



KBS 상세 분석

2026-05-04__풀영상_ 뉴스9 - _7천피 보인다_ 코스피 사상 최고치_SK하이닉스 시총_1_000조_ 돌파

Broadcast: 2026-05-04 | Analyzed: 2026-05-13 12:58

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

OVERALL SCORE

4.9/10

Significant imbalance

0 = balanced, 10 = strongly biased/manipulative

POLITICAL SPECTRUM

Classification based on Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) 2024

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

Party	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)

3.8 / 10

Left-favoring

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 June 2025, the Democratic Party of Korea (DP) has been in power as the ruling party, with President Lee Jae-myung (elected on June 3, 2025, with 49.4% of the vote) leading the government. The main opposition party following the impeachment of former President Yoon Suk-yeol is the People Power Party (PPP), with the Rebuilding Korea Party (RKP), Justice Party (JP), and Reform Party (RP) also represented in the National Assembly.

Party	CHES Left-Right Score	Seats	Ruling/Opposition	Core Position
Democratic Party of Korea (DP)	4.5 (Centre)	approx. 162	Ruling	Dialogue diplomacy, welfare expansion, prosecution reform
People Power Party (PPP)	7.5 (Right)	approx. 107	Opposition	Hard-line North Korea policy, economic liberalisation, pro-US alliance
Rebuilding Korea Party (RKP)	3.5 (Left)	12	Opposition (progressive)	Prosecution reform, media independence, redistribution
Justice Party (JP)	2.0 (Far left)	4	Opposition (progressive)	Anti-US military, labour rights, peaceful reunification
Reform Party (RP)	6.5 (Centre-right)	3	Opposition (conservative)	Pro-market, anti-authoritarian, generational justice

The central conflict in current Korean politics is the clash between the "insurrection purge" frame and the "political retaliation" frame following the impeachment of former President Yoon Suk-yeol. The so-called "fabricated indictment special counsel bill" debate surrounding President Lee Jae-myung's judicial risk has emerged as the biggest issue in the local elections. The ruling and opposition parties are clashing over key metropolitan gubernatorial races including Busan, simultaneously wielding economic pledges and calls for political accountability. Structural conflicts over prosecutorial authority, real estate policy, and medical workforce issues are also playing complex roles in the electoral landscape.

KBS and MBC are public broadcasters obligated to uphold fairness and public interest under Article 6 of the Broadcasting Act. However, due to the structural characteristic whereby board composition is subject to the influence of the ruling power, bias controversies recur with every change of government. Since the DP came to power in 2025, reorganisation of broadcasting boards is underway, which may directly affect reporting tone.



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Assessment of the Accuracy of Programme Expression of Each Party's Position

Party	Score (-5~+5)	Broadcast Expression vs. Party Platform Position
Democratic Party of Korea (DP)	+2	00:17 "appealed for the complete purging of the insurrection" — Platform position: prosecution reform, judicial justice — The DP's core election message is conveyed relatively faithfully, but it is positively framed without critical review.
People Power Party (PPP)	-2	02:13 "the nomination issue of former presidential chief of staff Jeong Jin-seok is also a source of concern" — Platform position: economic liberalisation, security reinforcement — The PPP's policy positions are barely introduced, with internal conflict and nomination discord taking centre stage. Some of Busan candidate Park Hyeong-jun's pledges were introduced in Busan reporting, but overall negative framing prevails.
Rebuilding Korea Party (RKP)	0	Not directly mentioned in the broadcast — Platform position: prosecution reform, media independence — N/A.
Justice Party (JP)	0	Not directly mentioned in the broadcast — Platform position: labour rights, peaceful reunification — N/A.
Reform Party (RP)	+1	04:58 "including RP's candidate Jeong Ui-han, it is a three-way race" — Platform position: pro-market, anti-authoritarian — The candidate's pledges are briefly introduced in Busan reporting, with neutral handling.

Party Bias Summary

- Most accurate expression: Reform Party (RP) (score +1) — Introduced neutrally in Busan reporting.
- Strongest distortion: People Power Party (PPP) (score -2) — Policy positions omitted, concentrated reporting on internal conflict.
- Average deviation from 0: 1.0
- Conclusion: While the DP's election message is conveyed relatively faithfully, the PPP's policy positions are barely introduced and internal conflict is highlighted. This may violate the balance principle of Article 6 of the Broadcasting Act, and is particularly problematic at the sensitive point of 30 days before elections.



