



KBS 상세 분석

2026-04-22_가상국가의 왕이 되다_풀영상_ 창 545회_KBS 26.4.21._

Broadcast: 2026-04-22 | Analyzed: 2026-05-13 13:50

Version 2.8-detail | Universal 2.8-detail | Konverter 3.4 (2026-05-20) | Standard: 방송법 제6조

**OVERALL
SCORE**

3.0/10

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	JP	RKP	DPK	RP	PPP
CHES	2.00	3.50	4.50	6.50	7.50
Spectrum	<i>Left</i>	<i>Left</i>	<i>Center</i>	<i>Right</i>	<i>Right</i>

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

TENDENCY (L – R)

4.5 / 10

Balanced

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

← Left

Right →

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

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



POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

Since the inauguration of President Lee Jae-myung (Democratic Party of Korea) in June 2025, the DPK has been the governing party. The PPP is operating as the main opposition party following the impeachment of former President Yoon Suk-yeol. Of the 300 seats in the National Assembly, the DPK holds approximately 162, the PPP approximately 107, the RKP 12, the JP 4, and the RP 3.

Party	CHES Left-Right	Seats	Governing/Opposition	Core Position
더불어민주당(DP)	4.5 (Centre-Left)	~162	Governing	Dialogue diplomacy, expanded welfare, prosecution reform
국민의힘(PPP)	7.5 (Right)	~107	Opposition	Hard-line North Korea policy, economic liberalisation, security strengthening
조국혁신당(RKP)	3.5 (Left)	12	Opposition (Progressive)	Prosecution reform, press independence
진보당(JP)	2.0 (Far-Left)	4	Opposition	Anti-US military, labour rights, reunification
개혁신당(RP)	6.5 (Centre-Right)	3	Opposition (Conservative)	Pro-market, generational justice

Since Yoon Suk-yeol's impeachment, the core conflict axis is the prosecution reform and judicial independence debate between the DPK and PPP. Ongoing ruling-opposition confrontations persist over North Korea policy (dialogue vs. sanctions), economic policy (welfare expansion vs. deregulation), and amendments to the Broadcasting Act (composition of the KBS and MBC boards of directors). The judicial risks associated with President Lee Jae-myung and the PPP's internal rebuilding process are also major sources of tension.

KBS and MBC are public broadcasters obligated to uphold fairness and public interest under the Broadcasting Act. Article 6 of the Broadcasting Act explicitly stipulates the fairness and diversity of broadcasting and imposes political neutrality in reporting as a legal obligation. Every successive administration has influenced editorial direction through the composition of public broadcaster boards of directors, and in 2025 the DPK's amendment to the Broadcasting Act expanded the size of those boards.



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Each party's official platform position is assessed in terms of how accurately it is represented in the programme. The score measures the accuracy of representation of the party's position, not whether the treatment is positive or negative.

Party	Score (-5~+5)	Programme Representation vs. Platform Position
더불어민주당(DP)	0	04:27 "This time, they targeted President Lee Jae-myung" — Platform position: Strengthening response to cybercrime — President Lee Jae-myung is mentioned as a target of swatting, but the DPK's policy position is not directly addressed [N/A]
국민의힘(PPP)	0	No PPP-related content in programme — Platform position: N/A [N/A]
조국혁신당(RKP)	0	No RKP-related content in programme [N/A]
진보당(JP)	0	No JP-related content in programme [N/A]
개혁신당(RP)	0	No RP-related content in programme [N/A]

Party Bias Summary

- Most accurate representation: N/A (no party is directly addressed in the programme)
- Strongest distortion: N/A
- Average deviation (from 0): 0.0
- Conclusion: This programme, as investigative reporting on juvenile cybercrime, does not directly address the policy positions of any specific party. President Lee Jae-myung is mentioned as a target of swatting, but this is part of factual case reporting and is unrelated to the DPK's policy positions. Accordingly, no bias is observed from the perspective of accuracy of party platform representation.



CHAPTER 2 — PROGRAMME INFORMATION AND TOPIC FRAMEWORK

Basic Programme Information

- Title: KBS Investigative Report (presumed) — Discord Virtual Nation and Swatting Crime Special
- Date: Based on transcript filename (specific date not stated)
- Presenter/Reporter: Reporting team (multiple; specific names unconfirmed)
- Interview Subjects:

Actors	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political Spectrum
Victim's mother (Jiwoo's mother)	Parent of swatting victim	None	N/A
Han Ji-woo (student)	Adolescent victim of Discord virtual nation	None	N/A
Jeong Min-gi (student)	Adolescent victim of Discord virtual nation	None	N/A
Mr. Jeon	Operator of large Discord server (victim and whistleblower)	None	N/A
Investigating police officer	Detective in charge of swatting case	National Police Agency	N/A
Police special forces officer	Explosives response special unit	National Police Agency	N/A
Cybersecurity expert (presumed)	Commentary on VPN and investigative technology	Private	N/A
Legal expert (presumed)	Commentary on sentencing levels and punitive damages	Private	N/A
Adolescent psychology expert (presumed)	Psychological analysis of virtual nation addiction	Private	N/A
Mr. Jo's defence counsel	Legal representative for the suspect	Private	N/A
Anonymous middle school student (Discord user)	Internal witness to virtual nation	None	N/A

Main Topics

An in-depth investigative report on the reality, harm, investigative limitations, and sentencing debate surrounding swatting (false bomb threats) crimes derived from Discord-based adolescent virtual nation culture.

