



NPO DETAILED ANALYSIS

2024-02-15_AT_300014391

Broadcast: NPO broadcast | 2024-02-15 | Analysed on: 2026-05-23 00:18

Version 3.0-detail | Universal 3.0-detail | Konverter 3.4 (2026-05-20) | Maatstaf: Mediawet 2008 Art. 2.1

TOTAL SCORE

4.3/10

Considerable imbalance

0 = balanced, 10 = strongly one-sided/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	SP	GL-PvdA	PvdD	D66	CDA	NSC	CU	VVD	BBB	SGP	PVV	FvD
CHES	1.10	2.40	2.50	4.80	5.50	5.80	6.00	7.00	7.50	7.80	9.20	9.50
Spectrum	Left	Left	Left	Left	Centre	Centre	Right	Right	Right	Right	Right	Right

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

TENDENCY (L – R)

4.8 / 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](#) | Threshold values: [Pew Research Center](#)

This section provides political context and does not count towards the total score.



POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

The Schoof cabinet (took office July 2024) is an extra-parliamentary cabinet consisting of PVV, VVD, NSC and BBB. Prime Minister Dick Schoof is non-partisan. The largest opposition party is GL-PvdA (25 seats), followed by D66 (9 seats), CDA (5 seats), SP (5 seats), ChristenUnie (3 seats), PvdD (3 seats), SGP (3 seats) and FvD (3 seats).

Party	CHES L-R	Seats	Government/Opposition	Core position
SP	1.1	5	Opposition	Socialist, anti-market healthcare
GL-PvdA	2.4	25	Opposition	Progressive-left, social security
PvdD	2.5	3	Opposition	Animal rights, left-ecological
D66	4.8	9	Opposition	Liberal-progressive, pro-EU
CDA	5.5	5	Opposition	Christian democratic, centre
NSC	5.8	20	Government	Economic security, centre-right
ChristenUnie	6.0	3	Opposition	Christian-social, centre-right
VVD	7.0	24	Government	Liberal-right, market economy
BBB	7.5	7	Government	Agrarian-populist, right
SGP	7.8	3	Opposition	Reformed, far right
PVV	9.2	37	Government	Nationalist, far right
FvD	9.5	3	Opposition	Far right, sovereignty

Dutch politics is currently dominated by four major fault lines: (1) migration and asylum policy, with the coalition advocating a hard line; (2) the affordability and accessibility of healthcare, particularly elderly care and waiting lists; (3) climate and nitrogen policy, where farming interests clash with environmental ambitions; (4) the relationship with the EU and international obligations, including humanitarian aid to conflict zones.

The Dutch public broadcaster operates under the Media Act 2008, with Article 2.1 requiring pluriform, balanced and independent reporting across the total output. AVROTROS is one of the broadcasting associations within the NPO system and bears its own editorial responsibility. PVV leader Wilders has repeatedly criticised the NPO as a "left-wing broadcaster", which underlines the political sensitivity of balanced reporting.



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Assessment per party

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast representation vs. party programme
VVD	0	Not present in broadcast — party position not represented
PVV	0	Not present in broadcast — party position not represented
GL-PvdA	0	Not present in broadcast — party position not represented
NSC	0	Not present in broadcast — party position not represented
D66	0	Not present in broadcast — party position not represented
BBB	0	Not present in broadcast — party position not represented
CDA	0	Not present in broadcast — party position not represented
SP	0	Not present in broadcast — party position not represented
ChristenUnie	-2	22:38 "ChristenUnie MP Don Ceder even wants there to never be another cent going to UNRWA" — Party programme position CU: humane refugee policy, Christian-social — representation reduces the CU position to a hard austerity stance without nuancing the broader CU vision on emergency aid; Ceder's own explanation (22:41-22:49) is partially quoted but the framing is negatively charged

Explanation: The broadcast covers three topics (healthcare flow, Russian cancer vaccine, UNRWA). None of the major parties speaks as a representative, with the exception of a brief reference to ChristenUnie MP Don Ceder in the UNRWA segment. Party programme positions are not systematically tested or represented.

Summary Party Bias

- Most accurate representation: No party systematically represented (score 0)
- Strongest distortion: ChristenUnie (score -2) — position is negatively framed without full context
- Average deviation from 0: 0.2
- Conclusion: The broadcast is largely non-party-political in nature; the three topics covered are not presented through party-political lenses. The only party-political reference concerns Don Ceder (CU), whose position on UNRWA funding is negatively framed by expert Peter Malcontent without Ceder himself being able to respond adequately.

Left-Right Overall Tendency

TENDENCY SCORE: +1.2

CLASSIFICATION: Slightly left-favouring

Reasoning: The UNRWA reporting tends towards a pro-Palestinian frame in which the decision of Western countries to suspend funding is implicitly presented as problematic. The expert Malcontent characterises Israel's actions as strategic and misleading, without a pro-Israeli or critically-UNRWA voice being given proportionate coverage. The healthcare segment contains no clear left-right tendency but implies that market forces and budget cuts are the cause of capacity problems, which aligns with a left-progressive narrative.



CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Broadcast details

- Title: EenVandaag
- Date: 15.02.2024
- Length (estimated from transcript):
- Presenter/Reporter: Not named in transcript
- Persons interviewed:

Person	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political Spectrum
Jos Schols	Professor of geriatric medicine, Maastricht University	Academic/independent	Neutral
Joyce (surname not mentioned)	Transfer nurse HagaZiekenhuis; chair of the transfer nurses section V&VN	Professional association	Neutral
Kelly (surname not mentioned)	Informal carer (daughter of patient)	None	Neutral
Willem (surname not mentioned)	Informal carer (son of patient)	None	Neutral
Peter Malcontent	Expert on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict	Academic/independent	Neutral-left framed
Don Ceder	MP ChristenUnie	ChristenUnie	Centre-right
UNRWA director (name not mentioned)	Director UNRWA camp Lebanon	UN organisation	Institutional
Ronald Plasterk	Former informateur; entrepreneur cancer vaccine	Independent/PvdA background	Left (historical)
Russian scientist (not named)	Medical expert (not identified)	Not specified	Neutral

Main topic

The broadcast covers three separate subjects: (1) the stagnating flow of patients through Dutch hospitals due to capacity shortages in follow-up care; (2) the credibility of Putin's announcement about a Russian cancer vaccine; (3) the financial crisis at UNRWA following the suspension of donations by Western countries.



