critical examination. The content of the platform is accurately reflected, but presented in a unilaterally positive context.
CDP	0	Not mentioned — Party platform: constitutionalism, nuclear phase-out, renewable energy — Completely absent. Score of 0 reflects "not mentioned."
Komeito	0	Not mentioned — Party platform: pacifism, social security — Completely absent.
Ishin	0	Not mentioned — Party platform: deregulation, constitutional revision — Completely absent.
JCP	0	Not mentioned — Party platform: constitutionalism, immediate nuclear phase-out, anti-rearmament — Completely absent.
DPP	0	Not mentioned — Party platform: consumption tax 5%, realistic security — Completely absent.

### Party Bias Summary

- Most accurate representation: LDP (Score +2) — Reported in a manner consistent with the party platform, but the presentation in a unilaterally positive context is problematic.
- Greatest distortion: None applicable (all opposition parties are not mentioned)
- Average deviation from 0: 0.3 (LDP's +2 averaged over 6 parties)
- Conclusion: This broadcast reports only on the LDP government's diplomatic activities, with all 6 opposition parties going entirely unmentioned. This indicates a structural preferential treatment of the LDP government, but the formal constraints of a news bulletin must be taken into account. The fact that there is zero reference to the opposition parties' foreign policies creates tension with the principle of political fairness under Broadcasting Act Article 4.

### Overall Tendency on the Left-Right Spectrum

TENDENCY SCORE: -0.8

(Positive value = left-wing favouring, negative value = right-wing favouring, 0.0 = balanced)

Classification: Right-wing favouring (mild)

Rationale: This broadcast reports on the LDP government's (L-R score 7.0) diplomatic activities without critical examination, and completely omits the perspectives of opposition parties (particularly left-wing parties such as CDP and JCP). The LDP government's policy priorities of energy security, FOIP, and fossil fuel cooperation are placed at the centre of the agenda, while the policy priorities of left-wing parties — constitutionalism, nuclear phase-out, and anti-rearmament — are excluded from the agenda. However, the point that the Trump administration's (right-wing populist) declining approval ratings are reported in a negative context shows a complex structure that cannot be characterised as simple right-wing favouring. Overall, a mild tendency of right-wing (LDP government) favouring is confirmed in domestic Japanese politics.



## CHAPTER 2 — PROGRAMME INFORMATION AND TOPIC FRAMEWORK

### Broadcast Data

- Title: NHK News 9 o'clock (estimated)
- Date (from filename): 2025 (specific date cannot be determined from transcript)
- Estimated Broadcast Duration: Approximately 5 minutes (portion of transcript provided)
- Anchor/Reporter: Not identifiable (no names recorded in transcript)
- Guests: None (studio read-aloud format, no interview subjects)

Actors	Position	Party/Affiliation	Political Spectrum
Sanae Takaichi (mention only)	Prime Minister	LDP	Right-wing (hardline conservative within LDP)
Albanese (mention only)	Prime Minister of Australia	Labor Party	Centre-left
Donald Trump (mention only)	President of the United States	Republican Party	Right-wing populist

### Main Themes

A two-story news report covering Prime Minister Takaichi's visits to Vietnam and Australia (energy security and critical minerals cooperation) and the declining approval ratings of the Trump administration.

### Ideological Context

Energy security has become one of the highest-priority issues in Japan's foreign policy since Russia's invasion of Ukraine. Stable procurement of LNG and strengthening of supply chain resilience for critical minerals form the core of the LDP government's "Free and Open Indo-Pacific (FOIP)" strategy. Meanwhile, reporting on the Trump administration's approval ratings is of high interest to Japanese viewers because US foreign policy (tariffs, military actions) directly affects Japan's security and economy. As of 2025, US-China tensions and the tariff war are intensifying, and Japan's diplomatic positioning is being questioned.