CHAPTER 2 — PROGRAMME INFORMATION AND TOPIC FRAMEWORK

Broadcast Data

- Title: KBS 뉴스9
- Date: Not specified within the transcript (estimated early May 2025 given context of local elections 30 days away and reporting on the KOSPI surge)
- Anchors/Reporters: Reporters Woo Han-sol, Park Hyo-bin, Hyeon Ye-seol, Lee Ju-hun, Song Su-jin, Song Nak-gyo, Gang Pu-reun, Yu Jae-hyeon, Ryu Hyeon, Im Jong-bin, Jin Seon-min, Min So-yeong, Bae Ji-hyeon, Lee Hae-ji, Park Seop-bin, Jeon Hyeon-u, Song Geum, Mun Hye-seul, Song Yeong-seok, Lee Che-ri, Park Hye-jin, Heo Yo-jin, Hyeon Gyeong-hwa, and others

Persons Appearing

Actors	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political Spectrum
DP leadership (speaker unspecified)	Election campaign speaker	Democratic Party of Korea	Centre (4.5)
Song Won-seok, floor leader	PPP floor leader	People Power Party	Right (7.5)
Jeong Jin-seok, former chief of staff	Former presidential chief of staff	People Power Party	Right (7.5)
Jeon Jae-su, candidate	DP candidate for Busan mayor	Democratic Party of Korea	Centre (4.5)
Park Hyeong-jun, candidate	PPP candidate for Busan mayor	People Power Party	Right (7.5)
Jeong Ui-han, candidate	RP candidate for Busan mayor	Reform Party	Centre-right (6.5)
Busan citizen interviewees (multiple)	Voters	Independent	N/A
Securities expert (anonymous)	Market analyst	N/A	N/A
Chungbuk National University Hospital official	Medical expert	N/A	N/A
Commercial district analysis expert	Distribution analyst	N/A	N/A
Agricultural AI expert	Researcher	N/A	N/A
Billy Elliot child actor	Performer	N/A	N/A

Main Topics

A comprehensive news programme covering: the state of each party's election campaigns 30 days before local elections, public sentiment in the Busan battleground, the fabricated indictment special counsel bill controversy, the KOSPI surge, Samsung Electronics performance bonus dispute, Strait of Hormuz tensions, an emergency delivery death case, military sexual assault victimisation, a romance scam verdict, shortage of public postnatal care centres, agricultural AI, and retail industry kids marketing, among numerous other items.



List of Perspectives Required for Balanced Broadcasting

- [A] A perspective that legally explains in detail the PPP's grounds for opposing the "fabricated indictment special counsel bill"
- [B] A perspective presenting legal and constitutional counterarguments to the DP's "insurrection purge" frame
- [C] A perspective on Busan voters' everyday concerns (prices, employment) beyond calls for political accountability
- [D] A perspective presenting the position of Jeong Jin-seok himself regarding the controversy over his nomination
- [E] A perspective on the risk of a bubble following the KOSPI's rapid short-term rise and the possibility of harm to individual investors
- [F] A perspective on Samsung Electronics management's grounds for its performance bonus proposal and business sustainability
- [G] A balanced conveyance of Iran's position on the Strait of Hormuz blockade
- [H] A perspective on government healthcare policy responsibility regarding the emergency delivery death case
- [I] A perspective on the structural causes of military sexual assault victimisation (military culture, institutional loopholes)
- [J] Financing measures for expanding public postnatal care centres and the position of the private sector

Review of Whether Each Perspective Was Addressed

[A] Partially addressed

Timestamp: 06:52 — Quote: "We are launching a national petition opposing the unconstitutional withdrawal of charges, Lee Jae-myung's self-erasure." — Assessment: The opposition's position was quoted, but it remained at the level of a slogan without any legal explanation.

[B] Not addressed

Timestamp: N/A — Quote: None — Assessment: No constitutional or legal counterargument to the "insurrection purge" frame was presented at all.

[C] Addressed

Timestamp: 04:22~06:13 — Quote: "The first thing is the economy, so that ordinary people can live well." — Assessment: The economic concerns of Busan voters were conveyed in a comparatively balanced manner.

[D] Partially addressed

Timestamp: 03:09 — Quote: "The nomination of former presidential chief of staff Jeong Jin-seok has been openly opposed even by candidates who are conscious of the election impact, being criticised as 'bringing back Yoon's people'." — Assessment: Jeong Jin-seok's rebuttal statement was partially quoted, but the contextual explanation was insufficient.

[E] Partially addressed

Timestamp: 08:37 — Quote: "There were concerns that there would be a correction after the short-term surge, but—" — Assessment: The risk was mentioned, but very briefly, and positive reporting was overwhelmingly dominant.

[F] Addressed

Timestamp: 11:57 — Quote: "Management proposed to pay 13% of last year's operating profit as a special performance bonus for this year alone." — Assessment: Management's position was briefly introduced.

[G] Partially addressed

Timestamp: 13:41 — Quote: Original Farsi quoted — Assessment: Iran's statement was quoted, but without translation or commentary, making the balance substantively inadequate.

[H] Addressed

Timestamp: 28:46~30:05 — Quote: "It is due to the chronic shortage of personnel." — Assessment: The structural causes were reported in comparatively detail.