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

CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS



Hard facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically verifiable

1. EXPERT SELECTION

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Who speaks as an expert?

Expert 1: Jos Schols — Professor of geriatric medicine, Maastricht University

Timestamp: 02:34

Statement: "It cannot be that we, the impressive Netherlands, end up relying solely on informal carers. That is unacceptable."

Framing: Academic expert in geriatric medicine; no visible party-political affiliation; speaks from clinical and policy expertise.

Missing counter-voice: A health insurer or policymaker who explains the financial and organisational constraints of the system.

Source depth check:

(a) FUNDING: Maastricht University — publicly funded via OCW. No direct institutional interest in a specific policy outcome, but as a professor of geriatric medicine he has an interest in recognition of the seriousness of elderly care problems.

(b) MANDATE: Compatible with neutral scientific assessment of the flow problems.

D1 Conflict of interest: +1 — Publicly funded, no commercial interest; slight interest in policy attention for his field

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Academic speaking critically about the healthcare system; limited career risk

D3 Professional competence: +2 — Professor of geriatric medicine; statements fall within his field

D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — No contradictory previous statements visible in transcript

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Predominantly factual, some normative statements ("unacceptable")

D6 Source level: +1 — Primary expert, no third-party citation

• TOTAL: +7 → SOURCE LIGHT: GREEN

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: Schols is framed as a neutral academic authority, which is largely justified. His normative statements ("unacceptable") are not marked as such.

Expert 2: Joyce — Transfer nurse HagaZiekenhuis; chair of the transfer nurses section V&VN

Timestamp: 07:56

Statement: "for home care you sometimes have to go through 10 providers before you find a home care provider."

Framing: Professional practice expert; speaks from daily operational experience; chair of professional association.

Missing counter-voice: A home care provider who explains why they refuse requests.

Source depth check:

(a) FUNDING: V&VN is a professional association funded by membership contributions from nurses. Interest in recognition of workload and capacity problems.

(b) MANDATE: Compatible with practice-oriented assessment; not fully neutral given professional interest.

D1 Conflict of interest: 0 — Professional association has an interest in recognition of workload

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Speaks critically about the system; limited risk

Voorzitter: Schläpfer, David - **Contact:** kontakt@SVFAB.ch - **Adres:** SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zürich 1



- D3 Professional competence: +2 — Direct practical experience in the described domain
- D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — Consistent with professional group positions
- D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Predominantly factual with concrete examples
- D6 Source level: +2 — Primary experiential source

• TOTAL: +7 → SOURCE LIGHT: GREEN

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: Joyce is framed as a neutral practical expert; her institutional interest as chair of a professional association is not mentioned.

Expert 3: Peter Malcontent — Expert on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict

Timestamp: 21:27

Statement: "Israel is looking for scapegoats with which it can also divert attention from itself."

Framing: Academic expert; no institution or chair mentioned in transcript; speaks in strongly normative terms about Israeli actions.

Missing counter-voice: An expert with a more critical view of UNRWA or a pro-Israeli academic.

Source depth check:

(a) FUNDING: Not mentioned in transcript. Academic affiliation not specified.

(b) MANDATE: Unclear — no institution or chair mentioned; credibility rests on the title "expert".

- D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Affiliation unknown; possible ideological position not verifiable
- D2 Personal risk: 0 — No visible personal risk from his statements
- D3 Professional competence: +1 — "Expert" without further qualification; field plausible but not verifiable
- D4 Consistency of opinion: 0 — No previous statements available in transcript
- D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1 — Statements such as "scapegoats" and "divert attention" are strongly normative without factual substantiation
- D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary interpretation of available facts

• TOTAL: -1 → SOURCE LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: Malcontent is framed as a neutral "expert" while his statements are strongly normative and his affiliation is not mentioned. This is a case of apparent neutrality with structurally partisan framing.

Missing expert groups:

- Israeli academic or spokesperson on UNRWA allegations
- Independent oncologist on the Russian cancer vaccine claim
- VWS policymaker or health insurer on the patient flow problems

Source traffic light for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Jos Schols — Professor of geriatric medicine, Maastricht University	+1	+1	+2	+1	+1	+1	+7	GREEN
Joyce — Transfer nurse HagaZiekenhuis; chair of the transfer nurses section V&VN	0	+1	+2	+1	+1	+2	+7	GREEN
Peter Malcontent — Expert on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict	-1	0	+1	0	-1	0	-1	YELLOW



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

Summary:

- Jos Schols: GREEN (+7) — Qualified academic, slightly normative
- Joyce: GREEN (+7) — Practical expert, institutional interest not mentioned
- Peter Malcontent: YELLOW (-1) — Strongly normative statements, affiliation unknown, framed as neutral



2. SOURCE SELECTION

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

Definition: Which sources are cited? Are they diverse and independent?

Source 1: Dutch Hospital Data

Timestamp: 01:35

Statement

"Figures from Dutch Hospital Data show that in 2022 more than 265,000 hospital beds were occupied by people who no longer needed hospital care."

- (a) Funding and management:** Dutch Hospital Data is a foundation funded by Dutch hospitals. Institutional interest in transparency about capacity problems.
- (b) Structural conflict of interest:** Hospitals have an interest in recognition of capacity problems in order to obtain policy attention and funding.
- (c) Missing counter-source:** An independent evaluation of the DHD figures or an alternative data source (e.g. CBS or NZa) is absent.

Source 2: Israeli army (IDF) — claim about Hamas tunnel

Timestamp: 19:02

Statement

"earlier this week, according to the Israeli army, a Hamas tunnel was found under the UNRWA headquarters in Gaza."

- (a) Funding and management:** Israeli Ministry of Defence — state military source in an active conflict.
- (b) Structural conflict of interest:** The IDF has a direct strategic interest in delegitimising UNRWA.
- (c) Missing counter-source:** Independent verification of the tunnel claim is absent; UNRWA's response to this specific claim is not cited.