World Context

Swatting first became a social problem in the United States; in South Korea, legal responses began in earnest following the creation of the public intimidation offence in 2024. Discord is a voice and chat platform primarily used by those in their teens and twenties, and its anonymity and server self-governance structure are being exploited as spaces for criminal planning. The key social issues are the sentencing level for juvenile cybercrime, the responsibilities of platform companies, and the limitations of international investigative cooperation. The balance



between victim protection and offender rehabilitation, as well as the psychological background of digitally marginalised youth, are also important axes of discussion.

Perspectives Required for Balanced Reporting

- The actual harm experienced by swatting victims (students, parents, businesses)
- The psychological background and social marginalisation factors of offending adolescents
- The technical limitations of investigative agencies and difficulties in international cooperation
- The appropriateness of current sentencing levels (under-punishment vs. need for juvenile rehabilitation)
- The legal and ethical responsibilities of platform companies such as Discord
- Legislative alternatives such as the introduction of punitive damages
- Comparative cases of punishment in other countries (e.g., the United States)
- Digital literacy education for adolescents and preventive measures
- Positive aspects of virtual nation culture (creativity, community) vs. risk of criminalisation
- The suspect's position and guarantee of due process

Review of Whether Each Perspective Was Addressed

[A] Addressed

Timestamp: 00:32~24:50 — Quote: "The police officer read out to us the actual content that had been written under my child's name" / "We have moved house and the shop is also just up for sale" — Assessment: The victim's experience is covered in sufficient detail and with emotional depth.

[B] Addressed

Timestamp: 14:06~15:19 — Quote: "They were living in a place where they felt somewhat marginalised" / "Ultimately it's about proving their own existence" — Assessment: The psychological background of the offending adolescents is analysed through the investigating officer and a psychology expert.

[C] Addressed

Timestamp: 16:55~35:11 — Quote: "Most VPN servers don't cooperate" / "It does come through eventually, but it takes quite a long time" — Assessment: The technical limitations of investigations and the difficulties of international cooperation are explained in concrete terms.

[D] Addressed

Timestamp: 43:14~47:02 — Quote: "Most received suspended sentences or fines" / "They learn: the law is weak. Just go in, cry a bit, write a few letters of remorse and you get off. They learn this as a group." — Assessment: The sentencing debate is covered, but the position advocating lenient punishment is almost entirely absent.

[E] Addressed (partially)

Timestamp: 32:58~33:36 — Quote: "Discord cooperates with law enforcement agencies around the world" / "They responded in general terms that all users can report violations of the guidelines" — Assessment: Discord's position is introduced, but it amounts only to a general statement with insufficient in-depth analysis.

[F] Addressed

Timestamp: 41:16~42:11 — Quote: "We should actively introduce so-called punitive damages into civil liability" — Assessment: Legislative alternatives are proposed through a legal expert.

[G] Addressed

Timestamp: 39:06~41:48 — Quote: "The swatting perpetrator was sentenced to 20 years in prison" / "In the United States, under federal law, up to 20 years can now be handed down" — Assessment: Cases from Germany and the United States are presented for comparison.

[H] Addressed (partially)

Timestamp: 46:57~47:16 — Quote: "The opportunity to meet real people. The opportunity to truly communicate with real people. Children need to be given the chance to experience a more solid real world like that." — Assessment: The emphasis leans towards punishment and real-world experience rather than preventive education.

[I] Addressed (partially)



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

Timestamp: 47:46~47:52 — Quote: "Discord itself is a very innocent and well-intentioned community platform meant for having fun. It's just being used maliciously." — Assessment: The positive aspects of the platform itself are briefly mentioned but not discussed in depth.

[J] Addressed (partially)

Timestamp: 44:53~45:43 — Quote: "He is acknowledging and reflecting on the parts he was involved in, and is now seeking forgiveness" / "He did not participate in some of the offences" — Assessment: The suspect's position is briefly introduced through defence counsel, but there is no opportunity for direct statement.



CHAPTER 3 — DETAILED ANALYSIS OF 15 CRITERIA

Hard Facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically verifiable

1. Expert Selection

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total Score: 4/10

Expert 1: Investigating police officer

Timestamp	14:06~16:45
Statement	"They were living in a place where they felt somewhat marginalised — marginalised at home or at school — but on Discord they were being treated as very important and valued"
Classification	Police officer directly in charge of the swatting case

Missing counterargument: Rehabilitation-centred perspective of an adolescent psychiatrist or juvenile law specialist

In-Depth Source Review:

(a) Funding: National Police Agency employee — operated with state funds

Conflict of interest: Law enforcement agencies have an institutional interest in securing budgets and personnel by emphasising the severity of crime

(b) Authority: Has expertise in criminal investigation but juvenile psychology and rehabilitation are outside the area of specialisation

