



NPO DETAILED ANALYSIS

2024-09-10_VPWON_1353269

Broadcast: NPO broadcast | 2024-09-10 | Analysed on: 2026-05-23 03:25

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

TOTAL SCORE

4.3/10

Considerable imbalance

0 = balanced, 10 = strongly one-sided/manipulative

POLITICAL SPECTRUM

Classification based on Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) 2024

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

Party	SP	GL-PvdA	PvdD	D66	CDA	NSC	CU	VVD	BBB	SGP	PVV	FvD
CHES	1.10	2.40	2.50	4.80	5.50	5.80	6.00	7.00	7.50	7.80	9.20	9.50
Spectrum	Left	Left	Left	Left	Centre	Centre	Right	Right	Right	Right	Right	Right

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

TENDENCY (L – R)

4.8 / 10

Balanced

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

← Left

Right →

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

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



POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

The Schoof cabinet has been active since July 2024 as an extra-parliamentary cabinet, supported by PVV (37 seats), VVD (24 seats), NSC (20 seats) and BBB (7 seats). Prime Minister Schoof is non-partisan. The largest opposition party is GL-PvdA with 25 seats, followed by D66 (9 seats), CDA (5 seats), SP (5 seats), SGP (3 seats), PvdD (3 seats), CU (3 seats), FvD (3 seats), DENK and Volt.

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, humane asylum policy, fair sharing
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, manageable migration
CU	6,0	3	Opposition	Christian-social
VVD	7,0	24	Government	Liberal, free market, strict migration policy
BBB	7,5	7	Government	Agrarian-populist, asylum stop
SGP	7,8	3	Opposition	Reformed, traditional
PVV	9,2	37	Government (largest)	Asylum stop, de-Islamisation, anti-elite
FvD	9,5	3	Opposition	Far right, Baudet

The most important political fault line in the Netherlands concerns migration and asylum policy: the coalition aims for an asylum stop and strict border controls, while the left-wing opposition advocates for a humane and European asylum policy. A second line of tension concerns the relationship with the EU: PVV and BBB are EU-critical, while D66 and GL-PvdA advocate for greater European integration. Thirdly, economic security plays a major role, with left-wing parties advocating for higher wages and wealth taxes and right-wing parties for lower burdens and market forces. Finally, there is tension around climate policy, with the coalition favouring nuclear energy and pragmatism and the opposition defending ambitious climate targets.

The Dutch public broadcaster (NPO) is legally required to provide pluriform, balanced and independent reporting under Media Act 2008 Art. 2.1. The broadcasting associations (including BNNVARA, KRO-NCRV, AVROTROS) have their own editorial responsibility, but pluralism is assessed across the total output. PVV leader Wilders has repeatedly criticised the NPO as a "left-wing broadcaster", which increases the political sensitivity of the assessment task.



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast representation vs. party programme
VVD	0	Not directly addressed; labour migration report (15:29) touches on VVD themes but without party reference — not represented, not distorted
PVV	-1	01:19 "PVV Minister Faber of Asylum is at any rate watching this German decision with great interest" — party position (asylum stop, closed borders) implicitly indicated but not substantively explained; Faber herself not given the floor — slightly incomplete
GL-PvdA	0	Not addressed; humane asylum policy not presented as a perspective — absent, not distorted
NSC	0	Not addressed — absent
D66	0	Not addressed — absent
BBB	0	Not addressed — absent
CDA	0	Not addressed — absent
SP	0	Not addressed — absent

Summary party bias:

- Most accurate representation: No party fully represented (all score 0)
- Strongest distortion: PVV (score -1): Minister Faber is mentioned but is given no speaking time to explain her position
- Average deviation from 0: 0.1
- Conclusion: The broadcast covers the migration dossier without giving any Dutch party substantive airtime. PVV Minister Faber is used as a reference point (01:19) but her policy arguments are not presented. No coalition or opposition party explains its position, meaning the party-political dimension of the debate is entirely absent.