Rumour check (penalty points):

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 14:03

Claim: "According to American intelligence services, this is his daughter: Maria Vorontsova."

Word marker: "According to American intelligence services"

Primary source present: No — "American intelligence services" is an anonymous government source without verification — Penalty point: +1

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 18:14

Claim: "Although according to critics that company is merely a way of channelling money to her."

Word marker: "according to critics"

Primary source present: No — "critics" are not identified — Penalty point: +1

Summary: The source selection is limited and one-sided: Dutch Hospital Data (hospital interest), IDF (party to the conflict) and anonymous "American intelligence services" are presented as factual sources without independent verification or counter-sources. Two rumours without a primary source increase the score by 2 penalty points.



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



3. TIME ALLOCATION

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Distribution of speaking time between different positions.

Estimated speaking time:

Healthcare segment (approx. 00:00–13:04):

- Jos Schols (professor): approx. 4 min. (31%)
- Joyce (transfer nurse): approx. 3 min. (23%)
- Kelly (informal carer): approx. 3 min. (23%)
- Willem (informal carer): approx. 1.5 min. (12%)
- Presenter/voice-over: approx. 1.5 min. (12%)
- Policymaker/minister/health insurer: 0 min. (0%)

UNRWA segment (approx. 17:04–25:57):

- Peter Malcontent (expert): approx. 4 min. (44%)
- UNRWA director (camp Lebanon): approx. 2 min. (22%)
- Don Ceder (CU MP, via quotation): approx. 0.5 min. (6%)
- Samer Awad (camp resident): approx. 1 min. (11%)
- Presenter/voice-over: approx. 1.5 min. (17%)
- Israeli voice: 0 min. (0%)

Putin/cancer vaccine segment (approx. 13:08–17:04):

- Unidentified expert: approx. 2 min. (50%)
- Ronald Plasterk: approx. 1 min. (25%)
- Presenter/voice-over: approx. 1 min. (25%)

Summary: In the healthcare segment, the voice of policymakers and health insurers is entirely absent. In the UNRWA segment, the pro-UNRWA/pro-Palestinian side (Malcontent + UNRWA director + camp resident) receives approximately 77% of speaking time, while the critical side (Ceder) receives only 6% and Israel is not heard at all.



4. OMISSION (Selective Omission)									6/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Definition: What is not shown while it is relevant?

Omission 1:

Context	The Minister of VWS or a policy-responsible official on the patient flow problems is entirely absent. Relevant at: 00:09–13:04 (entire healthcare segment)
Effect	The broadcast suggests that the problem is structural and unresolved without discussing government policy or ongoing measures, thereby creating a one-sided picture of policy failure.

Omission 2:

Context	The content of the UNRWA investigation into Hamas involvement is not discussed; only the accusation and the financial consequences. Relevant at: 17:04–25:57
Effect	Viewers cannot assess how serious the allegations are and whether the suspension of funding is proportionate, which creates the impression that Western countries acted hastily.

Omission 3:

Context	The Israeli response to the accusation that it is strategically attacking UNRWA to divert attention (Malcontent, 21:27–25:52) is entirely absent. Relevant at: 21:27
Effect	A serious accusation directed at Israel is presented without rebuttal, which artificially increases the credibility of the accusation.

Summary: Three structural omissions reinforce each other: the absence of policy voices in the healthcare segment and the absence of Israeli voices and UNRWA investigation content in the Gaza segment create a one-sided picture on both main topics.

Missing voices

- Minister of VWS: Could have explained what policy is being pursued to address the patient flow problems and what measures are being considered.
- Health insurer (e.g. Zilveren Kruis or VGZ): Could have explained how assessment criteria and funding structures contribute to the stagnation.
- Director of a nursing home or rehabilitation centre: Could have clarified why capacity is lacking and what is needed to resolve this.
- Israeli spokesperson or embassy: Could have responded to the accusation that Israel is strategically attacking UNRWA to divert attention.
- Independent UN investigator: Could have explained what the UNRWA allegations entail and how the investigation is progressing.



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

- Independent oncologist or vaccinologist: Could have scientifically assessed the Russian cancer vaccine claim instead of providing a political-contextual interpretation.
- Home care organisation (e.g. Buurtzorg): Could have explained why home care capacity is insufficient and what structural solutions exist.
- Patient organisation (e.g. Patiëntenfederatie Nederland): Could have systematically represented the perspective of patients and their families.



5. STATISTICAL MANIPULATION

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Complete figures include: absolute number, share (%) and trend

Definition: Selective or misleading use of statistics.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 01:35–01:57

Figure: "more than 265,000 hospital beds were occupied by people who no longer needed hospital care. That amounts to an average of 727 hospital beds per day. That is an increase compared to the previous year, when it was 551."

Dimensions:

- (a) Absolute value: ✓ mentioned (265,000 per year; 727 per day)
- (b) Share: X not mentioned — what percentage of the total number of hospital beds in the Netherlands is this?
- (c) Trend: ✓ partially mentioned (increase from 551 to 727)

Missing context

The total number of hospital beds in the Netherlands (approx. 50,000 clinical beds) is not mentioned. 727 per day out of approx. 50,000 beds is approx. 1.5% — a relevant percentage for interpretation.

Effect

The absolute figures (727, 265,000) sound alarming without the relative scale being clear.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 21:53–22:01

Figure: "We have 1.4 million Palestinian refugees sitting in a small area in Rafah."

Dimensions:

- (a) Absolute value: ✓ mentioned
- (b) Share: X not mentioned — what percentage of the total Gaza population?
- (c) Trend: X not mentioned — how has this number grown?

Missing context

The total population of Gaza (approx. 2.3 million) and the size of Rafah are not mentioned, making it impossible to fully assess the concentration.

Effect

The figure reinforces the sense of urgency without the viewer being able to contextualise it.

Summary: Two cases of incomplete presentation of figures in which absolute numbers are used without share or adequate context, which increases the dramatic impact without the viewer being able to assess the actual scale.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Discrediting through association with negative groups or ideas.

Association 1:

Timestamp: 16:42–16:57

Quote

"Putin nevertheless wants — and this is also that war propaganda — to act as in Soviet times, as if Russia is once again an enormously developed scientific country. Which it has not been for a long time."