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

- \* Specific content of Prime Minister Takaichi's FOIP speech and its diplomatic implications for China and Russia
- \* Consistency of LNG procurement cooperation with environmental and climate change policy (contradiction with decarbonisation targets)
- \* Contrast with opposition parties' (CDP, JCP, Reiwa) energy and foreign policy
- \* Legal binding force and effectiveness of the joint statement that "export controls will not be imposed without reason"
- \* Political stance and reliability of the data source (RealClearPolitics) for Trump approval rating data
- \* Japan's official government position on Trump administration policies (tariffs, Iran military operation)
- \* Environmental and human rights risks in critical minerals cooperation (issues at mining sites)
- \* Criticism of foreign policy from domestic opposition parties and civil society
- \* Connection to US midterm elections (context of a verdict on the Trump administration)
- \* Geopolitical significance of Vietnam's cooperation on crude oil procurement (connection to South China Sea issues)

### Confirmation of How Each Perspective Is Handled

[A] Not mentioned



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

Timestamp: 00:00:51 — Quote: "delivered a speech on a diplomatic policy that has evolved the Free and Open Indo-Pacific" — Assessment: The existence of the speech was mentioned, but no details of the content or critical examination were provided whatsoever.

[B] Not mentioned

Timestamp: 00:00:15 — Quote: "a joint statement aimed at the smooth distribution of energy, including LNG, liquefied natural gas" — Assessment: No mention of contradiction with climate change or decarbonisation goals.

[C] Not mentioned

Timestamp: N/A — Quote: None — Assessment: There is absolutely no reference to opposition parties' foreign or energy policy.

[D] Partially mentioned

Timestamp: 00:01:37 — Quote: "is expected to compile a joint statement confirming that export controls will not be imposed without reason" — Assessment: Reported as a "prospect," but no examination of legal binding force or effectiveness.

[E] Partially mentioned

Timestamp: 00:02:24 — Quote: "according to the American political information site RealClearPolitics" — Assessment: The source was identified, but no critical examination of RCP's political stance or methodology.

[F] Not mentioned

Timestamp: N/A — Quote: None — Assessment: Japan's official government position on Trump administration policies was not reported.

[G] Not mentioned

Timestamp: 00:01:48 — Quote: "cooperation regarding critical minerals produced in Australia" — Assessment: No mention of environmental or human rights issues associated with mining.

[H] Not mentioned

Timestamp: N/A — Quote: None — Assessment: Critical perspectives from domestic opposition parties and civil society are completely absent.

[I] Partially mentioned

Timestamp: 00:01:57 — Quote: "also becomes an opportunity for voters to pass judgment on the Trump administration" — Assessment: The connection to midterm elections was suggested, but no specific electoral information or contextual explanation was provided.

[J] Not mentioned

Timestamp: 00:00:36 — Quote: "confirmed cooperation on Vietnam's procurement of crude oil" — Assessment: No mention of the South China Sea issue or geopolitical implications.



## CHAPTER 3 — 15 Criteria: DETAILED ANALYSIS

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

#### 1. Expert Selection

2/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

#### Expert 1: RealClearPolitics (cited as data source)

**Timestamp** 00:02:24

**Statement** "according to the American political information site RealClearPolitics, based on the average of various opinion polls as of the 1st of this month"

Characterisation: A US political information aggregation site. Provides polling averages.

Missing counter-argument: Independent polling organisations (Gallup, Pew Research, etc.) or academic perspectives critical of RCP's methodology.

#### Detailed Verification of Information Sources:

**(a) Funding:** RealClearPolitics is operated by a private company (RealClearMedia Group). An affinity with conservative media has been noted, and it received methodological criticism regarding its coverage of the 2020 presidential election results.

**(b) Mandate:** Aggregating and averaging polls is methodologically valid, but if the selection criteria for which polls to include are not transparent, the results can be biased.

#### **(c) Reliability Matrix (Source Traffic Light, 6 dimensions, each -2 to +2):**

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Affinity with conservative media, questions about transparency of methodology

D2 Personal risk: 0 — Professes to take a neutral position as an organisation

D3 Professional competence: +1 — Expertise in poll aggregation is acknowledged, but it is not an academic institution

D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — Consistent, as it continuously publishes data

D5 Emotionalisation vs data: +1 — Presents numerical data with low emotional appeal

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary information (aggregation of individual surveys)

**TOTAL: +2 → Source Traffic Light: Yellow (-4 to +4)**

**(c) PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE:** RCP is presented as a "neutral data aggregation site," but there is no explanation to viewers of RCP's character or limitations, and the premise of neutrality is unverified. This is also a problem under Criterion 12 (source selection).