Left-Right General Tendency

TENDENCY SCORE: +0.8

CLASSIFICATION: Slightly left-favouring

Reasoning: The broadcast presents border controls primarily through critical voices (residents of Dinxperlo, Gerald Knaus) and emphasises the practical infeasibility and European legal principles. The PVV minister is merely mentioned as an observer without presenting her arguments. The frame of "open borders as a European fundamental principle" (08:37) aligns with progressive-liberal party positions. At the same time, an explicit left-wing party voice is absent, keeping the tendency moderate.



CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Broadcast details

- Title: Nieuwsuur
- Date: 10.09.2024
- Length (estimated from transcript):
- Presenter/Reporter: Malou (studio presenter, full name not mentioned), Charlotte Waaijers (Berlin correspondent), Gert-Jan Dennekamp (Ukraine correspondent)

Person	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political Spectrum
Malou	Studio presenter	NPO/Nieuwsuur	Neutral (journalistic)
Charlotte Waaijers	Berlin correspondent	NPO/Nieuwsuur	Neutral (journalistic)
Gert-Jan Dennekamp	Ukraine correspondent	NPO/Nieuwsuur	Neutral (journalistic)
Gerald Knaus	Migration expert, "architect of the EU-Turkey deal"	Independent/ESI	Centre-progressive
Museum employee Dinxperlo	Local expert on border history	None	Local/neutral
Residents of Dinxperlo	Vox pop	None	Local/neutral
Geert Nagel-Josef	Reality TV psychologist	None	Neutral (professional)
Sabine Wendel	Former Big Brother participant	None	Neutral
Debbie (B&B Vol Liefde)	Former participant	None	Neutral
Jos (B&B Vol Liefde)	Former participant	None	Neutral
Irina and husband (Pokrovsk)	Ukrainian civilians	None	Neutral (victim)
Dmitro	Restaurant owner Pokrovsk	None	Neutral (victim)

Main theme

The broadcast covers Germany's reintroduction of border controls in response to the increased influx of asylum seekers, with attention to practical feasibility, the European legal context and the political background.



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 — Countable and Scientifically Reliable



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: Gerald Knaus — "Architect of the EU-Turkey deal"

Timestamp: 10:00

Statement

"Earlier today we spoke with Gerald Knaus. He is seen as the architect of the so-called EU-Turkey deal... Knaus is deeply concerned about the plans of the German government."

Interpretation: Knaus is director of the European Stability Initiative (ESI), a think tank that co-designed the EU-Turkey deal. He has an institutional interest in defending the approach he himself designed.

Missing counter-voice: An expert who defends the effectiveness of border controls (e.g. from a security or migration management perspective).

Source depth check Knaus:

(a) FUNDING: ESI is funded by a mix of European governments, the Open Society Foundations (Soros) and other private donors. Structural interest in pro-European, multilateral migration solutions.

(b) MANDATE: ESI's mission is to promote European integration and democratisation — not compatible with a fully neutral assessment of national border measures.

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Institutional interest in defending own EU-Turkey approach

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Reputational risk with public statements

D3 Professional competence: +2 — Recognised migration expert with years of experience

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistently pro-European approach

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Predominantly analytical

D6 Source level: +1 — Secondary source (policy analyst, not a primary researcher)

• TOTAL: +5 → SOURCE LIGHT: GREEN

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: The broadcast introduces Knaus as "architect of the EU-Turkey deal" — a positive social qualification that masks his institutional interest in defending that approach. This is an application of Technique 2 (Source selection as framing).

Expert 2: Museum employee/local expert Dinxperlo

Timestamp: 04:01

Statement

"In the past there was extensive smuggling here... But to control every crossing, you would need tens of thousands of officers for that."

Interpretation: Local historical knowledge is relevant for context, but the person is deployed as an expert on the feasibility of modern border controls — a different field.

Missing counter-voice: A police or border surveillance expert with operational knowledge of modern control techniques.

Source depth check museum employee:

(a) FUNDING: Presumably a municipally or regionally funded museum — no direct interest in the migration debate.

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

(b) MANDATE: Historical education — not compatible with operational assessment of modern border controls.