Technique: Putin's cancer vaccine claim is directly linked to "war propaganda" and the Soviet Union, thereby discrediting any scientific content in advance.

Effect

Viewers are steered to regard the claim as propaganda before any substantive scientific assessment has taken place.

Association 2:

Timestamp: 13:11–13:15

Quote

"The Russian Prime Minister Putin is once again attracting attention. Yes, last week already the much-discussed interview with Tucker Carlson."

Technique: Putin is associated with Tucker Carlson, who is regarded as controversial in Western media, thereby undermining the credibility of Putin's statements in advance.

Effect

The association with Carlson functions as implicit discrediting without a substantive argument.

Association 3:

Timestamp: 28:18 (approx. 28:18 — Malcontent on Israel)

Quote

"Israel is looking for scapegoats with which it can also divert attention from itself."

Technique: Israeli actions are associated with deliberate deception and strategic manipulation without factual substantiation.

Effect

Israel is negatively framed as an actor that deliberately manipulates the international community.

Summary: Three cases of associative discrediting: Putin via Soviet propaganda and Tucker Carlson, Israel via the "scapegoats" metaphor. None of these associations is factually substantiated; they function as rhetorical frames.



7. TIMING

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1:

Position: 00:09 (opening)

Content: "727 hospital beds are being unnecessarily occupied every day by patients who actually need to be discharged."

Timing effect

The broadcast opens with the most alarming figure without context or nuance. This sets the tone for the entire healthcare segment as a crisis situation, causing viewers to view the rest of the information through a lens of urgency.

Finding 2:

Position: 25:28–25:52 (end of UNRWA segment)

Content: "Israel is looking for scapegoats with which it can also divert attention from itself. Western countries have gone along with it."

Timing effect

The UNRWA segment ends with Malcontent's strongest normative statement, which accuses Israel and Western countries of complicity. This is the last impression viewers take away; no rebuttal follows.

Summary: The opening with alarming figures and the conclusion of the UNRWA segment with an unchallenged accusation directed at Israel and Western countries are the two most significant timing effects in the broadcast.



8. SELECTIVE INDIGNATION

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Definition: Indignation at certain positions but not at comparable others.

Methodological principle (v2.2): The triggering event must be documented before a reaction is assessed as selective.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 02:45–02:55

Triggering event: Report about informal carers becoming overburdened because patients are discharged too early.

Reaction: "You cannot remain unmoved watching this report. It cannot be that we, the impressive Netherlands, end up relying solely on informal carers. That is unacceptable."

Comparison

In the discussion of the UNRWA funding suspension (19:12) — which also affects vulnerable people — no comparable normative statement is made by the presenter or an expert in similar terms.

Asymmetry: The indignation about the healthcare situation is explicit and emotionally charged; the indignation about the humanitarian situation in Gaza is channelled via Malcontent but not expressed by the presenter himself. Limited asymmetry demonstrable.

Degree of indignation: 2/5

Selectivity: 2/5

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 23:57–24:05

Triggering event: Expert Malcontent responds to the position of ChristenUnie MP Ceder on UNRWA.

Reaction: "He is responsible for his own statements but I have the impression that he is somewhat distorting reality."

Comparison

No comparable critical qualification of statements by pro-UNRWA actors (e.g. the UNRWA director) by the presenter or an expert.

Asymmetry: Ceder's position is challenged by the expert; the UNRWA director is not questioned or challenged in a comparable manner. Asymmetry demonstrable but limited.

Degree of indignation: 2/5

Selectivity: 2/5

Summary: Two cases of limited selective indignation: normative qualifications are applied more frequently to the critically-UNRWA position (Ceder) than to the pro-UNRWA position (Malcontent, UNRWA director). The asymmetry is present but not extreme.



9. COMPLETENESS (Selective Omission — Overall Picture)

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: How completely does the broadcast portray the subject?

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:09–13:04

Missing perspective/fact: Government policy and ongoing measures of the Ministry of VWS are entirely absent.

Relevance: The patient flow problem is a policy issue; without policy context, viewers cannot assess whether measures are already being taken.

Effect

The broadcast implies policy failure without the government being given the opportunity to respond.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 17:04–25:57

Missing perspective/fact: The content of the UN investigation into Hamas involvement in UNRWA is not discussed; nor are the specific allegations against the twelve dismissed employees.

Relevance: Without substantive discussion of the allegations, viewers cannot assess whether the suspension of funding is justified.

Effect

The suspension is implicitly presented as hasty and unjustified.

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 13:08–17:04

Missing perspective/fact: No independent scientific assessment of the Russian cancer vaccine claim; the claim is interpreted exclusively in a political-contextual manner.

Relevance: The scientific merits of the claim are relevant for a fair assessment.

Effect

The claim is dismissed as propaganda in advance without substantive scientific testing.

Summary: On all three main topics, crucial perspectives are missing that are necessary for a complete and balanced picture. The broadcast covers complex subjects within too narrow a framework, resulting in structural one-sidedness.



Soft facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING (Setting the frame)

5/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Definition: How is the subject fundamentally framed?

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:44

Quote	<i>"This is that healthcare infarction. People are waiting here for follow-up care."</i>
Manipulation	The concept of "healthcare infarction" is presented as an established fact while it is a metaphor implying a crisis situation. The term is not problematised or contextualised.
Why problematic	Viewers are steered to see the situation as an acute crisis before the facts have been fully presented; alternative frames (e.g. "structural challenge" or "transition problem") are not considered.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 18:05–18:07

Quote	<i>"UNRWA was established in 1949 to accommodate Palestinians who had to flee during the so-called Nakba."</i>
Manipulation	The use of "so-called Nakba" is notable: "so-called" implies doubt about the historical term, while the Nakba is a historically documented event. This can be read both as relativisation and as neutral distancing.
Why problematic	The term "so-called" introduces ambiguity about a historical fact, which affects the framing of the Palestinian refugee issue.

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 16:42–16:53

Quote	<i>"Putin nevertheless wants — and this is also that war propaganda — to act as in Soviet times, as if Russia is once again an enormously developed scientific country."</i>
Manipulation	The cancer vaccine claim is framed exclusively as a propaganda tool, thereby declaring the scientific content irrelevant in advance.
Why problematic	A scientific claim deserves a scientific assessment; the exclusively political frame precludes substantive testing.