#### Missing Expert Groups:

- Independent polling experts (researchers from Gallup, Pew, etc.)
- US political scientists (structural factor analysis of Trump approval ratings)
- Japanese foreign policy experts (assessment of Takaichi's diplomacy)

#### Source Credibility Overview:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
RealClearPolitics (cited as data source)	-1	0	+1	+1	+1	0	+2	Yellow



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

*Summary (Matrix Results):*

- RealClearPolitics: Yellow (+2) — Functions as a data source, but is problematic in being presented as "objective data" without explanation of its methodology or political stance.



## 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: RealClearPolitics

**Timestamp** 00:02:24 — Statement: "according to the American political information site RealClearPolitics"

**(a) Funding and operating entity:** Private company (RealClearMedia Group). An affinity with conservative media has been noted.

**(b) Structural conflict of interest:** As it holds the authority to select and exclude individual surveys, subjective elements may enter into the calculation of averages.

**(c) Missing counter-sources:** No comparison with data from independent polling organisations such as Gallup, Pew Research Center, or FiveThirtyEight.

### Source 2: Japanese Government (Prime Minister Takaichi / Ministry of Foreign Affairs)

**Timestamp** 00:00:03–00:01:50 — Statement: All government announcement read-alouds in general

**(a) Funding:** National budget (public institution)

**(b) Structural conflict of interest:** The government has an institutional incentive to evaluate its own diplomatic activities positively.

**(c) Missing counter-sources:** Opposition party assessments of foreign policy, analysis by independent foreign policy experts, perspectives from the counterpart countries (Vietnam, Australia).

*Summary: The only sources cited in this broadcast are the government announcement and RCP, and the voices of independent experts, opposition parties, and civil society are completely absent. The diversity of sources is remarkably low, creating tension with the obligation to present multifaceted viewpoints under Broadcasting Act Article 4.*



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

Estimated speaking time:

- Reporting related to Prime Minister Takaichi (government diplomatic activities): Approximately 1 minute 50 seconds (approximately 37%)
- Reporting on Trump administration approval ratings: Approximately 2 minutes 10 seconds (approximately 43%)
- Anchor read-aloud (neutral transitional portions): Approximately 1 minute (approximately 20%)
- Opposition parties/critical perspectives: 0 seconds (0%)
- Expert commentary: 0 seconds (0%)

*Summary: Speaking time is concentrated on government and administration-side information, and time allocated to critical perspectives, opposition parties, and independent experts is zero. Even taking into account the formal constraints of a news bulletin, this is problematic from the perspective of presenting multifaceted viewpoints.*



## 4. SELECTIVE OMISSIONS

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Omission 1:

#### Context

Critical assessments of the Takaichi diplomacy from opposition parties and civil society

Relevant Timestamps: 00:00:03–00:01:50

#### Impact

The government's diplomatic activities are reported one-sidedly, and the domestic political context (opposition reactions, Diet deliberations) is completely absent. Viewers cannot recognise the domestic political divisions over foreign policy.

### Omission 2:

#### Context

The contradiction between LNG/fossil fuel cooperation and Japan's decarbonisation targets

Relevant Timestamps: 00:00:15, 00:01:33

#### Impact

The expression "smooth distribution of energy" conceals the tension with climate change policy. In the context of Japan having declared 2050 carbon neutrality, failure to report the contradiction of expanding LNG cooperation is a significant omission.

### Omission 3:

#### Context

Multifaceted perspectives in the analysis of factors behind Trump's declining approval ratings

Relevant Timestamps: 00:02:48–00:03:49

#### Impact

"Tariffs," "government shutdown," and "Iran military operation" are listed as factors in the approval rating decline, but the logic of Trump supporters, reasons why approval ratings remain at a certain level, and assessments within the Republican Party are not mentioned at all.

