



## NPO DETAILED ANALYSIS

2024-07-02\_POW\_05749609

Broadcast: NPO broadcast | 2024-07-02 | Analysed on: 2026-05-22 19:03

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

### TOTAL SCORE

**3.7/10**

*Slight 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)

**5.3 / 10**

*Balanced*

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

← Left

Right →

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

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



## POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

The Schoof cabinet (since July 2024) is an extra-parliamentary cabinet consisting of PVV, VVD, NSC and BBB. Prime Minister Dick Schoof is non-partisan. The coalition holds a majority in the House of Representatives. The main opposition parties are GL-PvdA (25 seats), D66 (9 seats), SP (5 seats), CDA (5 seats), PvdD (3 seats), CU (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
GL-PvdA	2,4	25	Opposition (largest)	Progressive-left, climate, 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	Centre-right, economic security
CU	6,0	3	Opposition	Christian-social
VVD	7,0	24	Government	Right-liberal, free market
BBB	7,5	7	Government	Agrarian-populist, right
SGP	7,8	3	Opposition	Reformed, far right
PVV	9,2	37	Government (largest)	Far right, Wilders, migration stop
FvD	9,5	3	Opposition	Far right, Baudet

The main political fault line concerns migration and asylum policy, with the coalition advocating a hard-line approach and the left-wing opposition calling for a more humane policy. A second line of tension concerns climate and nitrogen, where farming interests clash with environmental ambitions. Thirdly, the question of economic security and purchasing power plays a central role, particularly for lower-educated voters who have placed their hopes in PVV and BBB. Finally, there is tension around the rule of law and the independence of institutions, partly due to Wilders' criticism of the NPO as a "left-wing broadcaster".

The Dutch public broadcaster (NPO) operates under the Media Act 2008, of which Article 2.1 requires pluriform, balanced and independent reporting. The NPO system is fragmented: broadcasting associations such as BNNVARA, KRO-NCRV and AVROTROS each bear their own editorial responsibility. Pluralism is assessed across the total output, not per individual broadcast.



## CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

### Assessment per party

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast representation vs. party programme
VVD	0	Not covered substantively — score 0 (absent)
PVV	+1	00:49 "They are pleased that PVV and BBB are allowed to participate in this cabinet" — Programme position: migration stop, purchasing power — representation neutral-factual, no substantive examination of positions — slightly positively framed via voter confidence
GL-PvdA	0	Not covered — score 0 (absent)
NSC	0	Not covered substantively — score 0 (absent)
D66	0	Not covered — score 0 (absent)
BBB	+1	00:49 "They are pleased that PVV and BBB are allowed to participate" — Programme position: farming interests, asylum stop — representation neutral-factual via voter sentiment, no substantive examination
CDA	0	Not covered — score 0 (absent)
SP	0	Not covered — score 0 (absent)

### Summary party bias

- Most accurate representation: PVV and BBB (score +1), factually correct but without substantive examination of promises
- Strongest distortion: No party actively distorted; opposition parties completely absent
- Average deviation from 0: 0.3
- Conclusion: The broadcast treats the swearing-in of the Schoof cabinet primarily as a news event. Coalition positions are not substantively examined; the opposition perspective is entirely absent. The voter confidence data are presented without any countervoice from critics or opposition parties, resulting in a slightly asymmetric picture in favour of the coalition.

### Left-Right General Tendency

TENDENCY SCORE: -0.5

CLASSIFICATION: Balanced (slight tendency towards right-favouring)

Reasoning: The broadcast is primarily a news bulletin and contains no pronounced ideological framing. However, the voter confidence data are presented without opposition commentary or critical interpretation, which slightly favours the coalition. The absence of left-wing perspectives is structural but consistent with the short bulletin format.



## CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

### Broadcast details

- Title: NPO News — Morning news bulletin (NOS)
- Date: 02.07.2024
- Length (estimated from transcript):
- Presenter/Reporter: Not named in transcript
- Persons interviewed:

Person	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political spectrum
Peter Kanne	Researcher Ipsos I&O	Independent research agency	Neutral/analytical
Unidentified minister(s)	Ministers-designate Schoof cabinet	Coalition (PVV/VVD/NSC/BBB)	Right to far right
Dick Schoof	Formateur/Prime Minister-designate	Non-partisan	Neutral (extra-parliamentary)
Guus Franke	Businessman/acquirer Vitesse	Private	Not applicable

### Main theme

The swearing-in of the Schoof cabinet on 2 July 2024, accompanied by a rise in confidence in the government among voters of PVV and BBB.



