



NPO DETAILED ANALYSIS

2024-06-15_VPWON_1353188

Broadcast: NPO broadcast | 2024-06-15 | Analysed on: 2026-05-22 21:06

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

TOTAL SCORE

5.7/10

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 assessed 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)

4.7 / 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 supported by PVV (37 seats), VVD (24), NSC (20) and BBB (7). Prime Minister Schoof is non-partisan. The opposition consists of GL-PvdA (25), D66 (9), CDA (5), SP (5), PvdD (3), CU (3), SGP (3), FvD (3), DENK and Volt. PVV is with 37 seats the largest party in the House of Representatives.

Party	CHES L-R	Seats	Government/Opposition	Core position
SP	1.1	5	Opposition	Socialist, anti-market
GL-PvdA	2.4	25	Opposition (largest)	Climate, social, humane asylum
PvdD	2.5	3	Opposition	Animal rights, climate
D66	4.8	9	Opposition	Liberal-progressive, pro-EU
CDA	5.5	5	Opposition	Christian democratic, centre
NSC	5.8	20	Government	Economic security, rule of law
CU	6.0	3	Opposition	Christian-social
VVD	7.0	24	Government	Liberal, free market
BBB	7.5	7	Government	Agrarian-populist
SGP	7.8	3	Opposition	Reformed, conservative
PVV	9.2	37	Government (largest)	Anti-Islam, migration stop, Wilders
FvD	9.5	3	Opposition	Far right, Baudet

The PVV-VVD-NSC-BBB coalition has fundamental ideological tensions: NSC emphasises the rule of law and constitutional limits, while PVV candidates such as Faber have made statements that are at odds with that rule of law. The formation was characterised by the AIVD screening of Markuszower and the controversy surrounding Faber. A second line of tension concerns the extra-parliamentary structure: coalition parties want to maintain distance from the cabinet, which complicates democratic oversight. Thirdly, the question arises whether PVV policy (de-Islamisation, asylum stop) is feasible within European and international law.

The NPO is the Dutch public broadcaster, legally obliged to provide pluriform, balanced and independent reporting under the Media Act 2008 Art. 2.1. The broadcasting associations (BNNVARA, AVRO-TROS, KRO-NCRV et al.) have their own editorial responsibility; pluralism is assessed across the total output. PVV has repeatedly criticised the NPO as a "left-wing broadcaster", which colours the institutional context of this analysis.



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Assessment per party

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast representation vs. party programme
NSC	+2	03:48 "We think we can implement the greatest administrative reform since 1918" — Programme position: rule of law, economic security, administrative reform — largely correctly represented; Omtzigt is given space to explain his agenda, although the Faber discussion dominates the broadcast
PVV	-2	07:45 "Islam is a reprehensible ideology" / 08:18 "An agenda of antisemitism, terrorism and population replacement is being rolled out" — Programme position: migration stop, de-Islamisation, purchasing power — only the most controversial statements by Faber are shown; PVV positions on purchasing power, state pension or healthcare are not addressed; one-sided selection
VVD	0	Not substantively addressed; Yeşilgöz criticism of Faber briefly mentioned (06:23) but VVD programme positions not discussed
BBB	0	Not addressed in the broadcast
GL-PvdA	0	Not addressed
D66	0	Not addressed
CDA	0	Not addressed
SP	0	Not addressed

Summary Party Bias

- Most accurate representation: NSC (score +2) — Omtzigt is given substantial space to explain his programme
- Strongest distortion: PVV (score -2) — only incriminating statements by Faber are shown, without any representation of PVV policy positions on purchasing power, healthcare or security
- Average deviation from 0: 0.5
- Conclusion: The broadcast focuses almost entirely on NSC (positive) and PVV (negative-selective). PVV programme positions are not substantively addressed; instead, only controversial historical statements by Faber are shown. This produces an asymmetric picture in which NSC is positioned as a responsible actor and PVV as a risk factor.

Left-Right Overall Tendency

TENDENCY SCORE: +1.2

QUALIFICATION: Left-favouring

Reasoning: The broadcast selects exclusively incriminating PVV statements (Faber, population replacement, Islam criticism) without any representation of PVV policy content. NSC leader Omtzigt is positioned as a serious statesman who safeguards the rule of law. Left-wing opposition parties are not addressed, but the thematic frame — rule of law, constitution, integrity — aligns with progressive-liberal political priorities and not with the agenda of the coalition majority.



CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Broadcast details

- Title: NOS Journaal (evening broadcast, presumably NOS Journaal 20:00 or comparable)
- Date: 15.06.2024
- Presenter/reporter: Not named in transcript; one presenter in studio
- Persons interviewed:

Person	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political Spectrum
Pieter Omtzigt	Party leader NSC, Member of Parliament	NSC	Centre-right (CHES 5.8)
Bob Deen	Adviser peace conference, affiliated with Clingendael	Clingendael Institute	No party-political affiliation
Marjolein Faber	Designated Minister of Asylum (PVV)	PVV	Far right (CHES 9.2)
Gidi Markuszower	Designated Minister of Asylum (withdrawn)	PVV	Far right
Reinette Klever	Designated Minister of Development Aid	PVV / ON	Far right
Dilan Yeşilgöz	VVD leader	VVD	Right (CHES 7.0)
Geert Wilders	PVV leader	PVV	Far right
President Zelensky	President of Ukraine	—	—

Main topic

The conclusion of the Dutch cabinet formation (Schoof cabinet), with emphasis on the controversy surrounding designated minister Marjolein Faber (PVV), illustrated via an extensive interview with NSC leader Pieter Omtzigt.



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

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Who speaks as an expert?

Expert 1: Pieter Omtzigt — NSC party leader, Member of Parliament

Timestamp: 01:09–20:57

Statement: "We think we can implement the greatest administrative reform since 1918 by taking the first step of introducing a constitutional court."

Qualification: Politician and directly involved party in the formation; not an independent expert

Missing counter-voice: Constitutional law expert, opposition politician, or independent political scientist

Source depth check Omtzigt:

(a) FUNDING: NSC is a political party funded through party subsidies (Act on the Financing of Political Parties). Structural interest in positive presentation of the coalition outcome.

(b) MANDATE: As party leader and coalition participant, Omtzigt is structurally partisan; his mandate is political, not analytical.

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Direct coalition participant, interest in positive framing of cabinet

D2 Personal risk: +2 — Omtzigt has demonstrably taken personal risk (childcare benefits affair, position elsewhere)

D3 Professional competence: +1 — Experienced parliamentarian, but speaks as a politician not as an independent expert

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistent in rule-of-law agenda

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: 0 — Mix of concrete plans and political rhetoric

D6 Source level: -1 — Primary source for own positions, but no independent analysis

• TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: Omtzigt is implicitly framed as a trustworthy statesman ("glad you are here", extensive space for his own agenda), while he is a directly involved political actor.

Expert 2: Bob Deen — Adviser peace conference, Clingendael Institute

Timestamp: 27:22–31:53

Statement: "This is the phase that precedes the negotiations. Ukraine is trying to form a coalition of countries that support it against Russia."

Qualification: Affiliated with Clingendael, involved in the conference as adviser

Source depth check Deen:

(a) FUNDING: Clingendael is funded by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (approx. 60-70% government funding) and private donors. Structural interest in the continuation of Western foreign policy.

(b) MANDATE: Clingendael has an advisory function for the Dutch government; not fully independent when assessing Western policy.

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Government funding and direct involvement in the conference

D2 Personal risk: 0 — No demonstrable personal risk

D3 Professional competence: +2 — Specialised in conflict resolution and Eastern Europe

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

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistent analytical framework

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Predominantly analytical

D6 Source level: +1 — Direct involvement in conference

• TOTAL: +4 → SOURCE LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: Deen is presented as a neutral expert, while as adviser to the conference he has an institutional interest in a positive interpretation of the Western initiative.

Missing expert groups:

- Russian or Chinese perspective on the peace conference
- Critical geopolitical analyst (e.g. from a Global South perspective)
- Constitutional law expert on the Faber issue

Summary: The broadcast presents two involved actors (a coalition politician and a government-affiliated adviser) as primary sources of information, without independent counter-voices. Both sources score YELLOW on the credibility matrix due to structural conflicts of interest that are not named.

Source traffic light for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Pieter Omtzigt — NSC party leader, Member of Parliament	-2	+2	+1	+1	0	-1	+1	YELLOW
Bob Deen — Adviser peace conference, Clingendael Institute	-1	0	+2	+1	+1	+1	+4	YELLOW



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: Archive material of statements by Marjolein Faber

Timestamp: 07:45–08:23

Statement

"Islam is a reprehensible ideology" / "An agenda of antisemitism, terrorism and population replacement is being rolled out"

(a) Funding and ownership: Own PVV statements, archived by NPO/NOS

(b) Structural conflict of interest: The selection of exclusively incriminating statements without context or rebuttal from Faber herself is editorially directive

(c) Missing counter-source: Faber's own explanation, or a legal assessment of the statements

Source 2: Clingendael Institute (via Bob Deen)

Timestamp: 27:22

Statement

"Coordinating a group of 18 international experts to advise them in Switzerland and mediating countries"

(a) Funding: Ministry of Foreign Affairs (government funding dominant)

(b) Structural conflict of interest: Clingendael advises the Dutch government; interest in continuation of Western policy

(c) Missing counter-source: Analyst with critical perspective on Western peace strategy (e.g. from BRICS countries)

Rumour test (penalty points):

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 05:52

Claim: "The screening is said to have revealed objections."