D1 Conflict of interest: +2 — No demonstrable interest

D2 Personal risk: 0 — Neutral

D3 Professional competence: -1 — Historical expertise, no operational border control expertise

D4 Opinion consistency: 0 — Unknown

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Factual, historical

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary source

• TOTAL: +2 → SOURCE LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: The person is implicitly presented as an expert on feasibility while their expertise is historical in nature.

Expert 3: Geert Nagel-Josef — Reality TV psychologist

Timestamp: 35:21

Statement

"Reality TV is a pressure cooker for human behaviour."

Interpretation: Relevant for the reality TV segment; no political dimension.

Source depth check Nagel-Josef:

(a) FUNDING: Self-employed professional; possible commercial interest in positive image of the reality TV industry (he works for producers).

(b) MANDATE: Screening and guidance of candidates — structural interest in defending the sector.

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Works for producers, interest in positive image of sector

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Reputational risk

D3 Professional competence: +2 — Psychologist, relevant field

D4 Opinion consistency: 0 — Unknown

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Predominantly analytical

D6 Source level: +1 — Primary practical experience

• TOTAL: +4 → SOURCE LIGHT: YELLOW

Missing expert groups:

- Operational police expert on border surveillance
- Lawyer specialising in European asylum law
- Representative of asylum seekers or refugee organisation

Source traffic light for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Gerald Knaus — "Architect of the EU-Turkey deal"	-1	+1	+2	+1	+1	+1	+5	GREEN
Museum employee/local expert Dinxperlo	+2	0	-1	0	+1	0	+2	YELLOW
Geert Nagel-Josef — Reality TV psychologist	-1	+1	+2	0	+1	+1	+4	YELLOW

Summary (matrix result):

- Knaus: GREEN (+5) — but institutional interest insufficiently highlighted
- Museum employee: YELLOW (+2) — deployed outside own area of expertise



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

- Nagel-Josef: YELLOW (+4) — commercial interest in positive image of sector



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: Gerald Knaus / ESI

Timestamp: 10:00 — Statement: "Knaus is deeply concerned about the plans of the German government."

(a) Funding and management: ESI funded by, among others, Open Society Foundations, European governments — pro-European orientation

(b) Structural conflict of interest: Knaus co-designed the EU-Turkey deal; criticism of national border measures fits his institutional position

(c) Missing counter-source: An expert who empirically substantiates the effectiveness of border controls (e.g. Clingendael, WODC)

Missing counter-source

Research institute that assesses border controls as effective

Source 2: Advisory Council on Migration

Timestamp: 15:35 — Statement: "The government has left labour migration to its own devices for too long and must take control again."

(a) Funding: State-funded advisory body

(b) Structural conflict of interest: Advisory council has an interest in policy relevance; recommendations are aimed at government action

(c) Missing counter-source: Employers' organisation (VNO-NCW) or sector representative defending labour migration

Rumour check: No explicit rumour markers found in the transcript. However, at 09:09 it is stated "They are people behind their desks who come up with that" — this is an unsubstantiated qualification of policymakers, but not a formal rumour.

Summary: The source selection is one-sidedly focused on critics of border controls and government policy; sources that substantiate the effectiveness or necessity of border measures are entirely absent.



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 (migration segment, approx. 00:00–16:00):

- Critical voices on border controls (residents of Dinxperlo, museum employee, Knaus reference): approx. 7 min. (44%)
- Neutral information provision (Charlotte Waaijers, voice-over): approx. 6 min. (38%)
- Supporters of border controls (no direct speaking time): 0 min. (0%)
- Other news (Ukraine, reality TV, etc.): approx. 26 min. (62% of total broadcast)
- Presenter: approx. 3 min. (19% of migration segment)

Summary: Supporters of border controls — including PVV Minister Faber — receive no direct speaking time; all substantive voices in the migration segment are critical or sceptical of the measure. This results in a structural imbalance.



4. OMISSION (Selective Omission)

6/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Definition: What is not shown, even though relevant?

Omission 1:

Context: Position of PVV Minister Faber is entirely absent

Relevant at: 01:19 — "PVV Minister Faber of Asylum is at any rate watching this German decision with great interest"

Effect: The minister is framed as a passive observer without presenting her policy arguments; viewers gain no insight into the Dutch government's position.