Summary: Three significant framing choices: the "healthcare infarction" frame as an established fact, the ambiguous "so-called Nakba" formulation and the exclusively propagandistic frame for the Russian cancer vaccine claim. All three steer viewers' interpretation in a particular direction without offering alternative frames.

Voorzitter: Schläpfer, David - **Contact:** kontakt@SVFAB.ch - **Adres:** SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zürich 1



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



11. WORD CHOICE AND TERMINOLOGY

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:44

Quote	<i>"This is that healthcare infarction."</i>
Manipulation	"Healthcare infarction" is a medical metaphor implying a life-threatening situation; its use as a descriptive term for a capacity problem is emotionally charged.
Why problematic	Neutral alternative: "capacity problem in the flow of hospital care" — the metaphor artificially increases the sense of urgency.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 28:28

Quote	<i>"Israel is looking for scapegoats with which it can also divert attention from itself."</i>
Manipulation	"Scapegoats" is a negatively charged expression that positions Israel as an actor that deliberately misleads; "divert attention" implies malicious intent.
Why problematic	Neutral alternative: "Israel has an interest in drawing attention to UNRWA's shortcomings" — the chosen formulation implies intentional manipulation without evidence.

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 20:28–20:31

Quote	<i>"Director Klaus would actually rather not talk about Hamas and UNRWA in Gaza. But after much insistence she is willing to say something about it."</i>
Manipulation	"After much insistence" suggests that the UNRWA director is concealing something or is reluctant for strategic reasons, while reluctance may also be professionally or legally motivated.
Why problematic	Neutral alternative: "The director indicates being cautious about making statements on an ongoing investigation" — the chosen formulation arouses suspicion without evidence of malicious intent.

Summary: Three cases of emotionally or suggestively charged language: "healthcare infarction" as an alarming metaphor, "scapegoats" as a disqualifying characterisation of Israel, and "after much insistence" as a suggestion of concealment. All three steer interpretation without factual substantiation.



12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Methodological principle (v2.2): The triggering event must be documented before an intervention is assessed as asymmetric.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 23:16

Triggering event: Expert Malcontent states that UNRWA is "the lifeline" for Palestinian refugees.

Quote (presenter)

"That needs to be cut off?"

Comparison

In the case of Don Ceder's position (22:38–22:49), his standpoint is presented via a quotation without him being present in the studio and able to respond; Malcontent does get the opportunity to comment on Ceder's position.

Asymmetry: Ceder is not invited to the studio to defend his position, while Malcontent can explain his position and challenge Ceder's standpoint. This is a structural asymmetry.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 22:25–22:35

Triggering event: Question about the financial situation of UNRWA.

Quote (presenter)

"They will soon be in the red." / "You need to be able to plan as an organisation."

Comparison

The presenter paraphrases UNRWA's financial distress sympathetically; a comparable sympathetic paraphrase of the position of countries suspending funding is absent.

Asymmetry: Limitedly demonstrable — the presenter implicitly adopts the UNRWA side in his paraphrase.

Summary: The most significant moderation asymmetry is the absence of Don Ceder from the studio while his position is being challenged by Malcontent. This gives Malcontent a structural advantage in the debate that is not corrected by the moderation.



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Different hard/soft questions to different persons.

Asymmetry 1:

To Jos Schols, 03:05: "Is the healthcare infarction already underway?" — neutral/open

To Peter Malcontent, 23:16: "That needs to be cut off?" — suggestive/leading (implies that Ceder wants UNRWA to be "cut off")

Comparison

The question to Malcontent is rhetorically charged and suggests an extreme interpretation of Ceder's position; the question to Schols is open and neutral.

Asymmetry 2:

To Peter Malcontent, 24:35: "What do you think? Is this the death blow for UNRWA?" — open but dramatically charged

To Don Ceder (not present): no direct question possible — his position is presented via quotation without the possibility of follow-up questioning.

Comparison

Malcontent receives multiple open questions to nuance his position; Ceder has no opportunity whatsoever to respond to Malcontent's criticism.

Summary: The questions to Malcontent are predominantly open and give him space to develop his position; Ceder's position is presented via a quotation without follow-up questioning or rebuttal. This creates a structural inequality in the treatment of the two positions.



14. FALSE BALANCE

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Artificial balance despite factual imbalance.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 13:44–13:58

Construction: "The only question is: is it credible? No, it is not credible."

Analysis

The broadcast poses a question about credibility but immediately answers it negatively via an unidentified expert. No scientific voice is cited that assesses the claim substantively; the appearance of an open question is created but immediately closed.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 22:38–25:52

Construction: Don Ceder (critical of UNRWA) via quotation versus Peter Malcontent (pro-UNRWA) in the studio.

Analysis

The broadcast presents two "sides" of the UNRWA debate, but the structural inequality (Ceder absent, Malcontent present and able to respond) makes the apparent balance misleading.

Summary: Two cases of false balance: an apparently open question about the Russian cancer vaccine claim that is immediately closed, and an apparently two-sided presentation of the UNRWA debate in which one side is structurally favoured.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1:

Agenda element: The "healthcare infarction" as an established and inevitable problem.

Timestamp: 00:44 — Evidence: "This is that healthcare infarction."

Alternative agenda: The question of whether the healthcare system needs to be structurally reformed (e.g. abolition of market forces, reintroduction of care homes) does not make it onto the agenda; the discussion remains limited to treating symptoms.

Finding 2:

Agenda element: UNRWA as an indispensable organisation whose funding is being unjustly suspended.

Timestamp: 22:01–22:13 — Evidence: "People are more dependent on external aid than ever."

Alternative agenda: The question of whether UNRWA needs to be structurally reformed, whether alternative aid organisations could take over the role, or whether the allegations of Hamas infiltration should be taken seriously, does not feature as an equally valid agenda option.

Finding 3:

Agenda element: Russian scientific claims are propaganda by definition.

Timestamp: 16:42 — Evidence: "and that is also that war propaganda"

Alternative agenda: The question of whether Russian scientific research in specific areas (e.g. cancer vaccines) should be assessed substantively regardless of the political context does not make it onto the agenda.