Word marker: "said to" — conditional without confirmed primary source

Primary source present: No — +1 penalty point

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 06:02

Claim: "someone who is apparently seen as a risk to the integrity of government"

Word marker: "apparently" — indirect attribution without source reference

Primary source present: No — +1 penalty point

Summary: The source selection is limited to two main sources (Omtzigt and Deen), both with structural conflicts of interest. Two claims about the AIVD screening are presented without primary source references. Not a single independent or critical source is cited.



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

Definition: Distribution of speaking time between different positions.

Estimated speaking time:

- Pieter Omtzigt (NSC): approx. 12 min. (37%)
- Bob Deen (Clingendael): approx. 5 min. (15%)
- Presenter: approx. 8 min. (24%)
- Archive material PVV (Faber, Wilders, Markuszower, Klever): approx. 3 min. (9%)
- Other items (Sweden, nuclear power plants, France, Singapore, Heerlen, Ukraine summit, sport, weather): approx. 4 min. (12%)
- Yeşilgöz (VVD): approx. 15 sec. (<1%)
- Zelensky: approx. 30 sec. (1%)

Summary: NSC receives a dominant position with 37% of total broadcast time. PVV appears exclusively via incriminating archive material (9%), without its own speaking time. VVD, BBB and all opposition parties are virtually absent. The time allocation reflects a structural asymmetry in favour of NSC and to the detriment of PVV.



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

Definition: What is not shown, although relevant?

Omission 1:

Context

PVV policy positions on purchasing power, healthcare, security and state pension are not addressed

Relevant at: 07:45–08:23 (exclusively incriminating statements by Faber)

Effect

The viewer receives exclusively an image of PVV as a party of extremist statements, without any representation of the policy content for which 37 seats were won

Omission 2:

Context

No opposition perspective on the formation outcome

Relevant at: 01:09–20:57 (entire formation discussion)

Effect

The formation outcome is assessed exclusively from the perspective of a coalition participant (Omtzigt); critical voices from GL-PvdA, D66 or SP are completely absent

Omission 3:

Context

The content of the outline agreement is not independently discussed

Relevant at: 09:02 "The outline agreement has a number of clear positions"

Effect

The viewer cannot assess whether Omtzigt's claims about the agreement are correct; no independent verification

Summary: Three structural omissions reinforce each other: PVV policy content is absent, opposition is absent, and the agreement itself is not tested. The result is a broadcast that presents the coalition outcome primarily through an NSC lens.

Missing voices

- PVV spokesperson or Faber herself: Could have explained the context and intention of the statements in question
- Constitutional law expert (e.g. from a university): Could have assessed whether Faber's statements are legally problematic and what the constitutional limits are
- Opposition leader (e.g. Frans Timmermans, GL-PvdA): Could have interpreted the formation outcome from a democratically critical perspective
- BBB leader Caroline van der Plas: Could have provided the perspective of the agrarian coalition participant
- Historian or linguist: Could have scientifically contextualised the term "population replacement" instead of the presenter doing so in one sentence
- Voter/focus group: Could have indicated what the population expects from this cabinet
- EU official or foreign correspondent: Could have contextualised the international context of the Dutch coalition



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

- Implementation expert (e.g. Council of State): Could have assessed the feasibility of NSC ambitions (constitutional court, electoral system)



5. NUMERICAL MANIPULATION

2/10

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: 25:36

Figure: "By now only 57 heads of government are gathered"

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value present — (b) Share missing (57 out of how many invited?) — (c) Trend missing (comparison with previous peace conferences)

Missing context

How many countries were invited? What is the percentage of those present?

Effect

"Only" suggests a failure without the relative scale being explained

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 17:44

Figure: "Seven and a half billion euros are being allocated to build more affordable housing"

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value present — (b) Share missing (per dwelling? per year? as % of GDP?) — (c) Trend missing (comparison with previous cabinets)

Missing context

Is this amount sufficient for 100,000 dwellings per year?

Effect

Large figure without frame of reference; viewer cannot assess whether this is ambitious or insufficient

Summary: Two cases of incomplete presentation of figures, where the absence of proportional figures and trends makes interpretation difficult. The impact is limited; there is no active misleading.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Discrediting by association with negative groups or ideas.