**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:** Peter Kanne — Researcher Ipsos I&O

Timestamp: 00:39–01:20

Statement: "Those lower secondary educated people have more confidence in the government because they link it very strongly to politics. So they are pleased that PVV and BBB are allowed to participate in this cabinet."

Framing: Kanne presents research results from Ipsos I&O. He interprets the data but also provides an interpretation of voter psychology.

Missing countervoice: A political scientist with a more critical view of the sustainability of this confidence, or a researcher who analyses the risks of high expectations.

#### Source depth check:

**(a) FUNDING:** Ipsos I&O is a commercial research agency, funded by clients (media, government, business). In this case presumably commissioned by a news editorial team. No direct political funding demonstrable.

**(b) MANDATE:** Ipsos I&O's mandate is to measure public opinion. This is compatible with neutral data presentation, but interpretation of voter psychology falls outside purely quantitative research.

D1 Conflict of interest: +1 — Commercial agency without demonstrable political ties; slight dependence on clients

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Kanne does not take a controversial position; limited personal risk

D3 Professional competence: +2 — Opinion polling and voter research are his core expertise

D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — No indications of inconsistency; Kanne is a regular commentator

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Predominantly data-driven, but interpretations are normatively coloured

D6 Source level: +1 — Primary data (own research), but methodology not explained

TOTAL: +7 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN (≥+5)

**(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE:** Kanne presents voter sentiment as fact, but his interpretation ("they feel seen by PVV, BBB") is a normative interpretation that is not contrasted with alternative explanations.

**Expert 2:** Unidentified minister(s)-designate

Timestamp: 02:12–02:28

Statement: "Will this be the most right-wing cabinet ever? I hope so. With a warm social heart."

Framing: A minister-designate gives a personal opinion about the political colour of the cabinet. This is not an expert opinion but a political statement.

Missing countervoice: A historian or political scientist who can historically verify the claim.

#### Source depth check:

**(a) FUNDING:** Not applicable (politician).

**(b) MANDATE:** Not compatible with neutral assessment; this is a party-political actor.

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Direct political actor with an interest in positive framing of the cabinet



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

D2 Personal risk: -1 — Limited risk; statement is politically strategic

D3 Professional competence: 0 — No expertise in the field of historical comparison of cabinets

D4 Consistency of opinion: 0 — Unknown

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1 — Normative ("I hope so"), no data

D6 Source level: -2 — Tertiary; personal opinion without substantiation

TOTAL: -6 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: RED ( $\leq -5$ )

**(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE:** Is the assessment framed as neutral? No, the statement is presented as political colour, but without historical verification or countervoice.

*Missing expert groups:*

- Political scientist for historical comparison of cabinets
- Constitutional lawyer for interpretation of extra-parliamentary cabinet
- Independent economist for verification of coalition promises

### Source traffic light for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Peter Kanne — Researcher Ipsos I&O	+1	+1	+2	+1	+1	+1	+7	GREEN
Unidentified minister(s)- designate	-2	-1	0	0	-1	-2	-6	RED

*Summary (matrix result):*

- Peter Kanne (Ipsos I&O): GREEN (+7) — Competent source, but interpretations are not contrasted
- Minister-designate (anonymous): RED (-6) — Political actor without neutral expertise; statement not historically verified



## 2. SOURCE SELECTION

4/10

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:** Ipsos I&O — Confidence survey

Timestamp: 00:32–00:34 — Statement: "From 29 percent at the last elections to 42 now, reports research agency Ipsos I&O."

- (a) Funding and sponsorship:** Commercial research agency; client not mentioned. Presumably commissioned by a news editorial team or political institution.
- (b) Structural conflict of interest:** No directly demonstrable conflict; Ipsos I&O has an interest in visibility and citable research.
- (c) Is a source missing that would substantiate an opposing position? Yes:** no alternative research (e.g. from SCP or Kantar) is cited for comparison. The methodology of the research (sample size, question formulation) is not explained.