*Summary: The omissions are systematic, and both the critical perspective on the government's diplomatic activities and the positive perspective on the Trump administration are absent. This asymmetric pattern of omissions creates tension with the obligation to present multifaceted viewpoints under Broadcasting Act Article 4.*

## Missing Voices

- Opposition party (CDP, JCP) foreign policy spokespeople: Could have provided critical assessments of the Takaichi government's FOIP strategy.
- Independent energy economists: Could have analysed the economic rationale of LNG procurement and its contradiction with decarbonisation targets.
- Climate change policy experts: Could have examined whether LNG and fossil fuel cooperation is consistent with Japan's 2050 carbon neutrality target.
- International law scholars: Could have assessed the legal binding force and effectiveness of the joint statement not to impose export controls.
- Independent US political scientists: Could have explained the methodological limitations and political context of RealClearPolitics data.



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

- Vietnam and Southeast Asia regional experts: Could have explained the geopolitical significance of Japan-Vietnam energy cooperation (relation to the South China Sea and China).
- Environmental and human rights NGOs from critical mineral mining areas: Could have raised environmental and indigenous rights issues associated with critical mineral production in Australia.
- Japanese consumer and civic organisations: Could have represented the impact of energy policy on domestic electricity prices and living costs.



## 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 00:02:28

Figure: "40.9% of respondents said they support the administration of President Trump, the lowest level since the launch of the second Trump administration."

#### Missing context

① The expression "lowest level" is used, but there is no comparison with previous presidents. ② There is no explanation of RCP's survey selection methodology. ③ No benchmark (historical average, international comparison) is provided for whether 40.9% approval is "low."

#### Impact

The expression "lowest level" gives the impression of indicating an absolute low, but without context, viewers cannot make an appropriate assessment.

### Finding 2:

Timestamp 00:02:46

Figure: "56.4% of respondents said they do not support."

#### Missing context

The breakdown of non-supporters (strongly disapprove vs. somewhat disapprove), regional and age-based distribution, and margin of error are not provided.

#### Impact

Simple presentation of figures oversimplifies the complex structure of public opinion.

*Summary: Figures are presented with a source cited, but comparative benchmarks, methodological explanations, and contextual information are absent, impeding viewers' appropriate assessment. It cannot be called serious numerical manipulation, but the incompleteness of information is problematic.*



## 6. Guilt by Association

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Association 1:

#### Timestamp

00:02:57

#### Quote

*"after announcements regarding Mexico, Canada, and also China, approval ratings gradually fell"*

Technique: Directly linking the Trump administration's approval rating decline to specific policies (tariffs, military actions), implying a causal relationship that these policies are "the cause of the approval rating decline."

#### Impact

This has the effect of conflating correlation with causation and framing the Trump administration's policies overall in a negative light.

*Summary: The technique of guilt by association is limited in this broadcast, and is used mildly primarily in the context of linking the Trump administration's policies with the approval rating decline. A score of 2 reflects a minor problem.*



## 7. Timing

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Position: 00:00:03 (opening)

Content: "Prime Minister Takaichi, who is visiting Vietnam, will depart for Australia, the next country on her itinerary, after this."

Timing effect: Placing the government's diplomatic activity at the opening of the broadcast positions it as the most important news. Information at the opening is most likely to remain in viewers' memory (primacy effect).

### Finding 2:

Position: 00:01:57 (transition to middle)

Content: "also becomes an opportunity for voters to pass judgment on the Trump administration"

Timing effect: The transition from reporting on the Japanese government's diplomatic achievements to reporting on the Trump administration's declining approval ratings produces an implicit contrast effect. The composition of "successful Japanese diplomacy" versus "Trump administration with falling approval ratings."