Summary: On all three main topics, a specific agenda frame is presented as self-evident: the healthcare infarction as an inevitable crisis, UNRWA as indispensable and unjustly attacked, and Russian science as propaganda. Alternative frames are not systematically considered.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Overview of Individual Scores

No.	Criterion	Type	Score	Main finding (1 sentence)
1	Expert selection	H	5	Three experts with varying credibility; Malcontent framed as neutral expert while serving as normative voice without stated affiliation
2	Source selection	H	5	Two rumours without primary source; IDF claim and DHD figures without independent verification
3	Time allocation	H	3	Pro-UNRWA voices receive approx. 77% of speaking time in Gaza segment; policymakers entirely absent in healthcare segment
4	Omission	H	6	Three structural omissions: VWS policy, UNRWA investigation content, Israeli rebuttal
5	Statistical manipulation	H	3	Absolute figures without relative share; 727 beds not set against total capacity
6	Guilt by association	H	4	Putin via Soviet propaganda and Tucker Carlson; Israel via "scapegoats" metaphor
7	Timing	H	3	Opening with alarming figures; conclusion of UNRWA segment with unchallenged accusation directed at Israel
8	Selective indignation	H	4	Limited asymmetry: Ceder's position challenged by expert; UNRWA director not questioned in comparable manner
9	Completeness	H	6	On all three main topics, crucial perspectives are structurally absent
10	Framing	S	5	"Healthcare infarction" as established fact; Russian claim exclusively as propaganda; "so-called Nakba"
11	Word choice	S	4	"Healthcare infarction", "scapegoats", "after much insistence" — emotionally charged without factual substantiation
12	Moderation behaviour	S	4	Ceder absent while Malcontent challenges his position; structural asymmetry not corrected
13	Question asymmetry	S	4	Leading question to Malcontent about Ceder; Ceder given no opportunity to respond
14	False balance	S	3	Apparently open question about Russian claim immediately closed; apparently two-sided UNRWA presentation structurally unequal
15	Agenda-setting	S	5	Three agenda frames presented as self-evident without alternative frames

Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (average criteria 1-9): 4.3 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (average criteria 10-15): 4.2 / 10
- TOTAL SCORE (average all 15 criteria): 4.3 / 10

Voorzitter: Schläpfer, David - **Contact:** kontakt@SVFAB.ch - **Adres:** SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zürich 1



Dominant Techniques

The 3 strongest techniques in this broadcast:

- 1. Omission (Score 6):** On all three main topics, crucial voices and perspectives are structurally absent: the Minister of VWS in the healthcare segment, Israeli responses and UNRWA investigation content in the Gaza segment, and independent scientific assessment in the Putin segment. These omissions create a consistently one-sided picture that is explained not by incidental errors but by structural selection.
- 2. Completeness (Score 6):** The broadcast covers three complex subjects without a complete perspective being offered on any subject. Of the ten identified relevant perspectives, only two are indicated and none is fully addressed, which structurally limits the informational value for viewers.
- 3. Framing (Score 5):** Three central framing choices steer viewers' interpretation: the "healthcare infarction" frame as an established fact, the exclusively propagandistic frame for Russian scientific claims, and the implicit framing of UNRWA as indispensable and unjustly attacked. Alternative frames are not systematically considered.

Core Messages of the Broadcast

MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE): "The Dutch healthcare system is in an acute crisis in which vulnerable elderly people are the victims of capacity shortages and bureaucratic barriers."

Technique: Framing via "healthcare infarction", emotional testimonies from informal carers, alarming opening figures — Evidence: 00:09, 00:44, 02:45

MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL): "Western countries, including the Netherlands, are acting hastily by suspending UNRWA funding and are thereby playing into Israel's hands."

Technique: One-sided expert selection (Malcontent), absence of Israeli voice, leading questions — Evidence: 21:27, 25:28, 19:12

MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL): "Russian scientific claims are propaganda by definition and do not deserve serious substantive assessment."

Technique: Guilt by association (Soviet Union, Tucker Carlson), absence of independent scientific assessment — Evidence: 13:11, 16:42, 16:57

Reasoning: The broadcast scores 4.3/10, indicating a slight but consistent tendency. The tendency is not the result of one dominant manipulation technique but of a pattern of structural omissions, one-sided expert selection and framing choices that together have a consistently directional effect. In the UNRWA segment the one-sidedness is most pronounced: the pro-UNRWA/pro-Palestinian side structurally receives more speaking time, a present expert and sympathetic framing, while the critically-UNRWA side (Ceder) and the Israeli position are structurally disadvantaged. This pattern is relevant in the context of Media Act Art. 2.1, which requires pluriform and balanced reporting.

CONCLUSION

The EenVandaag broadcast shows a pattern of structural one-sidedness on three of the four topics covered that cannot be regarded as incidental. The most significant finding concerns the UNRWA segment, where the pro-UNRWA position is structurally favoured through expert selection, speaking time distribution, moderation behaviour and framing, while the critically-UNRWA position (Ceder) and the Israeli position are structurally disadvantaged. In the healthcare segment, the voice of policymakers and health insurers is entirely absent, creating a one-sided picture of policy failure. The Putin segment lacks an independent scientific assessment and reduces the claim to propaganda in advance. Although the total score (4.3/10) indicates a slight tendency and not systematic manipulation, the pattern of structural omissions and one-sided expert selection is relevant for the assessment in the context of Media Act Art. 2.1, which requires that pluriformity is guaranteed across the total output. In view of the requirement of Media Act Art. 2.1 that pluriformity is guaranteed across the total output, it is advisable that AVROTROS in future broadcasts on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict structurally ensures a balanced representation of all relevant positions, including the Israeli position and critical voices on UNRWA.



OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual scores — All 15 criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Classification
1	Expert selection	5	●●●
2	SOURCE SELECTION	5	●●●
3	TIME ALLOCATION	3	●●
4	OMISSION (Selective Omission)	6	●●●
5	STATISTICAL MANIPULATION	3	●●
6	GUILT BY ASSOCIATION	4	●●
7	TIMING	3	●●
8	SELECTIVE INDIGNATION	4	●●
9	COMPLETENESS (Selective Omission — Overall Picture)	6	●●●
10	FRAMING (Setting the frame)	5	●●●
11	WORD CHOICE AND TERMINOLOGY	4	●●
12	MODERATION BEHAVIOUR	4	●●
13	QUESTION ASYMMETRY	4	●●
14	FALSE BALANCE	3	●●
15	AGENDA-SETTING	5	●●●

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

4.3/10

Considerable imbalance

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

4.2/10

Considerable imbalance

TOTAL SCORE

4.3/10

Considerable imbalance

Average of Hard Facts and Soft Facts



KEY — Meaning of the scores

Individual scores per criterion (0–10)

0	No finding	No relevant deviation established.
1–2	Weak finding	Slight deviation without material impairment of balance.
3–4	Slight to moderate finding	Recognisable tendency; minor to moderate impact.
5	Moderate finding with impact	Relevant imbalance that affects the opinion-forming potential of the audience.
6	Considerable finding (threshold)	Scores from 6 onwards are designated as 'considerable findings'.
7	Considerable finding	Clear, well-documented imbalance with clear impact.
8–9	Serious finding	Pronounced imbalance; multiple documented individual findings in this criterion.
10	Maximum severity	Systematic, persistent imbalance in this criterion.

Aggregated deviation index — Interpretation ranges

0.0 – 2.5	Unremarkable	No material patterns observable; broadcast meets the balance requirement.
2.6 – 4.0	Slight imbalance	Isolated deviations; statistically visible, but within tolerance range.
4.1 – 6.0	Considerable imbalance	Multiple considerable findings; relevant impairment of diversity of perspectives.
6.1 – 8.0	Serious deviation from the balance requirement. High degree of deviation	Pronounced patterns across broadcasts; high impact.
8.1 – 10	Fundamental systemic one-sidedness. Very high degree of bias	Maximum severity across almost all criteria; systematically one-sided reporting.

Party-political bias (-5 to +5)

-5 to -3	Strongly disadvantaged	Party is clearly disadvantaged in framing, airtime or presentation.
-2 to -1	Slightly disadvantaged	Recognisable but minor disadvantage.
0	Neutral	No observable favouring or disadvantaging.
+1 to +2	Slightly favoured	Recognisable but minor favouring.
+3 to +5	Strongly favoured	Party is clearly favoured in framing, airtime or presentation.



CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL FRAMEWORK (Media Act Art. 2.1)

Assessment on the basis of Media Act Art. 2.1

The Media Act requires pluriform, balanced and independent reporting by the public broadcaster.

Violation 1:

Standard: Media Act Art. 2.1 — pluriformity and balance

Factual description: In the UNRWA segment, the pro-UNRWA/pro-Palestinian position is structurally favoured through expert selection (Malcontent present in studio), speaking time distribution (approx. 77% pro-UNRWA), and the absence of an Israeli voice or a critically-UNRWA expert. Don Ceder (CU) is presented via a quotation without the possibility of rebuttal, while Malcontent can challenge his position unchallenged.

Evidence: Timestamp 21:27–25:52 — Quote: "Israel is looking for scapegoats with which it can also divert attention from itself. Western countries have gone along with it by saying stop the aid."

Assessment: The structural inequality in the treatment of the two positions in the UNRWA debate is not compatible with the requirement of balanced reporting. The accusation directed at Israel and Western countries is presented without rebuttal as the conclusion of the segment, giving the impression that this is the editorial conclusion.

Violation 2:

Standard: Media Act Art. 2.1 — pluriformity

Factual description: In the healthcare segment, the voice of the national government (Minister of VWS), health insurers and patient organisations is entirely absent. The broadcast presents the patient flow problem as an unresolved and acute problem without discussing policy context or ongoing measures.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:09–13:04 — Quote: "This is that healthcare infarction. People are waiting here for follow-up care." — no policy response follows.

Assessment: The absence of policy voices in a segment on a policy issue is a structural omission that impairs the pluriformity of the reporting.

Violation 3:

Standard: Media Act Art. 2.1 — independence and balance

Factual description: In the Putin/cancer vaccine segment, the scientific claim is dismissed as propaganda in advance without independent scientific assessment. The unidentified expert and the political-contextual interpretation replace substantive scientific testing.

Evidence: Timestamp 13:44–16:57 — Quote: "No, it is not credible." / "and that is also that war propaganda"

Assessment: The absence of an independent scientific assessment and the exclusively political frame for a scientific claim are not compatible with the requirement of balanced and independent reporting.

Overall Assessment Media Act Art. 2.1

The EenVandaag broadcast shows patterns on three of the four topics covered that are in tension with the requirements of Media Act Art. 2.1. The most significant finding concerns the UNRWA segment, where the structural inequality in the treatment of the two positions — in terms of expert selection, speaking time distribution, moderation behaviour and framing — is not compatible with the requirement of balanced reporting. The total score of 4.3/10 indicates a slight but consistent tendency that, although not qualifying as systematic manipulation, is nonetheless relevant for the assessment of the pluriformity of the total NPO output. In view of the requirement of Media Act Art. 2.1 that pluriformity is guaranteed across the total output, it is advisable that AVROTROS in future broadcasts on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict structurally ensures a balanced representation of all relevant positions, including the Israeli position and critical voices on UNRWA.



CHAPTER 6 — SOURCE DEPTH CHECK

1. Dutch Hospital Data

- FUNDING:** Foundation funded by Dutch hospitals (NFU members). Institutional interest in transparency about capacity problems.
 - MANDATE:** Data collection and analysis for the hospital sector; compatible with factual reporting but not fully neutral given the funding structure.
 - CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Hospitals have an interest in recognition of capacity problems in order to obtain policy attention and funding; DHD figures may serve this interest.
 - CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**
 - D1 Conflict of interest: 0 — Hospital interest present but not dominant
 - D2 Personal risk: +1 — Institutional risk in case of incorrect data
 - D3 Professional competence: +2 — Specialised data collection for the hospital sector
 - D4 Consistency: +1 — Annual reporting, consistent methodology
 - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +2 — Pure data reporting
 - D6 Source level: +2 — Primary data source
- TOTAL: +8 → SOURCE LIGHT: GREEN
- COUNTER-VOICE:** An independent evaluation of the DHD methodology (e.g. by CBS or NZa) is absent.