**Source 2:** Volkskrant — Algorithm discrimination

Timestamp: 06:15–06:28 — Statement: "Algorithms that discriminate can still be found everywhere in government, writes the Volkskrant."

- (a) Funding and sponsorship:** The Volkskrant is a commercial daily newspaper with a progressive-liberal editorial line.
- (b) Structural conflict of interest:** The Volkskrant has an editorial tradition of critical reporting on government conduct; this fits their profile but is not neutral.
- (c) Is an opposing source missing? Yes:** no response from the government or an opposing study is cited.

Rumour verification (penalty points): No explicit rumours without primary source found in the transcript.

Summary: The source selection is limited to one research agency and one newspaper; methodological accountability is absent. The absence of alternative sources or opposing studies limits pluriformity.



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

*Definition: Distribution of speaking time between different positions.*

Estimated speaking time:

- Peter Kanne (Ipsos I&O / coalition voter perspective): approx. 1 min. 20 sec. (approx. 13%)
- Minister(s)-designate / coalition: approx. 30 sec. (approx. 5%)
- Dick Schoof: approx. 10 sec. (approx. 2%)
- Police presenter Limburg: approx. 40 sec. (approx. 7%)
- Presenter/voice-over: approx. 7 min. (approx. 68%)
- Opposition: 0 sec. (0%)
- Critical voices about cabinet: 0 sec. (0%)

Summary: Speaking time is heavily concentrated with the presenter and one pro-coalition-oriented source (Kanne). Opposition and critical perspectives receive no speaking time. This is partly explainable by the bulletin format, but the choice to highlight exclusively coalition voter sentiment is an editorial asymmetry.



#### 4. OMISSION (Selective Omission)

6/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

*Definition: What is not shown, although relevant?*

##### Omission 1:

###### Context

No opposition reaction to the swearing-in of the Schoof cabinet.

Relevant at: 00:21–02:48 (entire cabinet section)

###### Effect

The swearing-in is presented as a broadly supported positive moment, while half of the House of Representatives is in opposition and has objections.

##### Omission 2:

###### Context

The 58% of the population that does not yet have confidence in the government is not mentioned or interpreted.

Relevant at: 00:32–00:34 — Quote: "From 29 percent at the last elections to 42 now"

###### Effect

The rise in confidence is presented as positive news, while the majority of the population still has no confidence.

##### Omission 3:

###### Context

The historical claim "most right-wing cabinet ever" is not factually verified.

Relevant at: 02:16–02:24 — Quote: "Will this now be the most right-wing cabinet ever? Well, I don't think so. / I hope so."

###### Effect

A politically significant claim is presented as a light-hearted anecdote without journalistic verification.

Summary: Three structural omissions limit the informational value of the broadcast: the absence of opposition voices, the failure to interpret the majority without confidence, and the failure to verify the historical claim about the political colour of the cabinet.

### Missing voices

- Opposition leader (e.g. Frans Timmermans, GL-PvdA): Could have articulated the objections of the largest opposition party to the coalition agreement.
- Constitutional lawyer: Could have interpreted the special nature of an extra-parliamentary cabinet and the democratic implications.
- Trade union representative (FNV/CNV): Could have articulated the expectations of employees regarding the new cabinet's policy.
- Migration law expert: Could have legally verified the feasibility of the promised asylum stop.
- Voter who does not support the cabinet: Could have represented the perspective of the 58% who do not yet have confidence.



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

- Historian/political scientist: Could have factually substantiated the historical comparison with previous right-wing cabinets.
- Representative of a minority group: Could have articulated the concerns of groups who may feel threatened by the proposed policy.



## 5. NUMERICAL MANIPULATION

4/10

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: 00:32–00:34

Figure: "From 29 percent at the last elections to 42 now"

Dimensions:

- (a) Absolute value: Shown (29% → 42%)
- (b) Share: Partial — 42% is presented as a positive result, but the complement (58% still has no confidence) is not mentioned
- (c) Trend: Partial — Only the comparison with the elections of November 2023 is made; no long-term trend or comparison with other cabinet formations

Missing context: What was the confidence level at the start of previous cabinets (e.g. Rutte I, II, III, IV)? Is 42% high or low in historical perspective?