Omission 2:

Context: Perspective of asylum seekers themselves is absent

Relevant at: 06:33 — "The number of people coming to Germany for asylum has increased enormously in recent years"

Effect: The human dimension of the asylum influx is reduced to statistics; motives for transit are not highlighted, which can have a dehumanising effect.

Omission 3:

Context: Successful examples of border controls in other EU countries are absent

Relevant at: 04:40 — "Can you actually properly close the border?"

Effect: The question of effectiveness is answered exclusively sceptically; empirical examples of effective border controls (e.g. Hungary, Austria) are not mentioned.

Summary: The selective omission of government positions, asylum seeker experiences and positive precedents for border controls creates a one-sided picture of the measure as infeasible and undesirable.

Missing voices

- PVV Minister Faber of Asylum: Could have explained the policy arguments for border controls and clarified the Dutch position
- GL-PvdA or D66 migration spokesperson: Could have introduced the perspective of humane asylum policy and European solidarity
- UNHCR Netherlands or VluchtelingenWerk: Could have highlighted the consequences for asylum seekers and the human rights dimension
- Transport entrepreneur or logistics expert: Could have quantified the economic costs of border controls for trade and transport
- Asylum seeker or refugee: Could have introduced the perspective of those directly affected
- European Commission spokesperson: Could have officially explained the European legal position
- Mayor of a border municipality: Could have provided the administrative perspective on feasibility
- Police expert on border surveillance: Could have assessed the operational feasibility of border controls



5. USE OF FIGURES

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Definition: Selective or misleading use of statistics.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 06:33

Figure: "Last year more than 350,000 people applied for asylum in Germany."

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value ✓ — (b) Share X — (c) Trend X

Missing context

No comparison with previous years (trend), no ratio to population size (per capita), no comparison with other EU countries

Effect

The absolute figure sounds large but without context provides no insight into the actual scale of the problem.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 06:09

Figure: "About half of the people are sent back... because they do not have the correct papers and do not apply for asylum."

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value X — (b) Share ✓ — (c) Trend X

Missing context

No absolute numbers, no information about what happens to those sent back

Effect

"About half" suggests effectiveness but without absolute numbers or follow-up data the meaning is unclear.

Summary: Figures are presented without the complete triangle (absolute/share/trend), giving an incomplete picture of migration dynamics.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Discrediting through association with negative groups or ideas.

Association 1:

Timestamp: 13:43

Quote

"The German government is also taking these decisions under pressure from the rise of the far-right AfD and with elections in sight."

Technique: The border control measures are associated with the "far-right AfD" — a party with a negative connotation in public debate. This implies that the measures are politically opportunistic and driven by extremist pressure.

Effect

Viewers are steered to associate border controls with far-right radicalism, even though they are measures of a regular centre-right coalition government.

Summary: The association of border controls with the "far-right AfD" is the only guilt-by-association technique in the broadcast, but it is significant because it implicitly undermines the legitimacy of the measure.



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: 01:01 (beginning)

Content: "Germany surprised friend and foe yesterday with a far-reaching decision"

Timing effect

The word "far-reaching" in the opening sentence immediately sets a frame of disproportionality; viewers are steered from the outset to regard the measure as extreme.

Finding 2:

Position: 13:43 (middle, after informative segment)

Content: Association with "far-right AfD"

Timing effect

After an informative segment about the measure, the political association with far-right radicalism is introduced, retroactively colouring the previously presented information.

Summary: The placement of the word "far-reaching" at the beginning and the AfD association in the middle of the segment create a negative frame that overshadows the informative content.



8. SELECTIVE INDIGNATION

2/10

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: The triggering event must be documented before a reaction can be assessed as selective.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 08:35

Triggering event: Description of the intention to turn back asylum seekers at the border

Reaction: "That goes against all European laws. It is precisely open borders that are an important fundamental principle of the European Union."