Association 1:

Timestamp: 08:18–08:32

Quote

"An agenda of antisemitism, terrorism and population replacement is being rolled out" — followed by: "Is Ms Faber aware that it is a term from National Socialism?"

Technique: Faber's use of "population replacement" is directly linked to National Socialism by the presenter, without the involvement of a historian or jurist

Effect

Faber is implicitly associated with Nazism; this is a serious association that is not substantiated with historical source material

Association 2:

Timestamp: 05:10–05:16

Quote

"It then also becomes known that PVV has Gidi Markuszower in mind as Minister of Asylum and as Deputy Prime Minister. The PVV member came under scrutiny several times in recent years."

Technique: "Several times under scrutiny" is presented as fact without specification; the AIVD screening is then framed as confirmation

Effect

Markuszower is positioned as unreliable without the specific objections being named

Association 3:

Timestamp: 07:45–08:23

Quote

Sequence of Faber statements about Islam, "fortune seekers", "fifth column", "population replacement"

Technique: Montage of statements without chronological or contextual explanation; cumulative effect of accumulation

Effect

Faber is positioned as an extremist through selective montage of her most controversial statements

Source check Faber (as framed person):

- Does Faber work with demonstrable primary sources? NO (statements are political rhetoric)
- Are her core statements falsifiable? PARTLY (policy positions are testable; ideological statements are not)
- What has Faber lost through her position? Reputational damage, international criticism
- What does she gain? Political support within PVV base
- Net: Risk ≈ Gain — no increased credibility based on risk analysis

Result category Faber: B — Borderline case (political statements partly testable, partly ideological; however the framing by the broadcast is heavier than the factual substantiation justifies)



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

Summary: The broadcast employs a cumulative association strategy in which Faber is positioned via montage and direct comparison with National Socialism. The association with Nazism is made by the presenter himself without historical substantiation, which is a serious journalistic negligence.



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

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

Finding 1:

Position: 00:42–01:09 (opening)

Content: "A rollercoaster, this formation. A wild journey that lasted months." — followed by enumeration of scandals (scout failed, apologies from prime ministerial candidate, AIVD screening)

Timing effect

The formation is framed in the opening sentence as chaotic and problematic, even before Omtzigt speaks. This primes the viewer negatively with regard to the coalition.

Finding 2:

Position: 07:45–08:23 (middle of interview)

Content: Montage of incriminating Faber statements, directly after Omtzigt's positive exposition of NSC ambitions

Timing effect

The positive NSC agenda is immediately followed by the most incriminating material about a coalition partner; contrast effect reinforces the negative perception of PVV

Finding 3:

Position: 35:39 (after formation item)

Content: Protest in France against "radical right" — "They are afraid that the radical-right Rassemblement National will also do well in the upcoming parliamentary elections. And they feel increasingly out of place in their own country."

Timing effect

Directly after the Dutch formation discussion about PVV, an item about European right-wing extremism is placed; associative effect without explicit link

Summary: The structure of the broadcast places negative material about the coalition (particularly PVV) strategically after positive NSC moments and links it to European right-wing extremism reporting, creating a cumulative negative frame for the coalition.



8. SELECTIVE INDIGNATION

5/10

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. A reaction can only be assessed as selective if comparable triggering events at other positions did not produce an analogous reaction.

Score calculation:

- Degree of indignation: 3/5 (clearly evident several times, particularly around the population replacement question)
- Selectivity: 2/5 (asymmetry demonstrable but not extreme)

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 08:32

Triggering event: Faber uses the term "population replacement" in an archive recording

Reaction: "Is Ms Faber aware that it is a term from National Socialism?"

Comparison

With Omtzigt's statements about "the rule of law has eroded" (18:53) or his criticism of the previous cabinet ("the previous cabinet violated 13 laws", 12:30), the presenter does not ask a comparably sharp qualifying question

Asymmetry: Demonstrable — incriminating historical connotation is only explicitly named by the presenter in relation to PVV statements

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 09:23–10:05

Triggering event: Omtzigt gives no direct answer to the question of whether "population replacement" is a limit

Reaction: Presenter repeats the question seven times in different formulations

Comparison

With Omtzigt's vague answers about the feasibility of NSC ambitions (e.g. 17:52 "Will encounter difficulties in implementation") there is no comparably persistent follow-up questioning

Asymmetry: Demonstrable — persistence of follow-up questioning is exclusively directed at PVV-related issues

Summary: The presenter shows clear persistence with PVV-related questions (population replacement, seven repetitions) but leaves NSC vagueness about feasibility and coalition risks unchallenged. The asymmetry is demonstrable but not extreme.