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — The direction of harsher punishment aligns with the interests of the investigative agency

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Some professional risk exists in making public statements

D3 Expertise: +1 — Has practical investigative expertise, but limited in psychology and law

D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — Consistent position of the investigative agency

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: 0 — Mix of empirical observation and emotional expression

D6 Source tier: +1 — First-hand source based on direct investigative experience

TOTAL: +3 → Source traffic light: Yellow

(c) PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE: The law enforcement perspective is framed as neutral expert opinion, but there is a structural interest in the direction of harsher punishment → Relevant to Criterion 12 (Source Selection)

Expert 2: Legal expert (presumed)

Timestamp	41:16~42:01
Statement	"We can actively introduce so-called punitive damages into civil liability, so that not only criminal punishment but also financial disadvantage can provide us with the deterrent effect of punishment."
Classification	Legal expert (affiliation and name not disclosed)

Missing counterargument: Juvenile law rehabilitation principle specialist, legal scholar opposed to punitive damages



In-Depth Source Review:

(a) Funding: Private (affiliation unclear)

Conflict of interest: Difficult to assess conflict of interest due to unclear affiliation

(b) Authority: Has legal expertise, but expertise in juvenile law and rehabilitation is unclear

- D1 Conflict of interest: 0 — Affiliation unclear
- D2 Personal risk: 0 — Cannot be assessed
- D3 Expertise: +1 — Legal expertise presumed
- D4 Consistency of opinion: 0 — Past statements cannot be verified
- D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Relatively data-based statements
- D6 Source tier: 0 — Secondary analysis
- TOTAL: +2 → Source traffic light: Yellow**

(c) PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE: Only opinions in the direction of harsher punishment are presented, with no opposing legal scholar opinion

Expert 3: Adolescent psychology expert (presumed)

Timestamp	46:41~47:16
Statement	"The Discord issue, from the adolescent's perspective, was a means of confirming agency. They confirmed their agency, but they clearly did something wrong. But if they're not punished, these kids go wrong."
Classification	Adolescent psychology expert (affiliation and name not disclosed)

Missing counterargument: Adolescent psychiatrist emphasising treatment and rehabilitation over punishment

In-Depth Source Review:

(a) Funding: Private (affiliation unclear)

Conflict of interest: Affiliation unclear

(b) Authority: Adolescent psychology expertise presumed, but assessment of sentencing levels is outside the area of specialisation

- D1 Conflict of interest: 0 — Affiliation unclear
- D2 Personal risk: 0 — Cannot be assessed
- D3 Expertise: +1 — Adolescent psychology expertise presumed
- D4 Consistency of opinion: 0 — Past statements cannot be verified
- D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: 0 — Mix of psychological analysis and normative judgement
- D6 Source tier: 0 — Secondary analysis
- TOTAL: +1 → Source traffic light: Yellow**

(c) PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE: Statements are skewed towards emphasising the need for punishment, with no rehabilitation-centred perspective

Missing Expert Groups:

- Juvenile law specialist (analysis of the legal limits of harsher sentencing for adolescents)
- Adolescent psychiatrist (treatment- and rehabilitation-centred approach)
- Digital platform legal scholar (analysis of the scope of platform liability)

Source Credibility Overview:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Investigating police officer	-1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+3	Yellow
Legal expert (presumed)	0	0	+1	0	+1	0	+2	Yellow



Adolescent psychology expert (presumed)	0	0	+1	0	0	0	+1	Yellow
---	---	---	----	---	---	---	----	--------

Summary (Matrix Results):

- Investigating police officer: Yellow (+3) — Conflict of interest in the direction of harsher punishment
- Legal expert: Yellow (+2) — Affiliation unclear, bias towards harsher punishment
- Adolescent psychology expert: Yellow (+1) — Emphasis on need for punishment, rehabilitation perspective absent



2. Source Selection

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

Total Score: 4/10

Source 1: Investigating police officer

Timestamp

14:06~16:45 — Statement: "They were living in a place where they felt somewhat marginalised"

(a) Funding and operating entity: National Police Agency — state-funded

(b) Structural conflict of interest: Law enforcement agencies have an institutional interest in securing budgets and personnel by emphasising the severity of crime

(c) Missing counterargument sources: Juvenile law specialist, adolescent rehabilitation expert

Missing counterargument sources: Legal scholar or adolescent psychiatrist supporting lenient punishment

Source 2: Discord (written response)

Timestamp

33:10~33:36 — Statement: "Discord cooperates with law enforcement agencies around the world"

(a) Funding and operating entity: US private company — for-profit purpose

(b) Structural conflict of interest: Platform companies have an interest in opposing stricter regulation, and tend to minimise responsibility through general statements

(c) Missing counterargument sources: Legal scholars or civil society organisations advocating stricter platform regulation

Missing counterargument sources: Independent research analysing actual cases of Discord refusing to cooperate with investigations

Summary: Sources are concentrated on law enforcement and the victim's side, and there is a lack of sources representing diverse perspectives including the perpetrator's side, platform companies, and rehabilitation experts.