*Summary: The order in which information is placed has the effect of framing the Japanese government positively and the Trump administration negatively. There is no evidence of intentional manipulation, but a structural asymmetry exists.*



## 8. Selective Indignation

2/10

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): Record the triggering event before each assessment. A reaction is assessed as selective only when a similar trigger with another position did not produce a similar reaction.*

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 00:03:38

Triggering event: Mention of "the military operation against Iran that began in February this year"

Reaction: Listed as a factor in approval rating decline (negative context)

### Comparison

Japan's defence spending increase and acquisition of counter-strike capabilities (similarly military actions) are not mentioned in a critical context within the same broadcast.

Asymmetry: Mildly confirmable — US military actions are mentioned negatively in the context of approval rating decline, but Japan's military policy expansion is reported without a critical context. However, the two are different news items and there are limits to direct comparison.

*Summary: Selective indignation is mild in this broadcast, and manifests primarily as an asymmetric tone in the mention of US military actions and Japan's military policy expansion. A score of 2 reflects a minor problem.*



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

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

Share of covered perspectives

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



## Soft Facts — 6 qualitative techniques

### 10. Framing

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

#### Finding 1:

Timestamp	00:00:03
Quote	<i>"Prime Minister Takaichi, who is visiting Vietnam, will depart for Australia, the next country on her itinerary, after this."</i>
Manipulation	Prime Minister Takaichi's overseas visit is framed positively as "active diplomacy accumulating results."

Problem: By presenting the government's actions as a *fait accompli* without the purpose, background, or critical assessment of the diplomatic activity, viewers are given the impression of "diplomacy proceeding smoothly."

#### Finding 2:

Timestamp	00:00:44
Quote	<i>"Prime Minister Takaichi, having concluded her series of engagements in Vietnam, will depart for Australia, the next country on her itinerary, after this."</i>
Manipulation	The expression "having concluded her series of engagements" implies the success and completion of the diplomacy.

Problem: Without verification of the substantive outcomes or content of agreements from the talks, the completion of a schedule is framed as "success."

#### Finding 3:

Timestamp	00:01:57
Quote	<i>"also becomes an opportunity for voters to pass judgment on the Trump administration"</i>
Manipulation	Framing the midterm elections as a "judgment" on the Trump administration sets a context that presupposes a negative evaluation.

Problem: The word "judgment" carries judicial and punitive connotations, and compared to neutral terms such as "election" or "vote," it contains a specific political evaluation.

*Summary: The Japanese government's diplomatic activities are consistently framed positively and in terms of results, while the Trump administration is framed in a negative context. This asymmetry is mild, but creates tension with the principle of political fairness under Broadcasting Act Article 4.*



## 11. Word Choice and Terminology

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Timestamp

00:01:37

Quote

*"is expected to compile a joint statement confirming that export controls will not be imposed without reason"*

Manipulation

The expression "joint statement" (likely a transcription or reading error for "共同声明") emphasises the firmness of the agreement.

Problem: Combining the reservation "prospect" with the strong word "joint statement" creates the impression that an unconfirmed agreement is already a fait accompli. The neutral expression would be "is considering a joint statement."

### Finding 2:

Timestamp

00:01:57

Quote

*"becomes an opportunity for voters to pass judgment"*

Manipulation

"Judgment" (さばき) is a word with connotations of legal and moral sanction.

Problem: A neutral alternative expression would be "an opportunity for voters to evaluate" or "an election in which the will of the people is tested." "Judgment" contains a value judgement that presupposes a negative evaluation of the Trump administration.

### Finding 3:

Timestamp

00:00:56

Quote

*"appealed for the necessity of responses in light of the current international situation"*

Manipulation

The verb "appeal" emphasises the legitimacy and urgency of the claim.

Problem: By expressing a government policy announcement as "appealing," it bestows moral legitimacy on that claim. The neutral expression would be "stated" or "announced."

*Summary: In vocabulary selection, positive and active verbs are used for the actions of the Japanese government, while words with negative connotations are used for the Trump administration. This asymmetry is mild but consistent.*



## 12. Anchor Behaviour

1/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

*Methodological Principle (v2.2): Record the triggering event before each assessment. An intervention is assessed as asymmetric only when a similar trigger with another guest did not produce a similar intervention.*

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 00:00:03–00:01:50

Triggering event: Report on Prime Minister Takaichi's overseas visit (read-aloud of government announcement)

**Quote (anchor)** "Prime Minister Takaichi, who is visiting Vietnam," (read-aloud format)

**Comparison** This broadcast is in studio read-aloud format with no interview subjects present. Structurally, there is no opportunity for the anchor to ask questions or make interruptions.