Effect: The rise from 29% to 42% is presented as positive news without mentioning that a majority of 58% still has no confidence. This creates a rosier picture than the data justify.

### Finding 2:

Timestamp: 03:45–03:53

Figure: "At least one in five requests for assistance that the Netherlands receives from foreign police services is directed at the Limburg police."

Dimensions:

- (a) Absolute value: Not shown (no absolute number)
- (b) Share: Shown (20%)
- (c) Trend: Not shown

Missing context: How many requests for assistance is that in absolute numbers? Has this share risen or fallen? How does this relate to Limburg's share of total Dutch police capacity?

Effect: The figure suggests a disproportionate burden without showing the absolute scale or the trend.

Summary: Two numerical findings where relevant dimensions are missing. The confidence data are presented in a way that emphasises the positive development without mentioning the complement; the Limburg police data lack absolute numbers and trend context.



## 6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

1/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

*Definition: Discrediting through association with negative groups or ideas.*

### Finding 1:

Timestamp: 02:16–02:19

#### Quote

*"Will this now be the most right-wing cabinet ever?"*

Technique: The question implicitly associates the cabinet with an extreme political position ("most right-wing ever"), without this being historically substantiated or contextualised.

#### Effect

The question plants an association with extremism, but is too fleeting to qualify as systematic guilt by association.

Summary: No systematic guilt by association found. The question about "most right-wing ever" is a mild form of associative framing but is not elaborated upon.



## 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: 00:21–01:38 (beginning)

Content: Rise in confidence among coalition voters as the opening item after the cabinet announcement.

#### Timing effect

By placing the rise in confidence as the first substantive item, the tone of the broadcast is set positively with regard to the new cabinet. Critical voices do not appear in the opening minutes.

### Finding 2:

Position: 06:15–06:28 (middle)

Content: Algorithm discrimination in government (Volkskrant report).

#### Timing effect

This critical item about government conduct is placed after the sports reports and the European Championship news, giving it less emphasis than the cabinet story.

Summary: The positive cabinet information is prominently placed at the beginning; critical government information is dealt with later and more briefly. This is a slight but demonstrable timing asymmetry.



## 8. SELECTIVE INDIGNATION

1/10

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 starting point (v2.2): Before each assessment, the triggering event is documented. A reaction can only be assessed as selective if comparable triggering events at other positions did not produce an analogous reaction.*

### Finding 1:

Timestamp: 02:16–02:24

Triggering event: A minister-designate says "I hope so" in response to the question of whether this will be the most right-wing cabinet ever.

Reaction: The presenter responds light-heartedly: "So perhaps some alignment is still needed there, but they are taking their time for that."

### Comparison

No comparable moment with an opposition politician present in the broadcast.

Asymmetry: Not demonstrable due to lack of a comparable triggering moment at another position.

Degree of indignation: 0/5

Selectivity: 1/5

Summary: No selective indignation found. The presenter responds neutrally to slightly humorously to the statement of the minister-designate; there is no comparable moment with another political position to establish asymmetry.



## 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 topic? Are relevant perspectives, facts or actors systematically omitted?*

### Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:21–02:48

Missing perspective/fact: Opposition reaction to the swearing-in of the Schoof cabinet.

Relevance: The swearing-in of a cabinet is a constitutional moment in which the controlling power (House of Representatives, including opposition) plays an essential role.

#### Effect

The broadcast presents the swearing-in as a broadly supported positive moment, while the political reality is divided.

### Finding 2:

Timestamp: 00:32–01:38

Missing perspective/fact: Methodological accountability of the Ipsos I&O research (sample size, question formulation, margin).

Relevance: Without methodological context, the reliability of the confidence figures cannot be assessed.

#### Effect

The figures are presented as established fact, which increases their authority without this being justified.

### Finding 3:

Timestamp: 02:16–02:24

Missing perspective/fact: Historical verification of the claim "most right-wing cabinet ever".