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

Total Score: 3/10

Estimated speaking time:

- Victim's side (parents, adolescent victims): approx. 18 minutes (38%)
- Law enforcement (police officers, special forces): approx. 10 minutes (21%)
- Experts (legal, psychology, cybersecurity): approx. 8 minutes (17%)
- Narration (reporting team): approx. 7 minutes (15%)
- Perpetrator's side (indirect relay by defence counsel): approx. 1 minute (2%)
- Discord (introduction of written response): approx. 1 minute (2%)
- Other (virtual nation participant adolescent witness): approx. 2 minutes (4%)

Summary: The victim's side and law enforcement account for approximately 59% of total speaking time, while the perpetrator's side and the platform company account for a combined 4%. This is imbalanced in light of the principle of balanced reflection of diverse opinions under Article 6 of the Broadcasting Act, but can be partially justified given the victim-centred nature of investigative reporting.



4. SELECTIVE EXCLUSION

5/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Total Score: 5/10

Omission 1:

Context Complete absence of direct statements from offending adolescents or family testimony

Relevant timestamp: 44:53~45:43 (only indirect relay by defence counsel exists)

Effect Direct information about the perspective, home environment, and motivation of offending adolescents is blocked, resulting in a one-sided victim-only narrative.

Omission 2:

Context Complete absence of expert opinions supporting lenient punishment

Relevant timestamp: 43:14~44:02 (only criticism presented after introducing suspended sentence and fine judgements)

Effect With no counterarguments regarding the juvenile rehabilitation principle, the purpose of juvenile law, or the recidivism prevention effect of lenient punishment, the discussion flows one-sidedly towards harsher punishment.

Omission 3:

Context Absence of positive usage cases of the Discord platform and the perspective of the majority of normal users

Relevant timestamp: 06:32~06:42 (Discord is only described in the context of crime when introduced)

Effect A platform used normally by millions of people is framed solely as a criminal tool, fostering a negative perception of the platform as a whole.

Summary: The structural omission of direct statements from the perpetrator's side, rehabilitation-centred expert opinions, and the context of normal platform usage structurally reinforces the programme's bias towards harsher punishment.

Missing Voices

- Adolescent psychiatrist: Could provide a perspective on clinical diagnosis and the need for treatment of offending adolescents
- Ministry of Education / School counsellors: Could present preventive education and early intervention measures in school settings
- Digital platform legal scholar: Could provide academic analysis of the scope of legal liability for platforms such as Discord
- Juvenile law specialist: Could explain the legal and constitutional limits of tougher sentencing for juveniles and the principle of rehabilitation



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

- The offending adolescent themselves or their family: Could provide direct testimony on the motivation for the offence and home environment
- General adolescent Discord users: Could provide a balanced perspective between the platform's normal usage culture and the risk of criminalisation
- NGO supporting cybercrime victims: Could explain the current state and limitations of the victim recovery support system
- Parliamentary legislative staff: Could explain the current state of legislative discussions on the public intimidation offence and punitive damages



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

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

Total Score: 2/10

Finding 1:

Timestamp 17:21~17:28

Figure: "Since the creation of the public intimidation offence last March and through to the end of the year, nearly 200 cases occurred. 130 people were caught, and of these, 11 were taken into custody."

Missing context	The ratio relative to total cybercrime, comparison with the number of similar offences in the previous year, and detection rate relative to reports are not provided.
Effect	By presenting only absolute figures, the numbers are used without the context needed to accurately convey the trend or severity of the crime, potentially creating a misleading impression of increased crime severity.

Summary: Numerical manipulation is not at a serious level, but the presentation of absolute figures without context can give a misleading impression of the severity of the crime.



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

Total Score: 1/10

Association 1:

Timestamp	15:22~15:26
Quote	"The reason they can be more cruel or dangerous than organised crime gangs"
	Technique: Maximising the criminality of juvenile swatting offenders by comparing them to organised crime (gangs).
Effect	Equating juvenile offenders with adult organised criminals to build public opinion in favour of harsher punishment.

In-Depth Source Review for the Individual Concerned:

- This statement is from the investigating police officer, and is consistent with the institutional interests of law enforcement in emphasising the severity of crime.
- Is the statement data-based: No — a subjective assessment by an investigator without a basis for comparison
- Is the core claim falsifiable: Yes — can be verified through comparison of actual scale of harm
- Risk-benefit analysis: Law enforcement agencies benefit from emphasising the severity of crime to secure budgets and personnel
- Result category: B — Borderline case (some basis, but exaggerated comparison)

Summary: Explicit guilt-by-association techniques are used to a limited extent, and appear mainly in comparative expressions used to exaggerate the severity of the crime.



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

Total Score: 3/10

Finding 1:

Position: 00:00~01:17 (opening)

Content: "I'm pulling the strings of the whole of South Korea. I have truly shaken the foundations of the justice system."

Timing effect: Placing the most extreme and grandiose statement from an offending adolescent in the opening fixes viewers' initial perception in the 'dangerous juvenile criminal' frame.

Finding 2:

Position: 04:27~04:53 (early)

Content: "This time, they targeted President Lee Jae-myung." / "Let's go for Lee Jae-myung. The full weight of investigative power will be mobilised spectacularly."