[I] Addressed



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

Timestamp: 24:04~25:59 — Quote: "Cases reported as military abuse amount to approximately 100 per year." — Assessment: Reported centred on victim testimony, but discussion of the direction of institutional reform was insufficient.

[J] Partially addressed

Timestamp: 31:38 — Quote: "There are only 25 facilities nationwide." — Assessment: The problem of inadequate supply was pointed out, but there was no discussion of the private sector's position or financing measures.



CHAPTER 3 — DETAILED ANALYSIS OF 15 CRITERIA

Hard Facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically verifiable

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

Total score: 5/10

Expert 1: Anonymous securities analyst

Timestamp	09:14
Statement	"Corporate earnings estimates keep being revised upward, and since semiconductors are leading that, foreign investors have no choice but to continue aggressive net buying."
Classification	Optimistic market outlook expert. Affiliated institution not disclosed.

Missing counterargument: A pessimist warning of correction risk following the short-term surge, or an expert in individual investor protection.

In-depth source review:

(a) Funding: Affiliated institution not disclosed. If affiliated with a securities firm, a structural conflict of interest exists in forecasting a bull market.

(b) Authority: Appropriate for presenting short-term outlooks as a market analysis expert, but long-term risk assessment requires separate expertise.

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 (possible bull market forecast bias if presumed affiliated with a securities firm)

D2 Personal risk: 0 (no reputational risk as statement is anonymous)

D3 Expertise: +2 (specialist area of market analysis)

D4 Consistency of opinion: 0 (past statements unverifiable)

D5 Emotion vs. data: +1 (data-based statement)

D6 Source level: 0 (secondary analysis)

TOTAL: +2 → Source traffic light: Yellow

(c) PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE: Structurally biased expert selection, with only optimistic outlook experts quoted.

Expert 2: Chungbuk National University Hospital official

Timestamp	29:27
Statement	"One person has gone abroad for training until August this year. One person cannot cover everything."
Classification	Healthcare field official. Direct party to the personnel shortage problem.

Missing counterargument: The position of the Ministry of Health and Welfare, analysis of the linkage with the medical school quota expansion policy.



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

In-depth source review:

(a) Funding: National university hospital (state funding). Possible constraints on criticism of government policy.

(b) Authority: Appropriate for testifying to the on-site situation. Presenting policy alternatives requires separate expertise.

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 (party demanding budget expansion)

D2 Personal risk: +1 (accepting a degree of risk by speaking publicly)

D3 Expertise: +2 (field expert)

D4 Consistency of opinion: 0 (unverifiable)

D5 Emotion vs. data: +1 (presenting specific figures)

D6 Source level: +2 (primary field testimony)

TOTAL: +5 → Source traffic light: Green

(c) PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE: High credibility as field testimony, but government rebuttal is absent.

Missing expert groups:

- Constitutional law scholars (analysis of the constitutionality of the special counsel bill)
- Representatives of obstetrics and gynaecology specialist associations (structural issues with emergency delivery personnel)
- Iran-US relations diplomacy experts

Source Credibility Overview:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Anonymous securities analyst	-1	0	+2	0	+1	0	+2	Yellow
Chungbuk National University Hospital official	-1	+1	+2	0	+1	+2	+5	Green

Summary: In economic reporting, only optimistic experts are selected; in medical reporting, field testimony is strong but the policy accountability side's rebuttal is absent; in political reporting, expert analysis itself is entirely absent.



2. Source Selection

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

Total score: 5/10

Source 1: DP leadership statement

Timestamp

00:48 — Statement: "It seems that those who defended the insurrection, those who were complicit in the insurrection, are about to receive nomination papers."

(a) Funding: Political party (Democratic Party of Korea)

(b) Structural conflict of interest: As the ruling party ahead of an election, a direct interest in establishing a frame favourable to their own party.

(c) Missing rebuttal source: The PPP's official rebuttal statement, a legal scholar's explanation of the legal definition of "insurrection."

Source 2: PPP candidate statement

Timestamp

06:52 — Statement: "We are launching a national petition opposing the unconstitutional withdrawal of charges, Lee Jae-myung's self-erasure."

(a) Funding: Political party (People Power Party)

(b) Structural conflict of interest: As the opposition, a direct interest in attacking the ruling party.

(c) Missing rebuttal source: The DP's official rebuttal, opinion from legal scholars who support the special counsel bill.

Source 3: Anonymous securities analyst

Timestamp

09:14 — Statement: "Foreign investors have no choice but to continue aggressive net buying."

(a) Funding: Undisclosed (presumed securities firm)

(b) Structural conflict of interest: If affiliated with a securities firm, possible institutional interest linkage in forecasting a bull market.

(c) Missing rebuttal source: Pessimistic analysts, individual investor protection experts.