Relevance: This is a politically significant claim that requires journalistic verification.

#### Effect

The claim remains unverified and hanging in the air, creating the impression that the cabinet is indeed historically extreme without this being substantiated or refuted.

Summary: The broadcast shows three structural gaps: no opposition voices, no methodological accountability for research data, and no historical verification of political claims. This limits the informational value and the pluriformity of the reporting.



## 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 topic fundamentally framed?*

#### Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:21–00:29

<b>Quote</b>	<i>"Good morning. It is the morning of the swearing-in of the new cabinet. The new coalition is causing an increase in confidence in the government."</i>
<b>Manipulation</b>	The swearing-in and the rise in confidence are presented in the same breath as a causal relationship, while this is a correlation that requires further investigation.
<b>Why problematic</b>	Viewers get the impression that the new cabinet is directly responsible for the rise in confidence, while this may also be related to the expectation of change after a long formation process.

#### Finding 2:

Timestamp: 01:24–01:38

<b>Quote</b>	<i>"This cabinet also makes quite large promises in the area of immigration or nitrogen and that is conditional."</i>
<b>Manipulation</b>	The promises are framed as "large" (positive), while "conditional" is added as a mild caveat without further elaboration.
<b>Why problematic</b>	The frame suggests ambition with a small reservation, while the feasibility of the promises (particularly the asylum stop) is legally and practically highly contested.

#### Finding 3:

Timestamp: 02:07–02:11

<b>Quote</b>	<i>"And some of the ministers-designate still had to find their way around."</i>
<b>Manipulation</b>	The unfamiliarity of the new ministers is framed as light-hearted and sympathetic.
<b>Why problematic</b>	This humanises the new ministers in a way that is not applied to opposition politicians or critics.

Summary: The broadcast consistently opts for a positive-neutral frame around the change of cabinet. Critical elements are indicated but not elaborated upon. The causal relationship between cabinet formation and the rise in confidence is not questioned.



## 11. WORD CHOICE AND TERMINOLOGY

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

*Definition: What language is used? What connotations are set?*

### Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:21

<b>Quote</b>	"It is the morning of the swearing-in of the new cabinet."
<b>Manipulation</b>	"New" has a positive connotation of renewal and hope.
<b>Why problematic</b>	A neutral alternative would be: "the Schoof cabinet" or "the new coalition government". "New" is not wrong but loads the moment positively.

### Finding 2:

Timestamp: 01:53–01:56

<b>Quote</b>	"More than seven months after the elections, the formation is truly over today."
<b>Manipulation</b>	"Truly over" suggests relief and closure of a difficult period.
<b>Why problematic</b>	This frame favours the coalition by presenting the long formation as a past problem, while the substantive challenges are yet to begin.

### Finding 3:

Timestamp: 02:24

<b>Quote</b>	"With a warm social heart."
<b>Manipulation</b>	The addition by a minister-designate is not questioned or contextualised.
<b>Why problematic</b>	The claim "warm social heart" for a right-wing cabinet is politically contested; it is presented as fact without journalistic verification. Neutral alternative: cite the statement and then verify it against the coalition agreement.

Summary: The word choice is predominantly neutral but contains some positively charged terms around the change of cabinet. The most problematic finding is the unchallenged citation of "warm social heart" as a self-qualification by a coalition minister.



## 12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

*Methodological starting point (v2.2): Before each assessment, the triggering event is 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: 01:20–01:38

Triggering event: Peter Kanne states that the confidence is "conditional" and that the promises still need to be fulfilled.

#### Quote (presenter)

*"How solid is that confidence? Can it also disappear quickly again?"*

#### Comparison

There is no comparable moment with an opposition guest or critic present in the broadcast.

Asymmetry: Not demonstrable due to lack of a comparable moment; the question is critical but is not followed up with further questions about the feasibility of specific promises.

### Finding 2:

Timestamp: 02:12–02:14

Triggering event: A minister-designate is asked whether he has already practised the oath.

#### Quote (presenter)

*"Have you already practised the oath or affirmation a few times in the mirror?"*

#### Comparison

No comparable light-hearted moment with an opposition politician.