Timing effect: Placing the case involving the threat against President Lee Jae-myung early in the programme emphasises the political importance of the case and focuses viewers' attention. This has the effect of establishing the political context of the broadcast from the outset.

Finding 3:

Position: 46:13~47:16 (closing)

Content: "The kings of the virtual nations will step foot in the real world." / "Giving appropriate punishment is also what society must do."

Timing effect: Structuring the programme's conclusion with a message of harsher punishment leads viewers to recall the entire programme in the context of the need for harsher punishment.

Summary: A timing strategy is used whereby harsher punishment messages are strategically placed at the opening and closing to frame the entire programme's tone in the direction of harsher punishment.



8. Selective Outrage									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)

Total Score: 2/10

Methodological principle (v2.2): The triggering event must be documented before every assessment. A reaction can only be assessed as selective if a similar triggering event from a different position did not produce a similar reaction.

Finding 1:

Timestamp 43:52~44:02

Triggering event: Introduction of suspended sentence and fine judgement results

Reaction: "The law is weak. Just go in, cry a bit, write a few letters of remorse and you get off. They learn this. They learn this as a group."

Comparison

Excessively emotional statement from the victim's side (e.g., "I nearly died laughing" 00:51) — allowed without presenter intervention

Asymmetry: The expression of outrage at lenient punishment is presented as an expert statement, lending it authority, while the victim's emotional statements are received with empathy. However, since this stems from a difference in the role of the speaker (expert vs. victim), complete establishment of asymmetry is difficult.

Summary: Selective outrage is observed to a limited extent, and appears mainly in the way criticism of lenient punishment in the sentencing discussion is reinforced through expert authority.



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

9. COMPLETENESS									3/10
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).



Soft Facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. Framing

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total Score: 3/10

Finding 1:

Timestamp

00:00~01:17

Quote

"I'm pulling the strings of the whole of South Korea. I have truly shaken the foundations of the justice system."

Manipulation

The programme opens with the most grandiose and delusional statement from an offending adolescent, establishing the entire narrative as a 'dangerous juvenile criminal' frame.

Why it is problematic: It fixes viewers' initial perception so they receive the entire programme from the perspective of 'the threat of juvenile crime,' prioritising an individual criminalisation narrative over analysis of socio-structural causes.

Finding 2:

Timestamp

12:49~12:52

Quote

"In the virtual world they acted like kings, but in reality they kept their own world tightly hidden."

Manipulation

The narration defines the offending adolescents as 'kings of the virtual world,' constructing a frame that emphasises duplicity and deception.

Why it is problematic: It excludes the developmental-psychological context of adolescent online identity exploration and leads viewers to interpret it solely as criminal duplicity.

Finding 3:

Timestamp

46:13~46:20

Quote

"One day, when all the related trials are over, the kings of the virtual nations will step foot in the real world."

Manipulation

The closing narration once again defines the perpetrators as threatening figures using the expression 'kings of the virtual nations,' bringing the programme to an end.

Why it is problematic: Regardless of the trial outcomes, framing the offending adolescents as an ongoing threat produces the effect of building public opinion in favour of harsher punishment.



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

Summary: The entire programme is structured around the dichotomous frame of 'dangerous juvenile cybercriminals vs. innocent victims,' and lacks a balanced perspective on socio-structural causes or the possibility of rehabilitation.



11. Word Choice and Terminology

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total Score: 3/10

Finding 1:

Timestamp	15:22~15:26
Quote	"The reason they can be more cruel or dangerous than organised crime gangs"
Manipulation	The extreme expression of comparing juvenile swatting criminals to organised crime (gangs) as being 'more dangerous' is used.

Why it is problematic: The neutral alternative expression would be "serious cybercrime," and the comparison to organised crime exaggerates the severity of juvenile crime and inflames public opinion in favour of harsher punishment.

Finding 2:

Timestamp	07:50~07:53
Quote	"He gathered a thousand server members in the so-called Discord virtual nation, the 'Digye'."
Manipulation	The slang term 'Digye' is used as though it were an official term, a language choice that stigmatises that space as a criminal and abnormal world.

Why it is problematic: The neutral expression would be "Discord community," and the term 'Digye' has the effect of defining the entire space as a deviant one.

Finding 3:

Timestamp	27:47~27:54
Quote	"Later I realised this was becoming my shackles. I can't even leave. Then I'm really trapped in a prison I made myself."
Manipulation	The powerful metaphors of 'shackles' and 'prison' are placed as victim testimony, defining the entire Discord virtual nation as a space of confinement and exploitation.

Why it is problematic: Because this expression is presented as a victim's statement rather than narration, it carries stronger emotional persuasive force and reinforces a negative perception of the platform as a whole.

Summary: The programme repeatedly uses extreme and emotive language to describe offending adolescents and Discord spaces, which contributes to forming public opinion among viewers in favour of harsher punishment.



12. Presenter Behaviour

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total Score: 2/10

Methodological principle (v2.2): The triggering event must be documented before every assessment. An intervention can only be assessed as asymmetrical if a similar triggering event involving a different guest did not produce a similar intervention.