Comparison

In the description of the 144 Ukrainian drone attacks on Russia (21:10) — in which a Russian woman is killed — no comparable normative qualification is given

Asymmetry: The border control measure is normatively qualified ("goes against all European laws"), while military actions with fatal casualties are reported neutrally. The asymmetry is present but limited, because the legal qualification may be factually correct.

Degree of indignation: 1/5

Selectivity: 1/5

Summary: There is a slight normative asymmetry whereby border controls are legally qualified but comparable normative qualifications on other topics are absent; however, the asymmetry is limited.



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?

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 01:19

Missing perspective: Position of the Dutch government

Relevance: PVV Minister Faber is the most directly involved Dutch policymaker; her arguments are essential for a complete picture

Consequence: Viewers gain no insight into the Dutch policy reasoning; the measure is illuminated exclusively through foreign and critical voices

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 06:33

Missing perspective: Experiences of asylum seekers and refugee organisations

Relevance: The human impact of border controls on asylum seekers is an essential part of the debate

Consequence: Asylum seekers are reduced to statistics; the humanitarian dimension is absent

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 04:40

Missing perspective: Empirical examples of effective border controls

Relevance: The question of effectiveness is answered exclusively sceptically; counter-evidence is absent

Consequence: Viewers receive a one-sided picture of border controls as inherently ineffective

Summary: The broadcast systematically omits voices that could substantiate or nuance the border control measure, resulting in a structurally incomplete picture.

End of Hard Facts — Beginning of Soft Facts

Soft Facts — Debatable, Not Purely Countable

Germany's reintroduction of border controls touches on a fundamental European tension: the Schengen Agreement guarantees free movement of persons, but the Dublin Regulation obliges asylum seekers to apply in the first EU country of arrival — a rule that is massively circumvented in practice. Germany is under pressure from the rise of the AfD and approaching elections, giving the measure a strongly domestic political character. In the Netherlands, PVV Minister Faber is watching the German example with interest, while critics point to the legal and practical limitations. The debate touches on fundamental questions about national sovereignty versus European solidarity and the effectiveness of border measures as migration management.

Relevant Perspectives for a Balanced Broadcast

- * Position of the Dutch government (PVV/VVD/NSC/BBB) on border controls and asylum policy
- * Position of the Dutch opposition (GL-PvdA, D66) on humane asylum policy and European cooperation
- * Legal perspective: Schengen regulations and Dublin Regulation — what is legally permitted?

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

- * Perspective of asylum seekers themselves: why do people travel through to Germany?
- * Perspective of border municipalities and local administrators on both sides of the border
- * Economic perspective: costs of border controls for trade and transport
- * Security perspective: effectiveness of border controls in combating crime
- * Perspective of reception organisations (VluchtelingenWerk, UNHCR) on the consequences for asylum seekers
- * Comparative perspective: experiences of other EU countries with temporary border controls
- * Demographic perspective: composition of the asylum influx and integration results

Assessment: Was each perspective addressed?

[A] OMITTED

Timestamp: 01:19 — Quote: "PVV Minister Faber of Asylum is at any rate watching this German decision with great interest" — Assessment: Minister Faber is merely mentioned as an observer; her policy arguments are not presented and she is given no speaking time.

[B] OMITTED

Timestamp: n/a — Quote: none — Assessment: No opposition party or progressive voice on humane asylum policy is given the floor.

[C] INDICATED

Timestamp: 08:35 — Quote: "That goes against all European laws. It is precisely open borders that are an important fundamental principle of the European Union." — Assessment: Legal framework is briefly touched upon but not explained in depth; Dublin Regulation is mentioned (09:46).

[D] OMITTED

Timestamp: n/a — Quote: none — Assessment: The perspective of asylum seekers themselves is entirely absent; their motives for transit are not highlighted.

[E] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 01:51 — Quote: "We find that a very special sign, it belongs to us. It belongs to Dinxperlo and Suderwick." — Assessment: Residents and local stakeholders in Dinxperlo speak extensively about the impact on their daily lives.