Asymmetry: The question is light-hearted and humanising; this type of question is not put to critics or opposition politicians, but in the absence of such guests, asymmetry is not formally demonstrable.

Summary: Moderation behaviour is predominantly neutral but slightly favours the coalition through humanising questions to ministers-designate. In the absence of opposition guests, formal asymmetry is not demonstrable, but the editorial choice not to invite opposition guests is itself an asymmetry.



### 13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

*Definition: Different hard/soft questions to different persons.*

#### Asymmetry 1:

To Peter Kanne, 01:20: "How solid is that confidence? Can it also disappear quickly again?" — neutral/slightly critical

To minister-designate, 02:12: "Have you already practised the oath or affirmation a few times in the mirror?" — soft/humanising

#### Comparison

The researcher receives a substantively critical question; the minister receives a light-hearted question. This is a slight asymmetry, but the minister is also not a substantive interlocutor in this segment.

#### Asymmetry 2:

To minister-designate, 02:16: "Will this now be the most right-wing cabinet ever?" — potentially critical

Reaction: The minister denies it; another minister confirms it hopefully. No follow-up question.

#### Comparison

No opposition guest present to receive a comparable critical question.

#### Comparison

The question is asked but not followed up; with an opposition guest, such a claim would presumably be followed up.

Summary: Slight question asymmetry: ministers-designate receive soft, humanising questions; the only substantively critical question (about the solidity of the confidence) is put to the researcher, not to a political actor. In the absence of opposition guests, formal asymmetry is limited in demonstrability.



## 14. FALSE BALANCE

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

*Definition: Artificial balance despite factual imbalance.*

### Finding 1:

Timestamp: 02:16–02:24

Construction: "Will this now be the most right-wing cabinet ever? Well, I don't think so. / Will this be the most right-wing cabinet ever? I hope so."

### Analysis

Two ministers give opposing answers to the same question, creating the appearance of internal debate. However, this is not genuine balance: both speakers are coalition members; no opposition voice or historical expert is cited.

Summary: Limited false balance found. The two opposing ministerial statements create the impression of balance, but represent only one political side. Genuine balance would require an opposition voice or historical verification.



## 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 set: The rise in confidence in the government is the direct result of the coalition formation and is positive news.

Timestamp: 00:29–00:34 — Evidence: "The new coalition is causing an increase in confidence in the government. From 29 percent at the last elections to 42 now."

Alternative agenda: The question of why 58% still has no confidence; the question of whether confidence based on high expectations is sustainable; the question of what the swearing-in means for groups who do not feel represented.

### Finding 2:

Agenda element set: The swearing-in of the cabinet is a positive and historic moment that is broadly supported.

Timestamp: 01:49–01:56 — Evidence: "More than seven months after the elections, the formation is truly over today."

Alternative agenda: The constitutional special nature of an extra-parliamentary cabinet; the democratic tension between a cabinet without direct party ties and the coalition agreements.

Summary: The agenda is dominated by the coalition voter perspective and the positive framing of the change of cabinet. Structural questions about democratic legitimacy, feasibility of promises and the position of the majority without confidence do not make it onto the agenda.



## CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL ASSESSMENT

### Overview of individual scores

No.	Criterion	Type	Score	Main finding (1 sentence)
1	Expert selection	H	5	Only one substantive expert (Kanne), no countervoice; minister-designate cited as RED source without verification
2	Source selection	H	4	Limited to one research agency and one newspaper; methodology not accounted for
3	Time allocation	H	4	Coalition voter perspective dominates; opposition receives zero speaking time
4	Omission	H	6	No opposition voices, 58% without confidence not mentioned, historical claim not verified
5	Numerical manipulation	H	4	Rise in confidence presented without complement (58% have no confidence)
6	Guilt by association	H	1	No systematic guilt by association found
7	Timing	H	3	Positive cabinet information prominently at the beginning; critical government information later and more briefly
8	Selective indignation	H	1	No selective indignation demonstrable
9	Completeness	H	6	Three structural gaps: no opposition, no methodological accountability, no historical verification
10	Framing	S	5	Causal relationship between cabinet formation and rise in confidence not questioned
11	Word choice	S	3	Predominantly neutral; "warm social heart" cited without verification
12	Moderation behaviour	S	3	Humanising questions to ministers; no opposition guests invited
13	Question asymmetry	S	3	Soft questions to ministers; critical question to researcher, not to political actor
14	False balance	S	2	Two coalition ministers as false balance; no genuine counterpart
15	Agenda-setting	S	5	Coalition voter perspective as norm; structural questions about legitimacy and feasibility absent

### Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (average criteria 1-9): 3.8 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (average criteria 10-15): 3.5 / 10
- TOTAL SCORE (average all 15 criteria): 3.7 / 10

### Dominant techniques



**1. Omission / Selective Omission (Score 6):** The broadcast structurally omits opposition voices, the majority without confidence and historical verification of political claims. This creates a one-sidedly positive picture of the change of cabinet without journalistic justification.

**2. Completeness (Score 6):** Only three of the ten relevant perspectives are addressed or indicated. The editorial choice to take exclusively coalition voter sentiment as the main angle is a structural limitation of pluriformity.

**3. Framing (Score 5) and Agenda-setting (Score 5):** The swearing-in is framed as a positive and broadly supported moment; the rise in confidence is causally linked to the coalition formation without questioning this. Structural questions about democratic legitimacy and feasibility of promises do not make it onto the agenda.

## Core messages of the broadcast

---

**MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE):** "The new Schoof cabinet enjoys growing confidence and offers hope to voters who finally feel seen."

**Technique:** Framing and agenda-setting — Evidence: 00:29–01:20, 01:49–01:56

**MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL):** "The new ministers are ordinary people who also still need to get used to their new role."

**Technique:** Humanisation via soft questions and light-hearted anecdotes — Evidence: 02:07–02:28

**MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL):** "After a long formation, there is finally a stable cabinet that will tackle major problems."

**Technique:** Selective omission (no critical voices) and positive word choice — Evidence: 01:49–01:56, 00:29–00:34

**Reasoning:** The broadcast scores 3.7/10, indicating a slight but demonstrable tendency. The reporting is not actively manipulative but shows structural omissions that limit pluriformity. The choice to take exclusively coalition voter sentiment as the main angle, combined with the absence of opposition voices and critical interpretation, is an editorial choice that is not in accordance with the full spirit of Media Act Art. 2.1. The bulletin format explains some of the limitations, but not the consistent one-sidedness of the angle.

## CONCLUSION

---

The broadcast is a short news bulletin that treats the swearing-in of the Schoof cabinet as its main item. The reporting is factually correct but structurally incomplete: the opposition perspective is entirely absent, the majority of the population without confidence is not mentioned, and political claims are not historically verified. The rise in confidence is causally linked to the coalition formation without methodological accountability or journalistic questioning. In the light of Media Act Art. 2.1, which requires pluriform and balanced reporting, the broadcast falls short on the point of pluriformity: only one political angle (coalition voter sentiment) is substantively elaborated. This is partly explainable by the short bulletin format, but the consistent editorial choice for a positive coalition frame without countervoice is a demonstrable limitation of informational value. The total score of 3.7/10 places the broadcast in the category of "slight tendency", not in the category of systematic manipulation.



## OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

### Individual scores — All 15 criteria

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

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

**3.8/10**

*Slight imbalance*

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

**3.5/10**

*Slight imbalance*

#### TOTAL SCORE

**3.7/10**

*Slight imbalance*

*Average of Hard Facts and Soft Facts*



## KEY — Meaning of the scores

### Individual scores per criterion (0–10)

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

### Aggregated deviation index — Interpretation ranges

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

### Party-political bias (-5 to +5)

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

Norm: Media Act Art. 2.1 — Pluriformity

Factual description: The broadcast covers the swearing-in of the Schoof cabinet exclusively from the perspective of coalition voters and coalition members. No opposition party, no civil society organisation and no critical expert is given a voice.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:21–02:48 — Quote: "They are pleased that PVV and BBB are allowed to participate in this cabinet. They expect a great deal from it substantively, that truly major problems will be solved."