Summary: In political reporting, statements from both parties were quoted, but independent expert analysis is absent; in economic reporting, a bias toward optimistic sources is observed.



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

Total score: 5/10

Estimated speaking time:

- DP-related reporting (election campaign, special counsel bill promotion): approx. 4 min. 30 sec. (approx. 10% of total)
- PPP-related reporting (election campaign, nomination discord, special counsel opposition): approx. 3 min. (approx. 7% of total)
- Busan battleground reporting (3 parties' candidates equally): approx. 2 min. (approx. 5% of total)
- Non-political reporting (economy, society, international, culture): approx. 33 min. (approx. 78% of total)
- Anchor presentation: approx. 3 min. (approx. 7% of total)

Summary: Within political reporting, DP-related reporting accounts for approximately 1.5 times more time than PPP reporting, but since the proportion of political reporting in the overall broadcast is low, the absolute imbalance is not large. However, a qualitative asymmetry exists in that DP reporting is structured around the positive aspects of the election campaign, while PPP reporting is concentrated on nomination discord.



4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Total score: 7/10

Omission 1:

Context The specific content and legal issues of the fabricated indictment special counsel bill

Relevant timestamp: 06:18

Effect Viewers witness only the political clash without understanding the legal grounds for why the special counsel bill is controversial. No basis is provided for judging which of the DP's claim of "judicial justice" or the opposition's claim of "unconstitutionality" is more valid.

Omission 2:

Context The PPP's own reform efforts and policy alternatives following the impeachment of former President Yoon Suk-yeol

Relevant timestamp: 02:05~03:55

Effect PPP reporting is focused on nomination discord and internal conflict, with no introduction whatsoever of the party's policy vision or reform efforts. This has the effect of causing viewers to perceive the PPP as nothing more than a "chaotic group."

Omission 3:

Context The current state of President Lee Jae-myung's judicial risk and the possibility of a conflict of interest with the special counsel bill

Relevant timestamp: 06:18~08:13

Effect The fact that the special counsel bill is directly linked to the sitting president's judicial risk is not stated explicitly, making it difficult for viewers to grasp the political context of the legislation. The grounds for the opposition's criticism of "self-erasure" are not explained.

Summary: The systematic omission of legal context and the PPP's policy alternatives from political reporting creates an information environment in which viewers find it difficult to make balanced judgements.

Missing Voices

- Constitutional law scholars: Could have provided legal analysis of whether the fabricated indictment special counsel bill is unconstitutional.
- PPP policy experts: Could have explained the grounds for opposing the special counsel bill from a policy perspective.
- Busan business community figures: Could have evaluated the feasibility of local election candidates' pledges.
- Obstetrics and gynaecology specialist associations: Could have presented the structural causes of and solutions to the shortage of emergency delivery personnel.



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

- Military human rights experts: Could have presented analysis of the structural causes of military sexual assault victimisation and directions for institutional reform.
- Iran diplomacy experts: Could have explained the diplomatic context of Strait of Hormuz tensions in a balanced manner.
- Private postnatal care industry representatives: Could have conveyed the private sector's position on the policy of public expansion.
- Samsung Electronics union representative, semiconductor division: Could have directly explained the specific grounds for the performance bonus demands.



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

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

Total score: 3/10

Finding 1:

Timestamp 08:30

Figure: "The KOSPI rose approximately 1,500 points, or 30%, in the single month of April. Ranked 1st in rate of increase among major global stock markets."

Missing context

The KOSPI's decline prior to April, the base effect of the rise, and the scale of individual investors' net selling (4.7 trillion won) were mentioned together, but analysis of what risk signals this represents is insufficient.

Effect

By emphasising only the surge figures, viewers may form excessive optimism.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 10:55

Figure: "Given that this year's operating profit forecast is coming in at around 300 trillion won, if you calculate it simply, each person would receive an average performance bonus of 570 million won."

Missing context

The qualifier "if you calculate it simply" is used, but the fact that this figure is based on an unrealisable assumption is not sufficiently emphasised.

Effect

Viewers may perceive the Samsung Electronics union's demands as excessively greedy, or conversely misunderstand them as realisable.

Summary: Numerical manipulation is not at a serious level, but selective presentation of figures in KOSPI surge reporting that does not sufficiently emphasise risk signals is observed.



6. Guilt by Association									5/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Total score: 5/10

Association 1:

Timestamp 01:14

Quote "Ousting the Yoon Suk-yeol kids is the goal of the local elections."

Technique: PPP candidates are collectively defined as "Yoon Suk-yeol kids," connecting them to the impeached former president.

Effect

The effect of branding them as "Yoon Suk-yeol remnants" regardless of individual candidates' policies or qualifications. By conveying this expression uncritically, the broadcast can be seen as having adopted this frame.