[F] INDICATED

Timestamp: 03:16 — Quote: "That caused, even during the holidays, great congestion. In June, not the busiest month. Great congestion. In some places there was a delay of up to an hour." — Assessment: Economic impact on transport is indicated but not quantified or explored in depth.

[G] INDICATED

Timestamp: 04:40 — Quote: "Can you actually properly close the border? Anything is possible. You can build a wall." — Assessment: The effectiveness question is raised but answered exclusively from a sceptical perspective.

[H] OMITTED

Timestamp: n/a — Quote: none — Assessment: VluchtelingenWerk, UNHCR or other reception organisations are not given the floor.

[I] INDICATED

Timestamp: 06:09 — Quote: "About half of the people are sent back... because they do not have the correct papers and do not apply for asylum." — Assessment: Experiences at other German borders are briefly mentioned but not systematically compared.

[J] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 06:33 — Quote: "The number of people coming to Germany for asylum has increased enormously in recent years. Last year more than 350,000 people applied for asylum in Germany." — Assessment: Figures on asylum influx and countries of origin are presented, albeit without integration results.

The broadcast addresses the topic of border controls primarily from a local-practical and legally critical perspective, but omits crucial voices: the Dutch government, the opposition, asylum seekers themselves and reception



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

organisations. The economic and security dimensions are only indicated. The resulting picture is therefore incomplete and one-sidedly focused on the infeasibility of the measure.

Share of perspectives covered

Inverted: original value measures coverage (higher = better). Displayed as deviation (higher = greater gaps).



Soft facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING (Setting the frame)

6/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Definition: How is the topic fundamentally framed?

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 01:01

Quote	"Germany surprised friend and foe yesterday with a far-reaching decision"
Manipulation	The word "far-reaching" qualifies the measure as disproportionate; "friend and foe" suggests broad surprise and implicit disapproval
Why problematic	Viewers are steered from the very first sentence to regard the measure as extreme, before any substantive information has been given

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 08:37

Quote	"It is precisely open borders that are an important fundamental principle of the European Union."
Manipulation	Open borders are presented as a fundamental principle that is violated by border controls; the frame is that border controls are by definition contrary to European values
Why problematic	The Schengen Agreement explicitly permits temporary border controls (Art. 25-35 Schengen Borders Code); the frame is legally incomplete

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 13:43

Quote	"The German government is also taking these decisions under pressure from the rise of the far-right AfD"
Manipulation	Border controls are framed as a reaction to far-right radicalism rather than as a legitimate policy response to a real migration issue
Why problematic	This frame implicitly disqualifies the measure as politically opportunistic and inspired by far-right radicalism

Summary: The dominant frame of the broadcast is that border controls are far-reaching, legally problematic and politically opportunistic; alternative frames (effective policy instrument, legitimate exercise of sovereignty) are entirely absent.



11. WORD CHOICE AND TERMINOLOGY

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 01:01

Quote	"far-reaching decision"
Manipulation	"Far-reaching" has a connotation of disproportionality and extremism
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "significant decision" or "decision to reintroduce border controls"

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 13:47

Quote	"far-right AfD"
Manipulation	"Far-right" is a politically charged qualification that places the AfD outside the democratic spectrum
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "the right-wing populist AfD" or "the AfD, which is polling strongly"; the qualification colours the border control measure through association

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 05:09

Quote	"They are people behind their desks who come up with that."
Manipulation	Policymakers are portrayed as out-of-touch bureaucrats without practical knowledge
Why problematic	This is an ad hominem qualification that disqualifies policymakers without substantive arguments; neutral alternative: "policymakers who designed the measure"

Summary: The word choice in the migration segment is consistently negatively coloured with regard to border controls and the policymakers who advocate them, while neutral alternatives were available.



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 principle: The triggering event must be documented before an intervention can be assessed as asymmetric.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 13:43

Triggering event: Charlotte Waaijers introduces the AfD context in relation to border controls

Quote (presenter)

"The German government is also taking these decisions under pressure from the rise of the far-right AfD and with elections in sight. Do you think these measures will convince the viewer?"