Asymmetry: Cannot be confirmed — Cannot be assessed due to formal constraints.

*Summary: As this broadcast is in news bulletin read-aloud format and contains no interviews or discussions, it is difficult to empirically assess asymmetry in anchor behaviour. A score of 1 reflects the structural problem of reading out government announcements without critical examination.*



### 13. Question Asymmetry

1/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

#### Asymmetry 1:

This broadcast is in studio read-aloud format with no interview-style questions. Therefore, it is structurally impossible to empirically assess asymmetry in the hardness or softness of questions.

*Summary: As no question format exists, direct assessment of this criterion is impossible. A score of 1 reflects the fact that the structure of uncritically reading out government announcements structurally eliminates the opportunity for critical questions.*



<b>14. False Balance</b>									<b>2/10</b>
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

#### Finding 1:

##### Timestamp

00:02:28–00:03:49

Structure: Presentation of figures "40.9% support" versus "56.4% do not support"

##### Analysis

The presentation of the figures themselves is balanced, but in the causal analysis of the approval rating decline, only factors explaining the decline (tariffs, shutdown, military operation) are listed, and factors explaining why approval ratings remain at a certain level (the logic of supporters, assessment of economic policy) are not mentioned. This is not a false balance, but rather a one-directional presentation of causality.

*Summary: In this broadcast, one-directional presentation of information is a greater problem than false balance. A score of 2 reflects a minor problem.*



## 15. Agenda Setting

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Agenda element set: "Strengthening energy security is Japan's top diplomatic priority"

#### Timestamp

00:00:15 — Basis: "a joint statement aimed at the smooth distribution of energy, including LNG, liquefied natural gas, is expected to be compiled"

Alternative agenda: A diplomatic strategy prioritising decarbonisation and transition to renewable energy; moving away from fossil fuel dependence.

### Finding 2:

Agenda element set: "FOIP (Free and Open Indo-Pacific) is a legitimate framework for Japan's diplomacy"

#### Timestamp

00:00:51 — Basis: "delivered a speech on a diplomatic policy that has evolved the Free and Open Indo-Pacific"

Alternative agenda: Critical assessments of FOIP from China and ASEAN countries; the possibility of a multipolar diplomatic order.

### Finding 3:

Agenda element set: "The decline in the Trump administration's approval ratings is important news that should be reported as objective fact"

#### Timestamp

00:01:57–00:03:49 — Basis: Detailed reporting of approval rating data

Alternative agenda: Analysis of Japan's relationship with and approach to the Trump administration; analysis of policy impacts on Japan.

*Summary: In agenda setting, the LDP government's diplomatic line (FOIP, energy security, fossil fuel cooperation) is established as a self-evident premise, and alternative diplomatic lines and critical perspectives are excluded from the agenda. This creates tension with the obligation to present multifaceted viewpoints under Broadcasting Act Article 4.*



## CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

### OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

#### Individual Scores — All 15 Criteria

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

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

**3.6/10**

*Slight imbalance*

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

**2.8/10**

*Slight imbalance*

#### OVERALL SCORE

**3.2/10**

*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 ASSESSMENT (Broadcasting Act Article 4)

### Assessment Based on Broadcasting Act Article 4

Broadcasting Act Article 4 obliges broadcasters to maintain political fairness (Item 2), accuracy in reporting (Item 3), and multifaceted presentation of viewpoints (Item 4).

#### Violation 1:

Standard: Broadcasting Act Article 4, Item 4 (obligation to present multifaceted viewpoints)

Facts: In reporting on Prime Minister Takaichi's overseas visits, only government announcements are read aloud, and there is a complete absence of reference to opposition parties' assessments of foreign policy, analysis by independent experts, and alternative diplomatic lines (decarbonisation priority, multipolar diplomacy).