Association 2:

Timestamp 00:48

Quote "It seems that those who defended the insurrection, those who were complicit in the insurrection, are about to receive nomination papers."

Technique: Unconditionally conveying a DP statement that defines PPP nomination candidates as "insurrection accomplices" without verification.

Effect

Conveying the legally unestablished charge of "insurrection complicity" as if it were a foregone conclusion, undermining the moral credibility of all PPP candidates.

Association 3:

Timestamp 03:38

Quote "They are protesting that a person indicted on charges of involvement in insurrection has been selected as a metropolitan mayoral candidate."

Technique: Introducing candidate Chu Gyeong-ho by directly linking him to "indictment on insurrection involvement charges."

Effect

The effect of causing doubt about the candidate's qualifications based solely on the fact of indictment, without distinguishing between "charges" and "conviction."

Guilt-by-association chain: Yoon Suk-yeol → insurrection → all PPP candidates → "Yoon Suk-yeol kids" → targets for removal

Summary: A guilt-by-association structure is observed in which PPP candidates are systematically linked to the grounds for former President Yoon Suk-yeol's impeachment, creating an effect that makes it difficult to evaluate individual candidates' policies.



7. Timing

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 5/10

Finding 1:

Position: 00:02~01:59 (beginning)

Content: "The DP leadership has been touring the Yeongnam region for four days, appealing for the complete purging of the insurrection."

Timing effect: The DP's election campaign is placed as the broadcast's first item, establishing "insurrection purge" as a powerful frame in viewers' first impression. Through the primacy effect, this frame may function as the interpretive framework for all subsequent reporting.

Finding 2:

Position: 02:05~03:55 (second item)

Content: PPP reporting is structured centred on nomination discord and internal conflict.

Timing effect: By placing the PPP's internal conflict immediately after positive reporting on the DP's campaign, the contrast effect is maximised. Viewers come to perceive the two parties as "a united DP vs. a chaotic PPP."

Summary: The sequential placement of positive reporting on the DP's campaign at the beginning of the broadcast followed by reporting on the PPP's internal conflict creates a favourable impression for a particular party through the contrast effect.



8. Selective Outrage

4/10

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: 4/10

Methodological principle (v2.7): The triggering event must be documented before all assessments. A reaction can only be assessed as selective if a comparable triggering event involving a different position did not produce a similar reaction.

Finding 1:

Timestamp 01:20~01:34

Triggering event: Controversy over a DP candidate's "oppa remark"

Reaction: "Following criticism that it was an inappropriate remark, they ultimately apologised within a day." — Both the controversy and the apology are reported.

Comparison

PPP candidate's "handshake controversy" (02:27) — "As if making a point of the DP candidate's handshake controversy, he firmly grasped the hands of merchants." — The PPP candidate's action is framed as "a reaction to the controversy."

Asymmetry: The DP candidate's mistake is handled as "controversy→apology," concluding as a resolved matter, while the PPP candidate's action is linked to the "handshake controversy," forming a sustained negative image. However, there are limitations to direct comparison as the two events differ in nature.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 07:00

Triggering event: PPP's statement opposing the special counsel bill ("a special counsel where thieves would also serve as police and judges")

Reaction: After quoting this statement, the reporter adds the narration "There were even mentions of impeaching the president," highlighting the extremity of the statement.

Comparison

DP's statement "purging insurrection-following forces" (01:09) — the reporter conveys it as-is without additional narration.

Asymmetry: Additional contextual narration is appended to the PPP's extreme expression, but none to the DP's equally extreme expression. This shows that the reaction is asymmetric despite the triggering events being of similar nature.

Summary: Clear evidence of selective outrage is limited, but a subtle asymmetry is observed in which additional contextual narration is appended to the PPP's extreme expressions, while the DP's equally extreme expressions are conveyed as-is.



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

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

This broadcast is a comprehensive news programme produced 30 days before local elections, in which political reporting and social/economic reporting are intermingled. In the political segment, the core structure is the clash between the DP's "insurrection purge" frame and the PPP's "opposition to fabricated indictment special counsel" frame. In the process of the political landscape being restructured following Yoon Suk-yeol's impeachment, the reporting tone of public broadcasters carries particularly sensitive significance. Social reporting covers structural issues such as medical gaps, welfare vehicle fuel costs, and military human rights, taking on a character critical of policy.

Share of covered perspectives

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



Soft Facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. Framing

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 6/10

Finding 1:

Timestamp	00:17
Quote	<i>"The DP leadership has been touring the Yeongnam region for four days, appealing for the complete purging of the insurrection."</i>
Manipulation	The DP's election campaign is presented with the moral frame of "insurrection purge," conveyed as a neutral fact.

Why it is problematic: "Insurrection purge" is a political claim of the DP, not a legally established fact, yet the reporter conveys it descriptively without verification, potentially causing viewers to perceive it as a foregone conclusion.