Comparison

In the Ukraine segment (22:13), no comparable politically strategic questions are asked about the motives of the Ukrainian army

Asymmetry: The question about political motives is asked exclusively in relation to the border control measure, not in relation to other policy actions in the broadcast; the asymmetry is present but limited

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 04:37

Triggering event: Museum employee states that border controls do not work

Quote (no moderator intervention)

The claim "But we here in the border region know our way around. So that is not going to work." is not followed up or nuanced

Comparison

No comparable moment where a pro-border-control statement goes unchallenged — because no such statements occur in the broadcast

Asymmetry: Not fully demonstrable due to lack of a comparable triggering moment

Summary: Moderation behaviour is predominantly neutral but the questioning in the border control segment contains a slight asymmetry due to the politically strategic framing of the AfD context.



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Differently hard/soft questions to different persons.

Asymmetry 1:

To Charlotte Waaijers, 13:54: "Do you think these measures will convince the viewer?" — leading/soft (asks for political prognosis from a sceptical perspective)

To Gert-Jan Dennekamp, 22:13: "Gert-Jan, you were in Pokrovsk. What was it like there?" — open/neutral

Comparison

The question to Waaijers contains an implicit scepticism about the effectiveness of the measure; the question to Dennekamp is completely open. This is a slight asymmetry.

Asymmetry 2:

To museum employee, 04:40: "Can you actually properly close the border?" — leading (implies this is difficult)

No comparable question to a supporter of border controls — because no supporter is given the floor

Comparison

The questioning is consistently sceptical about border controls; a hard question to a supporter is absent due to the lack of that voice.

Summary: The questions in the migration segment are consistently aimed at eliciting sceptical answers about border controls; hard questions to supporters are absent because they are not given the floor.



14. FALSE BALANCE

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Artificial balance despite factual imbalance.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 01:23

Construction: "PVV Minister Faber of Asylum is at any rate watching this German decision with great interest, while critics are questioning whether it is feasible."

Analysis

The construction "on the one hand Faber, on the other hand critics" suggests balance, but Faber is given no speaking time while the critics speak at length. This is a false balance.

Summary: The mention of Minister Faber as a counterweight creates an appearance of balance that is not fulfilled in the rest of the broadcast; the actual distribution of speaking time is entirely one-sided.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1:

Agenda element: Open borders as a European fundamental principle that is not up for debate

Timestamp: 08:37 — Evidence: "It is precisely open borders that are an important fundamental principle of the European Union."

Alternative agenda: The question of whether the Schengen Agreement should be revised in light of the migration crisis; the question of whether national sovereignty over border management is legitimate

Finding 2:

Agenda element: Border controls as a politically opportunistic measure (reaction to AfD)

Timestamp: 13:43 — Evidence: "The German government is also taking these decisions under pressure from the rise of the far-right AfD"

Alternative agenda: The question of whether border controls are a legitimate and effective policy response to real migration pressure, regardless of the political context

Finding 3:

Agenda element: Labour migration as a problem of insufficient government control

Timestamp: 15:29 — Evidence: "The government has left labour migration to its own devices for too long and must take control again."

Alternative agenda: The economic contribution of labour migrants; the perspective of employers who depend on labour migration

Summary: The agenda-setting consistently places border controls in a negative frame (legally problematic, politically opportunistic) and leaves alternative agendas — sovereignty, effectiveness, economic necessity — out of consideration.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Overview of Individual Scores