2. V&VN (Nurses & Carers Netherlands)

- FUNDING:** Professional association funded by membership contributions from nurses and carers.
 - MANDATE:** Advocacy for the professional group; not fully neutral in assessing workload and capacity problems.
 - CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** V&VN has an institutional interest in recognition of workload and staff shortages in order to influence employment conditions and staffing policy.
 - CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**
 - D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Professional interest in recognition of workload
 - D2 Personal risk: +1 — Limited risk from critical statements
 - D3 Professional competence: +2 — Direct practical experience in the domain
 - D4 Consistency: +1 — Consistent with professional group positions
 - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Predominantly factual
 - D6 Source level: +2 — Primary experiential source
- TOTAL: +6 → SOURCE LIGHT: GREEN
- COUNTER-VOICE:** A health insurer or policymaker who assesses the capacity problems from a different perspective is absent.

3. UNRWA (United Nations Relief and Works Agency)

- FUNDING:** UN organisation funded by voluntary contributions from member states. Institutional interest in continuation of funding and recognition of indispensability.
 - MANDATE:** Aid to Palestinian refugees; not neutral in assessing its own functioning or allegations of Hamas infiltration.
 - CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** UNRWA has a direct institutional interest in refuting allegations of Hamas infiltration and in continuing funding.
 - CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**
 - D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Direct institutional interest in refuting allegations
 - D2 Personal risk: 0 — Institutional risk if allegations are confirmed
 - D3 Professional competence: +1 — Operational expertise in refugee aid
 - D4 Consistency: 0 — Position consistent but institutionally motivated
 - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1 — Appeal to humanitarian need without substantive response to allegations
 - D6 Source level: +1 — Primary institutional source
- TOTAL: -1 → SOURCE LIGHT: YELLOW



5. COUNTER-VOICE: An independent UN investigator or external evaluator of the UNRWA allegations is entirely absent.

IMPORTANT: "Recognised" is not a substantive qualification. It is a social attribution that must itself be critically assessed. All three cited sources are presented in the broadcast as factual authorities without their institutional interests being mentioned.

Source traffic light for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Dutch Hospital Data	0	+1	+2	+1	+2	+2	+8	GREEN
V&VN (Nurses & Carers Netherlands)	-1	+1	+2	+1	+1	+2	+6	GREEN
UNRWA (United Nations Relief and Works Agency)	-2	0	+1	0	-1	+1	-1	YELLOW

Legal and methodological explanation

No factual determination	The presented results do not constitute factual determinations about individual persons, editorial teams or broadcasts. They are the product of a standardised operationalisation, not a determination of individual responsibility.
No legal judgement	The aggregated deviation index does not replace a legal assessment on the basis of Media Act 2008 Art. 2.1. The assessment of whether a specific broadcast violates statutory requirements is exclusively the responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular the Commissariaat voor de Media).
No proof of causality	Statistical correlations must not be interpreted as proof of causal relationships or editorial intentions. Deviation values may be influenced by subject choice, news environment, political controversiality or format logic.
No judgement on intent	The analysis measures observable structural characteristics of broadcasts. A score of 7 means that a considerable imbalance has been established — not that the editorial team intended this. The methodology makes no statements about motives or strategic objectives.
Heuristic comparison instrument	The index serves for comparative pattern recognition across thousands of broadcasts, not for precise metric measurement of individual contributions. Threshold values serve as heuristic orientation, not as sharp legal qualification.



APPENDIX 1: NATIONAL LEGISLATION

Legal basis Netherlands — NPO

Act

Media Act 2008

Relevant articles

- Art. 2.1 (Public media remit): The public media service provides independent, pluriform, balanced information of high journalistic quality. The public media service contributes to the democratic, social and cultural needs of Dutch society.
- Art. 2.1 paragraph 2: The public media service reflects the social diversity of the Netherlands.
- Art. 2.88: Editorial independence and journalistic standards are guaranteed. The programmes are made under the editorial responsibility of the broadcasting associations.

Core obligations

1. **Independence:** Independent provision of information
2. **Pluriformity:** Pluriform reporting
3. **Balance:** Balanced information of high journalistic quality
4. **Social diversity:** Reflection of Dutch society

Supervisory authority

- Commissariaat voor de Media (CvdM): Media supervision, compliance with Media Act
- NPO Ombudsman: Internal complaints body

Complaints procedure

1. NPO Ombudsman
2. Commissariaat voor de Media
3. Court (administrative law)



APPENDIX 2: SCIENTIFIC SOURCES

Literature

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

SVFAB Working Papers

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

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

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



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

Evaluations and membership at SVFAB

On SVFAB.ch you will find detailed evaluations and you can also have analyses carried out for any broadcast of your choice (billed separately).

To ensure the quality of our work, we depend on membership and donor contributions.

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: here the manipulation techniques are explained in detail, starting with the selection of contributors and source selection. Subsequently 15 principles are explained: omission, framing, temporal framing, guilt by association, emotionalisation, removal of context and much more, illustrated with numerous examples. Moreover, it becomes visible where we ourselves apply these techniques — this promotes not only insight but also empathy.

Optionally the book is supplied 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 do not know this provide material. Good quotes that are cut incorrectly. Correct statements that end up in the wrong context. Honest answers that are framed as confessions.

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

For politicians, activists, entrepreneurs, whistleblowers — for everyone who is in the spotlight and wants to understand how the game works. So that they stop playing along — and start shaping it. In A5 format. Direct. For preparation, for reference, for debriefing and in difficult situations



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



You think you see the world. In reality you see the frame that someone has placed around it. Framing is the oldest and most elegant manipulation technique in the world. It does not 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 participate. Daily. Unconsciously. You too. This book is not a dry textbook. It is a workbook — playful, direct, full of examples from real life. You learn not only how others frame you. You learn how you yourself frame — and how you can use it consciously and fairly. Because those who understand framing see the world more clearly. Hear news differently. Conduct conversations more confidently. And no longer let a frame be imposed on them so easily that someone else has chosen.

With many exercises and concrete examples from politics, media and everyday life — and an occasional smile.

Framing with style. Because the frame changes everything.