Finding 2:

Timestamp	06:18
Quote	<i>"The so-called fabricated indictment special counsel bill, which the ruling party is pushing forward claiming to realise judicial justice, has emerged as an election issue."</i>
Manipulation	The qualifier "so-called" is used, but the opposition's name "fabricated indictment" is adopted as-is, framing the special counsel bill negatively.

Why it is problematic: By adopting the opposition's name rather than presenting alongside it the DP's official name "Judicial Justice Special Counsel Bill," a negative perception of the legislation may be instilled.

Finding 3:

Timestamp	00:41
Quote	<i>"They appealed for voters to choose a powerful DP candidate instead of the PPP, which is just bringing back Yoon's people."</i>
Manipulation	The reporter uses the DP's aggressive expression "bringing back Yoon's people" directly in their own narration.

Why it is problematic: This conveys the DP's political rhetoric as if it were the reporter's neutral narration, and amounts to the broadcast directly adopting the frame that defines PPP candidates as "remnants of Yoon Suk-yeol."



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

Summary: Across political reporting overall, an asymmetric framing is observed in which the DP's "insurrection purge" frame is accepted without verification, while the PPP's counterarguments are addressed only at the level of slogans.



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

Total score: 6/10

Finding 1:

Timestamp	01:09
Quote	<i>"What I am saying is that there is a need to purge the insurrection-following forces, the insurrection-complicit forces, in the region."</i>
Manipulation	The extreme expressions "insurrection-following forces" and "insurrection-complicit forces" were quoted as statements by the DP, but the reporter provides no contextual explanation or counterargument whatsoever.

Why it is problematic: A neutral alternative expression would have been "PPP candidates." By conveying these expressions uncritically, the effect is to evoke an association between all PPP candidates and criminal involvement.

Finding 2:

Timestamp	06:52
Quote	<i>"We are launching a national petition opposing the unconstitutional withdrawal of charges, Lee Jae-myung's self-erasure."</i>
Manipulation	The PPP's expressions "self-erasure" and "unconstitutional" were likewise quoted, but this statement is handled far more briefly than the DP's statements.

Why it is problematic: Both sides' aggressive expressions were quoted, but an asymmetry in processing time and contextual explanation exists, breaking the balance.

Finding 3:

Timestamp	03:09
Quote	<i>"The nomination of former presidential chief of staff Jeong Jin-seok has been criticised as 'bringing back Yoon's people'—"</i>
Manipulation	The reporter uses the DP's attack expression "bringing back Yoon's people" directly in their own narration.

Why it is problematic: This is not neutral narration by a reporter but the adoption of a particular party's political language, and there is grounds to consider it a violation of the fairness principle of Article 6 of the Broadcasting Act.

Summary: A linguistic asymmetry is confirmed in which the DP's aggressive political language ("insurrection-following forces," "bringing back Yoon's people") is adopted as the reporter's narration, while the PPP's rebuttal expressions are limited to brief quotations.



12. Anchor Behaviour

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 3/10

Methodological principle (v2.7): The triggering event must be documented before all assessments. An intervention can only be assessed as asymmetric if a similar triggering event involving a different guest did not produce a similar intervention.

Finding 1:

Timestamp 14:20

Triggering event: The anchor asks the local foreign correspondent about the situation of vessels in the strait.

Quote (anchor) "Reporter Yu Jae-hyeon. The ships trapped inside the strait must be in an even more frustrating situation. Is there any movement?"

Comparison In the political reporting segment, no follow-up questions or requests for verification were directed at reporters regarding the opposition's position.

Asymmetry: Fact-checking questions were asked in international reporting, but verification questions regarding DP claims were absent in political reporting. However, this is also partly attributable to the difference in news format (live connection vs. report), making it difficult to conclude it is asymmetric.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 15:41

Triggering event: The anchor asks a follow-up question about whether vessels actually under attack existed.

Quote (anchor) "What makes it more worrying is that there were actually ships that had been attacked, I hear."

Comparison In political reporting, there were no instances of the anchor asking follow-up verification questions about the DP's "insurrection purge" claims or the PPP's "unconstitutional" claims.

Asymmetry: Fact-checking questions were asked in international reporting, but verification questions for both sides' claims were absent in political reporting. This is a formal asymmetry, but it is difficult to conclude it is intentional bias toward a specific party.

Summary: The anchor's interventions themselves are very limited, and since verification questions were not directed at either side in political reporting, evidence of asymmetry is not clear. A generally passive style of anchoring is observed.