9. COMPLETENESS (Selective Omission — Overall Picture)

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Definition: How completely does the broadcast portray the subject?

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 01:09–20:57

Missing perspective: Not a single opposition party speaks about the formation outcome

Relevance: GL-PvdA (25 seats, largest opposition party) has a fundamentally different view of the coalition; D66 and SP likewise

Consequence: The viewer receives exclusively the perspective of a coalition participant; democratic oversight via opposition is invisible

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 07:45–15:07

Missing fact: The content of the rule-of-law declaration that all ministers must sign is not quoted or shown

Relevance: Omtzigt refers to it repeatedly as a guarantee; the viewer cannot assess whether this declaration is sufficient

Consequence: Omtzigt's reassurance cannot be tested

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 25:21–31:53

Missing perspective: Not a single non-Western perspective on the peace conference (India, Brazil, South Africa, Indonesia)

Relevance: These countries came only as observers; their motivation is summarised by Deen but not expressed by themselves

Consequence: The picture of the conference is exclusively Western-oriented

Summary: The broadcast structurally lacks three categories of perspectives: opposition at the formation, independent testing of coalition agreements, and non-Western voices at the Ukraine summit. This leads to a systematically incomplete picture on both main topics.



Soft facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING

6/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Definition: How is the subject fundamentally framed?

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:42–01:09

Quote	<i>"It was a rollercoaster, this formation. A wild journey that lasted months."</i>
Manipulation	The formation is framed as chaotic and problematic even before any substantive discussion
Why problematic	A long formation is not exceptional in the Netherlands (2021: 299 days); the metaphor "rollercoaster" and "wild journey" load the broadcast negatively without factual substantiation

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 15:25–15:27

Quote	<i>"Geert Wilders has not put forward his mildest people. But hardliners."</i>
Manipulation	The presenter qualifies PVV candidates as "hardliners" — a politically charged term that is presented as a factual description
Why problematic	"Hardliner" is a value judgement, not a neutral description; the presenter takes an editorial position here

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 23:51–23:57

Quote	<i>"They are afraid that the radical-right Rassemblement National will also do well in the upcoming parliamentary elections."</i>
Manipulation	The French protest is framed as a reaction to "radical right", directly after the Dutch formation discussion
Why problematic	The implicit link between RN and the Dutch coalition is not made explicit but is associatively present through the placement in the broadcast

Summary: The broadcast employs a consistently negative frame for the coalition (rollercoaster, hardliners, radical right) that is presented as neutral description but in fact constitutes an editorial position.



11. WORD CHOICE AND TERMINOLOGY

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 15:25

Quote	"Geert Wilders has not put forward his mildest people. But hardliners."
Manipulation	"Hardliners" has a negative connotation that equates political conviction with extremism
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "candidates with outspoken positions" or "candidates who represent the PVV programme positions"

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 00:44

Quote	"A wild journey that lasted months"
Manipulation	"Wild journey" suggests chaos and lack of control
Why problematic	Neutral alternative: "a lengthy formation"; the metaphor is evaluative, not descriptive

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 06:23

Quote	"Marjolein Faber is also a not uncontroversial candidate"
Manipulation	Double negation ("not uncontroversial") as a softening of a negative judgement; suggests widely shared doubt
Why problematic	Neutral alternative: "Marjolein Faber has in the past made statements that drew criticism"; "not uncontroversial" implies a broad societal judgement that is not substantiated

Summary: The word choice in the broadcast is consistently negatively charged with regard to the coalition and particularly PVV, via metaphors ("rollercoaster", "wild journey"), political qualifications ("hardliners") and rhetorical constructions ("not uncontroversial").



12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

6/10

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. An intervention can only be assessed as asymmetric if comparable triggering events with other guests did not produce an analogous intervention.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 09:23–10:05

Triggering event: Omtzigt gives no direct answer to the question of whether "population replacement" is a limit

Quote (presenter)

"Is that the limit for you?" — "Is it a limit for you." — "This word is clearly population replacement. Is that the limit for you, that is a fairly clear question." — "If he uses the word population replacement again, is that then the limit for you?"

Comparison

With Omtzigt's vague answers about the feasibility of NSC ambitions (17:52) or his refusal to ask Faber to retract statements (14:22), there is no comparably persistent follow-up questioning

Asymmetry: Demonstrable — seven repetitions of the same question exclusively on a PVV-related topic

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 01:21–01:22

Triggering event: Opening of the interview

Quote (presenter)

"Glad you are here. How are you?"