Finding 1:

Timestamp 45:04~45:12

Triggering event: Defence counsel for Mr. Jo conveying the suspect's intention to reflect

Quote (presenter) "What did he say he did it for? That person." / "Yes. Even so, just within what you can say having grasped the situation, because the viewers are curious."

Comparison During the victim's mother's statement (00:32~00:46) — emotional testimony allowed in full without presenter intervention

Asymmetry: A pressing question demanding additional information is put to the defence counsel, while the victim's side is given unlimited scope for emotional statements. However, since this is partly attributable to the difference in the role of the interviewee (defence counsel vs. victim), the asymmetry is not fully established.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 34:05~34:15

Triggering event: Cybersecurity expert explaining the possibilities of VPN tracking technology

Quote (presenter) "So not just VPN login records, but all IP access records, like CCTV like this"

Comparison When introducing Discord's general statement (33:10~33:36) — the presenter relays the general statement as is, with no separate critical question

Asymmetry: Active confirmatory questions are asked about the possibilities of investigative technology, while no critical follow-up questions are posed about Discord's responsibility. However, there are structural constraints arising from the difference in interview format (direct interview vs. written response), making it difficult to fully establish asymmetry.

Summary: Some asymmetry in presenter intervention is observed, but considering the difference in the roles of interviewees and the structural differences in interview format, it is difficult to conclude that this constitutes clear, intentional asymmetry. Overall, the presenter's behaviour is relatively neutral.



13. Question Asymmetry

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total Score: 3/10

Asymmetry 1:

To the victim's mother (00:32~00:46): Emotional testimony freely permitted, no additional verification questions — soft question

To Mr. Jo's defence counsel (45:04~45:12): "What did he say he did it for?" / "The viewers are curious" — pressing question demanding information

Comparison

While the victim's side is given unlimited scope for emotional statements, the perpetrator's defence counsel is subject to pressing questions demanding additional information. However, this is partly attributable to the difference in the roles of the interviewees.

Asymmetry 2:

To investigating police officer (33:42~34:15): "A way to get that authorisation faster, to shorten the time" — cooperative, solution-seeking question

To Discord (32:58~33:36): Written response relayed as is, no critical follow-up question — relay without verification

Comparison

Cooperative questions are directed at law enforcement, while no critical verification questions are posed regarding the platform company's general statement.

Summary: There is a tendency for cooperative and empathetic questions to be directed at victims and law enforcement, while relatively pressing or unverified questions are posed to the perpetrator's side and the platform company; however, given the nature of investigative reporting, it is difficult to characterise this as complete asymmetry.



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

Total Score: 2/10

Finding 1:

Timestamp 47:46~47:52

Composition: "Discord itself is a very innocent and well-intentioned community platform meant for having fun. It's just being used maliciously."

Analysis

By briefly mentioning the positive aspects of Discord in the final 2 minutes of the programme, it creates the appearance of balance; however, this perspective occupies an extremely small proportion of the full 47-minute programme. This amounts to nothing more than formal balance, not substantive balance.

Summary: False balance appears to a limited extent in the form of a perfunctory mention of Discord's positive aspects at the very end of the programme, and does not substantively resolve the imbalance of the programme as a whole.



15. Agenda Setting

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total Score: 4/10

Finding 1:

Established agenda element: Swatting is a serious crime for which punishment must be toughened, and current punishment is insufficient.

Timestamp

43:14~44:02 — Basis: Only critical expert statements presented after "most received suspended sentences or fines"

Alternative agenda: Empirical discussion of the juvenile rehabilitation principle, the purpose of juvenile law, and the recidivism prevention effect of lenient punishment

Finding 2:

Established agenda element: Discord virtual nations are a hotbed of juvenile crime.

Timestamp

06:26~07:13 — Basis: The introduction of Discord is framed only in the context of criminal planning

Alternative agenda: Cases of creative collaboration, social connection, and positive community formation among adolescents through Discord

Finding 3:

Established agenda element: The case involving the threat against President Lee Jae-myung is highlighted as a representative example of swatting crimes.

Timestamp

04:27~04:53 — Basis: "This time, they targeted President Lee Jae-myung" / "Let's go for Lee Jae-myung. The full weight of investigative power will be mobilised spectacularly."

Alternative agenda: The proportion the presidential threat case represents among all swatting cases, comparison with harm suffered by ordinary citizens

Summary: The programme sets the need for harsher punishment and the criminal nature of Discord as self-evident premises, and produces a political agenda-setting effect by highlighting the case involving the threat against President Lee Jae-myung as the representative example.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual Scores — All 15 Criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Rating
1	Expert Selection	4/10	<i>Slight imbalance</i>
2	Source Selection	4/10	<i>Slight imbalance</i>
3	Airtime Allocation	3/10	<i>Slight imbalance</i>
4	SELECTIVE EXCLUSION	5/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
5	Numerical Manipulation	2/10	<i>Unremarkable</i>
6	GUILT BY ASSOCIATION	1/10	<i>Unremarkable</i>
7	Timing	3/10	<i>Slight imbalance</i>
8	Selective Outrage	2/10	<i>Unremarkable</i>
9	COMPLETENESS	3/10	<i>Slight imbalance</i>
10	Framing	3/10	<i>Slight imbalance</i>
11	Word Choice and Terminology	3/10	<i>Slight imbalance</i>
12	Presenter Behaviour	2/10	<i>Unremarkable</i>
13	Question Asymmetry	3/10	<i>Slight imbalance</i>
14	False Balance	2/10	<i>Unremarkable</i>
15	Agenda Setting	4/10	<i>Slight imbalance</i>