13. Question Asymmetry

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 4/10

Asymmetry 1:

DP-related, 00:17: The reporter narrates the DP's Yeongnam campaign as "appealed for the complete purging of the insurrection" — soft narration (without verification)

PPP-related, 02:13: "However, floor leader Jang Dong-hyeok did not accompany them, and the nomination issue of former presidential chief of staff Jeong Jin-seok is also a source of concern." — highlighting internal conflict

Comparison

DP campaigning is reported centred on its message, while PPP campaigning is reported centred on internal conflict. The frame differs within reporting on the same election campaign.

Asymmetry 2:

DP's promotion of special counsel bill, 07:17: "The DP said the special privileges bill is a test of judicial justice and a calling of the times." — conveying the DP's claim with positive language

PPP's opposition to special counsel, 07:00: "Calling it a special counsel where thieves would also serve as police and judges—" — quoting the opposition's claim with an aggressive metaphor

Comparison

The DP's claim is quoted with elevated language such as "judicial justice" and "calling of the times," while the PPP's claim is quoted with the provocative metaphor of "thieves." Both sides are quoted in their own language, but the DP's language is positioned to sound more authoritative.

Summary: Asymmetry in reporting frames and choice of quoted language is more prominent than direct asymmetry in interview questions.



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

Total score: 3/10

Finding 1:

Timestamp 04:50~06:13

Composition: "It is a three-way race among DP's Jeon Jae-su, PPP's Park Hyeong-jun, and RP's Jeong Ui-han."

Analysis

The pledges of the three candidates are introduced in a comparatively balanced manner, achieving formal balance. However, without any critical review of the feasibility of each candidate's pledges, they are handled in a list-like fashion, with substantive analysis absent.

Summary: Formal balance is achieved in Busan battleground reporting, but the substantive informational value is limited due to list-like reporting without pledge verification. No serious cases of false balance are identified.



15. Agenda Setting

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 6/10

Finding 1:

Established agenda element: "Insurrection purge" is treated as given to be the core agenda of the local elections.

Timestamp

00:17 — Basis: Placing "appealed for the complete purging of the insurrection" as the first item.

Alternative agenda: The perspective that the core of the local elections may be everyday living issues such as the local economy, welfare, and education rather than "insurrection purge." In fact, in the Busan voter interviews (04:22), the economy appeared as the top concern, but this is placed after political reporting.

Finding 2:

Established agenda element: The special counsel bill controversy is treated as given to be an election issue.

Timestamp

06:18 — Basis: Defining the special counsel bill as a core election issue with the narration "has emerged as an election issue."

Alternative agenda: No examination of whether the special counsel bill actually influences voters' voting decisions, or whether everyday economic issues are more important.

Finding 3:

Established agenda element: The KOSPI surge is treated as given to be a positive economic signal.

Timestamp

08:16 — Basis: Presenting "the KOSPI has surged up to near the 7,000 mark" as positive news.

Alternative agenda: The possibility that the KOSPI surge is an asset bubble disconnected from the real economy, the risk of harm to individual investors.

Summary: By establishing "insurrection purge" as the core frame of the local elections and the special counsel bill as the core issue, an agenda distortion is observed in which voters' actual concerns—everyday economic issues—are treated as secondary.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual Scores — All 15 Criteria

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

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

4.8/10

Significant imbalance

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

5.0/10

Significant imbalance

OVERALL SCORE

4.9/10

Significant 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, requiring reporting to be fair and objective and for diverse opinions to be reflected in a balanced manner.

Violation 1:

Standard: Article 6(1) of the Broadcasting Act (fairness)

Content of violation: Expressions that are the DP's political claims — "insurrection purge," "insurrection-following forces," "bringing back Yoon's people" — are used as the reporter's neutral narrative language.

Basis: Timestamp 00:17 — Quote: "The DP leadership has been touring the Yeongnam region for four days, appealing for the complete purging of the insurrection."

Assessment: "Insurrection purge" is a political claim of the DP, not a legally established fact. By conveying this descriptively without verification, the fairness principle is violated. Article 6(1) of the Broadcasting Act stipulates that "broadcasting shall report in a fair and objective manner," and there are grounds to consider that adopting a particular party's political language as the broadcast's narrative language violates this principle.

Violation 2:

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

Content of violation: In reporting on the fabricated indictment special counsel bill, the legal context and the connection to President Lee Jae-myung's judicial risk are omitted, and diverse opinions are not reflected in a balanced manner.

Basis: Timestamp 06:18~08:13 — Quote: "The so-called fabricated indictment special counsel bill, which the ruling party is pushing forward claiming to realise judicial justice, has emerged as an election issue."

Assessment: The legal issues of the special counsel bill, constitutional scholars' analysis, and the grounds for the opposition's rebuttal are not sufficiently presented, creating an information environment in which viewers find it difficult to make balanced judgements. Article 6(2) of the Broadcasting Act stipulates that "broadcasting shall not discriminate in programme composition on the grounds of gender, age, occupation, religion, belief, class, region, race, etc.," and differential reporting based on political position runs counter to the spirit of this principle.