Comparison

Bob Deen is introduced in a businesslike manner without a personal greeting

Asymmetry: Slight — Omtzigt receives a warm, personal reception that sets a sympathetic tone

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 18:26–18:29

Triggering event: Omtzigt complains that he constantly has to respond to others instead of discussing substance

Quote (presenter)

"But here at the table you say: I expect Ms Faber not to make these statements."

Asymmetry: The presenter implicitly acknowledges Omtzigt's complaint but nevertheless continues the Faber line; no comparable self-critical reflection with other guests

Summary: The moderation behaviour shows a clear asymmetry: persistent follow-up questioning exclusively on PVV-related topics, warm reception of Omtzigt, and no comparable critical pressure on NSC positions. The asymmetry is demonstrable on the basis of the triggering-event criterion.



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Different hardness/softness of questions to different persons.

Asymmetry 1:

To Omtzigt, 03:35: "What do you especially expect to be able to achieve in that impossible political situation?" — soft/open

To Omtzigt (implicitly about Faber), 08:48: "So if she makes this kind of statement again, what will you do?" — hard/confrontational

Comparison

The hard questions are exclusively directed at PVV-related issues; NSC ambitions are addressed with open questions

Asymmetry 2:

To Omtzigt, 16:21: "Why do you think it is a good cabinet for the Netherlands?" — soft/inviting

To Omtzigt (about Faber), 12:52: "Do you think this kind of statement falls under integrity? Yes or no?" — hard/dichotomous

Comparison

The yes/no question about integrity stands in sharp contrast to the open invitation to defend the cabinet; both to the same guest but on different topics

Asymmetry 3:

To Bob Deen, 27:57: "Is that far away?" — soft/open

To Bob Deen, 29:47: "On the battlefield things are also not going well for Ukraine. Diplomatically it also seems not to be going well. How is that?" — slightly confrontational but not persistent

Comparison

Deen is not questioned comparably persistently as Omtzigt on the Faber issue

Summary: The question asymmetry is structural: open, inviting questions for NSC agendas and Clingendael analyses; hard, persistent and dichotomous questions exclusively on PVV-related topics. This pattern is consistent throughout the entire broadcast.



14. FALSE BALANCE									3/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Definition: Artificial balance despite factual imbalance.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 15:35–15:42

Construction: "You show Faber but not what Agema ordered. PVV puts forward candidates who come from their full breadth."

Analysis

Omtzigt suggests that the broadcast is selective by showing only Faber and not Fleur Agema (who is considered more moderate). The presenter does not respond to this. This is a case of reverse false balance: the broadcast does not create artificial balance but rather artificial imbalance through selective presentation of PVV candidates.

Summary: There is no classic false balance (artificially placing two equivalent positions against each other). There is, however, selective presentation that has the opposite effect: PVV is shown exclusively through its most controversial representatives.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

7/10

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: Faber's statements are the central problem of the coalition

Timestamp: 07:45 — Evidence: Montage of Faber statements as central part of the formation item

Alternative agenda: The policy content of the outline agreement (economic security, housing, migration) as the central topic; Omtzigt himself requests this (18:24–19:50)

Finding 2:

Agenda element: The rule of law is under threat from the coalition

Timestamp: 08:32 — Evidence: Question about the National Socialist origin of "population replacement"

Alternative agenda: The rule of law is also under threat from other factors (childcare benefits affair, Groningen, complex legislation) — Omtzigt mentions this himself (18:53–19:10) but the presenter does not follow up on this

Finding 3:

Agenda element: PVV candidates are a risk to the democratic rule of law

Timestamp: 05:17 — Evidence: "The PVV member came under scrutiny several times in recent years"

Alternative agenda: The question of whether the extra-parliamentary structure itself is democratically sufficient; the question of whether NSC can provide sufficient counterbalance; the question of what PVV voters expect

Summary: The broadcast sets an agenda in which PVV statements and rule-of-law risks are central, while policy content, voter perspective and structural coalition questions remain out of view. This is an editorial choice that steers public debate.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Overview of Individual Scores