Basis: Timestamp 00:00:03–00:01:50 — Quote: "Prime Minister Takaichi, who is visiting Vietnam" (followed by one-sided read-aloud of government announcements)

Assessment: Broadcasting Act Article 4, Item 4 requires "clarifying viewpoints from as many angles as possible." Reporting only government announcements and presenting no critical perspectives or alternative positions whatsoever creates tension with the intent of that item. However, taking into account the formal constraints of a news bulletin, caution is needed in determining a violation in a single short broadcast.

#### Violation 2:

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

Facts: The LDP government's diplomatic activities are reported in a positive context without critical examination, while the foreign policies of all 6 opposition parties are completely unmentioned.

Basis: Timestamp 00:00:03–00:01:50 (LDP government reporting), opposition party mention: zero

Assessment: The principle of political fairness requires balanced presentation of the positions of the government and opposition. While it is not realistic to cover all opposition parties in a single news bulletin, if opposition perspectives are systematically absent as a continuous reporting pattern, violations of that item may arise.

### Broadcasting Act Article 4 Overall Assessment

As this broadcast is a short news bulletin, it is difficult to determine a violation of Broadcasting Act Article 4 based on it alone. However, the structural problems of uncritical read-aloud of government announcements, complete absence of opposition perspectives, and absence of independent experts create tension with the intent of Broadcasting Act Article 4, Item 2 (political fairness) and Item 4 (multifaceted presentation of viewpoints). In particular, the systematic omission of alternative perspectives on energy policy and diplomatic lines has the effect of impeding viewers' multifaceted understanding. In legal assessment, it is necessary to examine not this broadcast alone but NHK's continuous reporting patterns as a whole, and this analysis should be positioned as one case study thereof. For effective compliance with Broadcasting Act Article 4, an editorial policy of actively incorporating critical perspectives, opposition positions, and the views of independent experts even in news bulletins is required.

### Detailed Verification of Sources (Mandatory: All Expert Institutions, NGOs, and Advisory Bodies Cited)

#### RealClearPolitics (RCP)

- 1. Funding:** Operated by a private company (RealClearMedia Group). Funds raised through advertising revenue and paid services. An affinity with conservative media (such as Fox News) has been noted.
- 2. Mandate:** Provides poll aggregation and averaging services. The transparency of survey selection criteria has been questioned, and it received methodological criticism regarding its coverage of the 2020 presidential election results.



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

**3. Conflict of interest:** As it holds the authority to include or exclude individual surveys, subjective elements may enter into the calculation of averages. There is a structural possibility of manipulating averages by selecting or excluding surveys that favour particular political positions.

**4. Reliability Matrix (Source Traffic Light, 6 dimensions, each -2 to +2):**

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 (affinity with conservative media, opacity in survey selection)

D2 Personal risk: 0 (professes to take a neutral position as an organisation)

D3 Professional competence: +1 (expertise in poll aggregation is acknowledged, but it is not an academic institution)

D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 (consistent due to continuous data publication)

D5 Emotionalisation vs data: +1 (presents numerical data with low emotional appeal)

D6 Source level: 0 (secondary information: aggregation of individual surveys)

**TOTAL: +2 → Source Traffic Light: Yellow (-4 to +4)**

**5. Counter-sources:** Alternative sources such as Gallup (independent non-profit), Pew Research Center (independent non-profit), and FiveThirtyEight (aggregation based on statistical methodology) exist, but are not cited in this broadcast.

Important: The introduction as "an American political information site" is a social attribution that conceals RCP's political stance and methodological limitations, and is not neutral fact-checking. For appropriate information provision to viewers, an explanation of RCP's character and limitations is necessary.

*This analysis was prepared based on Version 2.7-detail as a Broadcasting Act Article 4 compliance review. The subject of analysis is limited to information contained in the transcript, and does not include direct assessment of visual or audio information. In legal judgement, before using this analysis as a primary source, cross-referencing with the full broadcast context and continuous reporting patterns is necessary.*

## 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).

**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)



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

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.**