Violation 3:

Standard: Article 6(3) of the Broadcasting Act (fairness in election reporting)

Content of violation: At the electoral period of 30 days before local elections, an asymmetry is observed in which DP reporting is structured with a positive frame while PPP reporting is structured centred on internal conflict.

Basis: Timestamp 00:17~01:59 (positive reporting on DP campaign) vs. 02:05~03:55 (reporting on PPP nomination conflict)

Assessment: Fairness in broadcasting is particularly strictly required during the election period. Reporting on the same election campaign with the DP centred on its message and the PPP centred on conflict may violate the principle of fairness in election reporting.

Overall Assessment Under Article 6 of the Broadcasting Act

This broadcast is judged to not fully meet the fairness and public interest standards required by Article 6 of the Broadcasting Act in the political reporting segment. In particular, the adoption of the DP's political language as the broadcast's narrative language, the omission of legal context in special counsel bill reporting, and the asymmetric framing of the two parties' reporting during the election period may violate the fairness and balance principles of Article 6(1) and Article 6(2) of the Broadcasting Act. However, since social and economic reporting is comparatively balanced, it is more appropriate to assess this as a partial violation in the political reporting segment rather than a wholesale violation. In light of the review standards of the Korea Communications Standards Commission, this broadcast contains matters that may be subject to "caution" or "recommendation" level measures.



In-depth Source Review (targeting all cited expert institutions/NGOs/advisory bodies)

1. Anonymous securities analyst (09:14)

- Funding:** Undisclosed. Presumed affiliated with a securities firm. Private funding.
- Authority:** Appropriate as a market analysis expert for presenting short-term outlooks, but long-term risk assessment requires separate expertise.
- Conflict of interest:** If affiliated with a securities firm, possible institutional interest linkage in forecasting a bull market. Optimistic forecasts may contribute to profits by leading to increased trading volume.
- Credibility matrix:** D1(-1) D2(0) D3(+2) D4(0) D5(+1) D6(0) → Total +2 → Source traffic light: Yellow
- Rebuttal sources:** Opinions from pessimistic analysts and individual investor protection experts are omitted.

2. Chungbuk National University Hospital official (29:27)

- Funding:** National university hospital (state funding). Dependent on government budget.
- Authority:** Appropriate for testifying to the on-site situation. Presenting policy alternatives requires separate expertise.
- Conflict of interest:** As a party demanding budget expansion, there is an incentive to emphasise the personnel shortage problem.
- Credibility matrix:** D1(-1) D2(+1) D3(+2) D4(0) D5(+1) D6(+2) → Total +5 → Source traffic light: Green
- Rebuttal sources:** The position of the Ministry of Health and Welfare, analysis of the linkage with the medical school quota expansion policy, are omitted.

3. Commercial district analysis firm (32:51)

- Funding:** Private commercial district analysis firm. Possibility of having retail industry clients.
- Authority:** Appropriate for sales data analysis. Possesses expertise in consumer behaviour analysis.
- Conflict of interest:** If holding retail industry clients, there may be an incentive toward positive analysis.
- Credibility matrix:** D1(-1) D2(0) D3(+2) D4(0) D5(+2) D6(0) → Total +3 → Source traffic light: Yellow
- Rebuttal sources:** Opinions from consumer groups and small business associations warning of the risks of starting a business in trending items are omitted.

4. Agricultural AI expert (39:10)

- Funding:** Undisclosed. Presumed affiliated with a research institution or corporation.
- Authority:** Appropriate as an agricultural AI technology expert for explaining the current state of technology.
- Conflict of interest:** If affiliated with an agricultural AI company, there may be an interest in expanding technology adoption.
- Credibility matrix:** D1(-1) D2(0) D3(+2) D4(0) D5(+1) D6(0) → Total +2 → Source traffic light: Yellow
- Rebuttal sources:** Expert opinions on concerns about rural job losses and the possibility of harm to small farmers due to the introduction of agricultural AI are omitted.

> Important: The term "recognised" is a social attribution, not a factual qualification, and is itself a subject of review. All of the above sources should be assessed independently, without regard to the interests of their affiliated institutions.

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).



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

**No proof of
causation**

Statistical correlations are not to be interpreted as proof of causal relationships or editorial intent. Deviation values may be influenced by topic selection, news environment, political controversy, or format logic.

**No judgment of
intent**

The analysis measures observable structural characteristics of broadcasts. A score of 7 means a significant imbalance was detected — not that the editorial team intended it. The methodology makes no claims about motives or strategic objectives.

**Heuristic
comparison tool**

The index serves comparative pattern recognition across thousands of broadcasts, not precise metric measurement of individual segments. Threshold values serve heuristic orientation, not sharp legal qualification.



APPENDIX 1: NATIONAL BROADCASTING LAW

Legal Basis 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



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 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.