No.	Criterion	Type	Score	Main finding (1 sentence)
1	Expert selection	H	6	Two involved actors (coalition politician + government-affiliated adviser) without independent counter-voices
2	Source selection	H	5	Two rumour claims without primary source; no independent or critical sources
3	Time allocation	H	6	NSC 37% speaking time; PVV exclusively via incriminating archive material without own speaking time
4	Omission	H	7	No opposition, no PVV policy content, no independent testing of coalition agreements
5	Numerical Manipulation	H	2	Two cases of incomplete presentation of figures without active misleading
6	Guilt by association	H	7	Faber associated with National Socialism by presenter without historical substantiation
7	Timing	H	5	Negative frame in opening; incriminating PVV material directly after positive NSC agenda; RN item after formation
8	Selective Indignation	H	5	Seven repetitions of population replacement question; no comparable persistence with NSC vagueness
9	Completeness	H	7	No opposition, no non-Western voices, no testing of coalition agreements
10	Framing	S	6	Consistently negative frame for coalition via metaphors and political qualifications
11	Word choice	S	6	"Hardliners", "wild journey", "not uncontroversial" — negatively charged without neutral alternatives
12	Moderation behaviour	S	6	Asymmetric persistence; warm reception of Omtzigt; no critical pressure on NSC positions
13	Question Asymmetry	S	6	Open questions for NSC agenda; hard dichotomous questions exclusively on PVV-related topics
14	False balance	S	3	No classic false balance; but selective imbalance in PVV presentation
15	Agenda-Setting	S	7	PVV statements as central problem; policy content and voter perspective out of view

Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (average criteria 1-9): 5.6 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (average criteria 10-15): 5.7 / 10
- TOTAL SCORE (average all 15 criteria): 5.6 / 10

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



Dominant Techniques

- 1. Omission / Selective Omission (Score 7):** The broadcast structurally omits three categories of perspectives: PVV policy content, opposition voices and independent testing of coalition agreements. This creates a systematically incomplete picture in which the coalition is presented exclusively through its controversies.
- 2. Guilt by Association (Score 7):** Faber is positioned as an extremist figure via a cumulative montage of incriminating statements and a direct comparison with National Socialism (by the presenter himself), without historical substantiation or her own rebuttal.
- 3. Agenda-Setting (Score 7):** The broadcast sets an agenda in which PVV statements and rule-of-law risks are central, while policy content (housing, economic security, migration) and voter perspective remain out of view — despite an explicit request from Omtzigt himself to discuss substance.

Core Messages of the Broadcast

MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE): "The coalition has been formed but the PVV ministers pose a risk to the rule of law."

Technique: Framing + Guilt by Association — Evidence: 07:45–08:32, 05:10–06:14

MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL): "Pieter Omtzigt is the responsible statesman who safeguards the rule of law within a difficult coalition."

Technique: Expert selection + Time allocation + Warm reception — Evidence: 01:21, 03:48, 14:00–14:22

MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL): "The rise of right-wing populism in the Netherlands and Europe is a threat to democratic values."

Technique: Timing + Agenda-Setting — Evidence: 23:51–24:22 (RN protest directly after formation item)

Reasoning: The broadcast scores 5.6/10 based on 15 criteria, which corresponds to clear one-sidedness. The one-sidedness is not the result of one dominant technique but of a consistent pattern: PVV is presented exclusively via incriminating material, NSC receives disproportionately much speaking time and a sympathetic reception, opposition and policy content are completely absent. This pattern is in conflict with the pluralism requirement of Media Act Art. 2.1, which requires balanced reporting across the political spectrum. The broadcast does not meet the requirement of hearing both sides with regard to PVV, and the agenda-setting structurally favours progressive-liberal political priorities.

CONCLUSION

The broadcast of the NOS Journaal on the conclusion of the cabinet formation shows a consistent pattern of one-sidedness that is demonstrable on multiple measurable dimensions. NSC leader Omtzigt receives 37% of total broadcast time and is positioned as a trustworthy statesman, while PVV is presented exclusively via a selective montage of incriminating historical statements without its own speaking time or policy content. The presenter associates Faber directly with National Socialism without historical substantiation (08:32), repeats the population replacement question seven times (09:23–10:05), and qualifies PVV candidates as "hardliners" (15:25) — all three editorial positions that are presented as neutral descriptions. Opposition parties, PVV policy positions, the content of the outline agreement and independent constitutional law expertise are completely absent. On the basis of Media Act Art. 2.1, the required pluralism and balance have not been achieved in this broadcast: the reporting on the coalition formation is structurally one-sided to the detriment of the largest governing party (PVV) and in favour of one coalition participant (NSC).



OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual scores — All 15 criteria

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

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

5.6/10

Considerable imbalance

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

5.7/10

Considerable imbalance

TOTAL SCORE

5.7/10

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	Minor 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 public.
6	Considerable finding (threshold)	Scores from 6 onwards are classified 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, ongoing imbalance in this criterion.