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

3.0/10

Slight imbalance

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

3.0/10

Slight imbalance

OVERALL SCORE

3.0/10

Slight imbalance

Average of Hardfacts and Softfacts



KEY — Score Definitions

Individual Scores per Criterion (0–10)

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

Aggregated Deviation Index — Interpretation Ranges

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

Party-Political Bias (-5 to +5)

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



CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL CLASSIFICATION (Broadcasting Act Article 6)

Assessment Under Article 6 of the Broadcasting Act

Article 6 of the Broadcasting Act stipulates the fairness and public interest of broadcasting; reporting must be fair and objective, and diverse opinions must be reflected in a balanced manner.

Violation 1:

Standard: Article 6(2) of the Broadcasting Act (balanced reflection of diverse opinions)

Violation content: Complete absence of a direct statement opportunity for the offending adolescent's side and structural omission of rehabilitation-centred expert opinions

Basis: Timestamp 44:53~45:43 — Quote: "He is acknowledging and reflecting on the parts he was involved in, and is now seeking forgiveness" (only indirect relay by defence counsel exists)

Assessment: The fact that no direct statement opportunity was provided to the suspect's side and only indirect relay by defence counsel was permitted is potentially in violation of the principle of balanced reflection of diverse opinions required by Article 6(2) of the Broadcasting Act. However, given that a victim-centred narrative is unavoidable given the nature of investigative reporting, whether this constitutes a violation requires further scrutiny.

Violation 2:

Standard: Article 6(1) of the Broadcasting Act (fair and objective reporting)

Violation content: Consistent agenda-setting towards harsher punishment and complete exclusion of expert opinions supporting lenient punishment

Basis: Timestamp 43:14~44:02 — Quote: Only critical expert statements presented after "most received suspended sentences or fines," with no expert opinion on the juvenile law rehabilitation principle

Assessment: Presenting only expert opinions supporting harsher punishment in the sentencing debate and completely excluding expert opinions supporting the rehabilitation principle is potentially in violation of the principle of fair and objective reporting under Article 6(1) of the Broadcasting Act.

Matters That May Be Considered Non-Violations:

The early placement of the case involving the threat against President Lee Jae-myung can be viewed as an editorial judgement taking into account the social importance of the case, and it is difficult to conclude that this constitutes a violation of the Broadcasting Act.

Overall Assessment Under Article 6 of the Broadcasting Act

This programme, as investigative reporting that examines in depth the public interest subject of juvenile cybercrime, satisfies the public interest requirement of Article 6 of the Broadcasting Act in certain respects. However, the absence of a direct statement opportunity for the perpetrator's side and the structural omission of rehabilitation-centred expert opinions are potentially in mild violation of the principles of fairness and diversity under Articles 6(1) and 6(2) of the Broadcasting Act. Consistent agenda-setting towards harsher punishment may undermine the fairness of the broadcast; however, given the nature of investigative reporting and the public interest purpose of victim protection, it is difficult to conclude that this constitutes a violation of the Broadcasting Act. For similar future reporting, it is recommended that the perpetrator's perspective and rehabilitation expert opinions be included in a balanced manner in order to comply with Article 6 of the Broadcasting Act.

In-Depth Source Review (Covering All Expert Organisations, NGOs, and Advisory Bodies Cited)

1. Investigating police officer (National Police Agency)

1. Funding: National Police Agency — operated with state funds

2. Authority: Has expertise in criminal investigation, but juvenile psychology and rehabilitation are outside the area of specialisation



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

3. Conflict of interest: Law enforcement agencies have an institutional interest in securing budgets and personnel by emphasising the severity of crime, and the direction of harsher punishment aligns with institutional interests

4. Credibility Matrix: D1(-1) D2(+1) D3(+1) D4(+1) D5(0) D6(+1) → Total +3 → Yellow

5. Counterargument sources: Juvenile law specialist, adolescent rehabilitation specialist — not cited in programme

2. Legal expert (affiliation unclear)

1. Funding: Private (affiliation unclear)

2. Authority: Legal expertise presumed; expertise in juvenile law and rehabilitation unclear

3. Conflict of interest: Difficult to assess due to unclear affiliation

4. Credibility Matrix: D1(0) D2(0) D3(+1) D4(0) D5(+1) D6(0) → Total +2 → Yellow

5. Counterargument sources: Legal scholar opposed to punitive damages, juvenile law rehabilitation principle specialist — not cited in programme

3. Adolescent psychology expert (affiliation unclear)

1. Funding: Private (affiliation unclear)

2. Authority: Adolescent psychology expertise presumed; assessment of sentencing levels is outside the area of specialisation