Assessment: The absence of any opposition perspective at a constitutionally significant moment (swearing-in of a new cabinet) is a demonstrable limitation of pluriformity as required by Art. 2.1. This is not in accordance with the requirement of balanced reporting.

#### Violation 2:

Norm: Media Act Art. 2.1 — Balance

Factual description: The rise in confidence from 29% to 42% is presented as positive news without mentioning that 58% of the population still has no confidence in the government. This creates an unbalanced picture of public opinion.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:32–00:34 — Quote: "From 29 percent at the last elections to 42 now, reports research agency Ipsos I&O."

Assessment: The omission of the complement (58% without confidence) is a selective presentation of data that gives a rosier picture than the facts justify. This is contrary to the requirement of balanced reporting.

No violation recognised for:

The remaining findings (slight framing, soft questions to ministers, humanising anecdotes) are not in themselves contrary to Media Act Art. 2.1, but contribute to the pattern of slight one-sidedness.

### Overall assessment Media Act Art. 2.1

---

The broadcast does not fully meet the requirements of pluriformity and balance as set out in Media Act Art. 2.1. The two demonstrable shortcomings — the absence of an opposition perspective at a constitutionally significant moment and the selective presentation of confidence data — are not of such a nature as to constitute a formal violation of the Media Act in the context of a short news bulletin. Media Act Art. 2.1 assesses pluralism across the total output of the public broadcaster, not per individual broadcast. Nevertheless, the structural one-sidedness in the editorial choices — exclusively coalition voter sentiment as the main angle, no opposition voices, no critical interpretation — is a pattern that, if repeated, would be contrary to the spirit of Art. 2.1. A supervisory authority (Commissariaat voor de Media) could, in the case of a series of similar broadcasts, conclude that the pluriformity requirement is not being complied with.



## CHAPTER 6 — SOURCE DEPTH CHECK

### Ipsos I&O — Confidence survey

**1. FUNDING:** Ipsos I&O is a commercial market research agency, part of the international Ipsos group. Funded by clients (media, government, business). The client for this specific research is not mentioned in the broadcast. No direct political funding demonstrable, but dependence on clients creates a slight incentive towards citable results.

**2. MANDATE:** The mandate of Ipsos I&O is to measure public opinion and market trends. This is compatible with neutral data presentation. However, the interpretation of voter psychology ("they feel seen") falls outside purely quantitative research and is a normative interpretation.

**3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** No direct institutional interest in a particular political outcome demonstrable. Slight dependence on clients (media, government) who expect citable results.

#### 4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX (Source traffic light, 6D -2/+2):

D1 Conflict of interest: +1 — Commercial agency without demonstrable political ties

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Limited risk for Kanne as commentator

D3 Professional competence: +2 — Opinion polling is core expertise

D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — No indications of inconsistency

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Predominantly data-driven

D6 Source level: +1 — Primary data, but methodology not explained

TOTAL: +7 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN (≥+5)

**5. COUNTERVOICE:** No alternative research (SCP, Kantar, Pew) is cited. The methodology (sample size, question formulation, margin) is not explained. A countervoice from a researcher who questions the sustainability of the confidence is absent.

IMPORTANT: "Research agency Ipsos I&O" is an institutional qualification that confers social authority. The actual reliability depends on the methodology, which is not accounted for in the broadcast. The source traffic light is GREEN based on the available information, but the absence of methodological transparency is a demonstrable limitation.

#### Source traffic light for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
CREDIBILITY MATRIX (Source traffic light, 6D -2/+2):	+1	+1	+2	+1	+1	+1	+7	GREEN

#### 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 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.



**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 significant 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](http://www.svfab.ch) | [kontakt@svfab.ch](mailto: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](http://www.SVFAB.ch) | [Kontakt@SVFAB.ch](mailto:Kontakt@SVFAB.ch)

**Bank details:** PostFinance – POFICHBE

**IBAN:** CH32 0900 0000 1675 6251 1

**Beneficiary:** SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zürich 1



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

## The following books are available from SVFAB

Orders via [www.svfab.ch](http://www.svfab.ch) or [kontakt@svfab.ch](mailto:kontakt@svfab.ch)



**Unbalanced reporting** is the response to the halving initiative in Switzerland: 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 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.**