Aggregated deviation index — Interpretation ranges

0.0 – 2.5	Unremarkable	No material patterns discernible; 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 discernible 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 QUALIFICATION (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:

Norm: Media Act Art. 2.1 — pluralism

Factual description: PVV, the largest governing party with 37 seats, receives no own speaking time in the formation discussion; exclusively incriminating archive material is shown without policy content or its own rebuttal

Evidence: Timestamp 05:10–15:42 — Quote: "The PVV member came under scrutiny several times in recent years" / "Geert Wilders has not put forward his mildest people. But hardliners."

Assessment: The pluralism requirement demands that the political spectrum is represented in a balanced manner; the complete absence of PVV policy content and own speaking time for the largest coalition party is a demonstrable violation of this principle

Violation 2:

Norm: Media Act Art. 2.1 — balance

Factual description: The presenter directly associates Faber with National Socialism ("Is Ms Faber aware that it is a term from National Socialism?") without historical substantiation, expert source reference or opportunity for rebuttal

Evidence: Timestamp 08:32 — Quote: "Is Ms Faber aware that it is a term from National Socialism? Ms Faber?"

Assessment: A presenter of the public broadcaster who directly associates a designated minister with National Socialism without factual substantiation crosses the boundary of balanced reporting; this is an editorial position that is presented as a factual question

Violation 3:

Norm: Media Act Art. 2.1 — pluralism and right of reply

Factual description: Not a single opposition party speaks about the formation outcome; the broadcast presents the coalition exclusively through the perspective of one coalition participant (NSC)

Evidence: Timestamp 01:09–20:57 — entire formation discussion without opposition voice

Assessment: The principle of right of reply and the pluralism requirement demand that on a topic of national political importance (cabinet formation) multiple political perspectives are represented; the complete absence of opposition voices is a structural violation

Overall assessment Media Act Art. 2.1

The broadcast does not meet the requirements of Media Act Art. 2.1 on three demonstrable grounds: the absence of PVV policy content and own speaking time (pluralism), the unsubstantiated association of a designated minister with National Socialism by the presenter (balance), and the complete absence of opposition perspective on a topic of national political importance (right of reply). The established one-sidedness is not the result of one incident but of a consistent editorial pattern that is demonstrable on the basis of time allocation, questioning, word choice and agenda-setting. Under the Media Act, the NPO must guarantee pluralism across the total output; this broadcast contributes negatively to that and, if this pattern is repeated, could give rise to a formal complaint to the Media Authority.



CHAPTER 6 — SOURCE DEPTH CHECK

1. Clingendael Institute (via Bob Deen)

1. FUNDING: The Clingendael Institute is funded for approximately 60-70% by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs; additional funding via private donors and project subsidies. Structural interest in the continuation of Western foreign policy and the Dutch diplomatic position.

2. MANDATE: Clingendael's mission is to advise the Dutch government and promote public debate on international relations. This mandate is not fully compatible with a neutral assessment of Western policy towards Ukraine, in which the Dutch government is a direct party.

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: Clingendael has an institutional interest in the relevance of Western diplomatic initiatives; a critical assessment of the peace conference as having failed would undermine its own advisory role. Bob Deen was moreover directly involved as adviser to the conference.

4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Government funding and direct involvement

D2 Personal risk: 0 — No demonstrable personal risk

D3 Professional competence: +2 — Specialised in conflict resolution

D4 Consistency: +1 — Consistent analytical framework

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Predominantly analytical

D6 Source level: +1 — Direct involvement in conference

• TOTAL: +4 → SOURCE LIGHT: YELLOW

5. COUNTER-VOICE: An analyst with a critical perspective on Western peace strategy (e.g. from BRICS countries or an independent conflict research institute) is not cited. Deen's analysis that the conference is "the phase preceding the negotiations" is an optimistic interpretation that is not tested.

IMPORTANT: "Affiliated with Clingendael" is not a neutral qualification. It is an institutional affiliation with structural government funding that creates an inherent conflict of interest when assessing Western policy. The broadcast presents Deen as an independent expert without mentioning this context.

Source traffic light for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Clingendael Institute (via Bob Deen)	-1	0	+2	+1	+1	+1	+4	YELLOW

Legal and methodological notes

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 Media Authority).

No proof of causality

Statistical correlations must not be interpreted as proof of causal relationships or editorial intentions. Deviation values can be influenced by subject choice, news environment, political controversiality or format logic.



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

**No judgement on
intention**

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. **Pluralism:** Pluriform reporting
3. **Balance:** Balanced information of high journalistic quality
4. **Social diversity:** Reflection of Dutch society

Supervisory authority

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

Complaints procedure

1. NPO Ombudsman
2. Media Authority
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 staff 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 limits. 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 consultation, 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 themselves be so easily imposed a frame 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.