3. Conflict of interest: Difficult to assess due to unclear affiliation

4. Credibility Matrix: D1(0) D2(0) D3(+1) D4(0) D5(0) D6(0) → Total +1 → Yellow

5. Counterargument sources: Adolescent psychiatrist emphasising treatment and rehabilitation over punishment — not cited in programme

4. Discord (written response)

1. Funding: US private for-profit company

2. Authority: First-hand source for platform operating policies, but independent verification of the actual state of investigative cooperation is not possible

3. Conflict of interest: Platform companies have an interest in opposing stricter regulation, and tend to minimise responsibility through general statements

4. Credibility Matrix: D1(-1) D2(0) D3(+1) D4(0) D5(0) D6(+1) → Total +1 → Yellow

5. Counterargument sources: Independent research analysing actual cases of Discord refusing to cooperate with investigations, legal scholars advocating stricter platform regulation — not cited in programme

Important Note: The social ascription of 'expert' status is not in itself a basis for neutrality. It is a social attribution that is itself subject to scrutiny. All of the above experts were assessed with a yellow traffic light because their affiliation, funding, and conflicts of interest are unclear or because they have a structural interest in the direction of harsher punishment.

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 방송법 제6조. The determination of whether a specific broadcast violates legal requirements is exclusively the responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular 방송통신위원회).

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.



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

**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 South Korea — KBS / MBC

Legislation

Broadcasting Act (방송법, Act No. 6139, January 28, 2000, last amended 2025)

Constitutional basis: Article 21 of the Constitution of the Republic of Korea (1987) guarantees freedom of expression and press. Paragraph 3: Standards for news services and broadcasting facilities shall be determined by law.

Relevant Provisions

- Art. 3 (Freedom of Broadcasting): Freedom of programming is guaranteed. No one may regulate or influence programming except under the conditions of this Act.
- Art. 5 (Public Responsibility of Broadcasting): Public responsibility of broadcasting. Broadcasting must conform to the democratic constitutional order.
- Art. 6 Para. 1 (Fairness and Public Interest): "Reporting through broadcasting must be fair and objective."
- Art. 6 Para. 2: Broadcasting shall not discriminate in its programming on the basis of gender, age, occupation, religion, belief, class, region, or race.
- Art. 6 Para. 3: Broadcasting must respect the ethical and emotional sensibilities of the people and contribute to the protection of fundamental rights and the promotion of international friendship.
- Art. 6 (further paragraphs): Obligation to promote diversity of opinion and balanced representation of different viewpoints on controversial issues.
- Art. 43 (Establishment of KBS): Establishment of the Korea Broadcasting Corporation (KBS) to create a fair and healthy broadcasting culture.
- Art. 44: Public responsibility of KBS.

Broadcasting Review Regulations

- Art. 9: Fairness/objectivity of reporting — detailed rules for news reporting.
- Art. 14: Objectivity in news reports.
- Art. 100: Sanction levels: Correction recommendation → Warning → Fine → Suspension of broadcasting license.

Regulatory Authorities

- KMCC / KCC (Korea Media and Communications Commission): Broadcasting policy, licensing, investigation and sanctioning of violations. 2025 reform: Renamed, new BMCC as independent buffer between politics and broadcasting governance.
- KCSC (Korea Communications Standards Commission): Content oversight. Reviews whether broadcasting content maintains fairness, public interest, and public responsibility (per Art. 32). 9 commissioners appointed by the President (6 ruling party, 3 opposition).
- Press Arbitration Commission: Complaint pathway for citizens. Right to correction, right of reply, follow-up reporting. Settlement is legally binding.

Public Broadcasters

Broadcaster	Legal Form	Funding
KBS (Korean Broadcasting System)	Public corporation	License fees + state funding + advertising (KBS-2)
MBC (Munhwa Broadcasting Corporation)	Corporation, 70% Foundation for Broadcast Culture	Primarily advertising



EBS (Educational Broadcasting System)

Public corporation

Textbook sales + advertising

Complaint Procedures

1. KCSC deliberation process (ex-post review)
2. Viewers' Complaint Settlement Committee (Art. 35, at broadcasters)
3. Press Arbitration Commission (correction, right of reply)
4. General courts

Comparison Switzerland — South Korea

Aspect	Switzerland (Art. 4 RTVG)	South Korea (Art. 6 Broadcasting Act)
Factual accuracy	Statutory (Art. 4 Para. 2)	Statutory (Art. 6 Para. 1: fair and objective)
Diversity of opinion	Statutory (Art. 4 Para. 4)	Statutory (Art. 6: diverse viewpoints)
Impartiality	Derived	Statutory (fairness)
Political balance	Derived	Implicit (diversity of opinion)
Independent complaints body	UBI (statutory)	KCSC + Press Arbitration Commission
Content oversight	BAKOM/UBI	KCSC
Structural issue	No direct political control	Government change → leadership change in KBS/MBC



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 | Kontakt@SVFAB.ch

Bank details: PostFinance – POFICHBE

IBAN: CH32 0900 0000 1675 6251 1

Beneficiary: SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zürich 1



The following books are available from SVFAB

Orders via www.svfab.ch or 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.