No.	Criterion	Type	Score	Main finding (1 sentence)
1	Expert selection	H	6	One-sided expert selection: exclusively critics of border controls, no supporters or operational experts
2	Source selection	H	5	Sources are structurally focused on criticism of border controls; counter-sources are absent
3	Time allocation	H	4	Supporters of border controls receive zero speaking time; all substantive voices are critical
4	Omission	H	6	Position of the Dutch government, asylum seeker experiences and evidence of effectiveness are systematically omitted
5	Use of figures	H	3	Figures are presented without the complete triangle absolute/share/trend
6	Guilt by association	H	2	Border controls are associated with the "far-right AfD"
7	Timing	H	3	"Far-reaching" in the opening sentence and AfD association in the middle create a negative frame
8	Selective indignation	H	2	Slight normative asymmetry regarding border controls vs. other topics
9	Completeness	H	6	Systematic omission of government positions, humanitarian dimension and evidence of effectiveness
10	Framing	Z	6	Dominant frame: border controls are far-reaching, legally problematic and politically opportunistic
11	Word choice	Z	5	Consistently negatively charged word choice regarding border controls ("far-reaching", "far-right")
12	Moderation behaviour	Z	3	Slight asymmetry in questioning; predominantly neutral
13	Question asymmetry	Z	4	Questions consistently aimed at scepticism about border controls; hard questions to supporters are absent
14	False balance	Z	2	False balance through mention of Faber without giving her speaking time
15	Agenda-setting	Z	5	Open borders as a self-evident fundamental principle; sovereignty and effectiveness questions off the agenda

Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (Average Criteria 1-9): 4.1 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (Average Criteria 10-15): 4.2 / 10
- TOTAL SCORE (Average all 15 criteria): 4.1 / 10

Dominant Techniques



The 3 strongest techniques of this broadcast:

- 1. Omission / Selective Omission (Score 6):** The broadcast systematically omits the positions of the Dutch government (PVV Minister Faber), asylum seekers and supporters of border controls. This creates a structurally incomplete picture in which the measure is illuminated exclusively through critical voices.
- 2. Framing (Score 6):** The dominant frame — border controls are "far-reaching", legally problematic and a reaction to far-right radicalism — is constructed from the very first sentence and consistently maintained. Alternative frames (legitimate policy instrument, exercise of sovereignty) are entirely absent.
- 3. Expert selection (Score 6):** All experts who speak about border controls are critical or sceptical; not a single expert who substantiates the effectiveness or legitimacy of the measure is given the floor. Gerald Knaus is presented as a neutral authority while his institutional interest in defending the EU-Turkey approach goes unmentioned.

Core Messages of the Broadcast

MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE): "Border controls are a far-reaching, legally problematic and practically infeasible measure."

Technique: Framing + Omission — Evidence: 01:01, 04:40, 08:35

MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL): "Policymakers who devise border controls are out-of-touch bureaucrats who do not know the practice."

Technique: Word choice + Expert selection — Evidence: 05:09, 04:01

MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL): "Border controls are a politically opportunistic reaction to far-right radicalism, not a legitimate policy response."

Technique: Guilt by association + Agenda-setting — Evidence: 13:43, 08:37

- Clear one-sidedness (5-6) ← No, average is 4.1 — see below

> Correction based on score: The total score of 4.1 places the broadcast on the boundary between "Slight tendency" and "Clear one-sidedness". Given the structural nature of the omissions — in particular the complete absence of government positions and the consistent negative framing of border controls — the qualification "Clear one-sidedness" is justified.

Reasoning: The broadcast displays a consistent pattern of selective omission, negative framing and one-sided expert selection with regard to border controls. PVV Minister Faber is mentioned but given no speaking time; all substantive voices are critical of the measure. The association of border controls with the "far-right AfD" and the qualification "far-reaching" in the opening sentence are indicators of editorial steering. This pattern is not incidental but structurally present throughout the migration segment. In light of Media Act Art. 2.1 — which requires pluriform and balanced reporting — the broadcast is insufficiently balanced on the main topic.

CONCLUSION

The Nieuwsuur broadcast covers Germany's reintroduction of border controls in a manner that structurally deviates from the requirement of pluriformity and balance as laid down in Media Act Art. 2.1. The measure is illuminated exclusively through critical and sceptical voices, while the Dutch government's position (PVV Minister Faber) is merely mentioned as a passive observer without substantive explanation. The word choice ("far-reaching decision", "far-right AfD"), the framing of open borders as an inviolable European fundamental principle and the systematic omission of evidence of effectiveness and humanitarian perspectives create a one-sided picture. The broadcast therefore does not meet the pluriformity requirement of Media Act Art. 2.1 for the migration segment, although the other segments (Ukraine, reality TV) are predominantly neutral. The total score of 4.1/10 places the broadcast in the category "Clear one-sidedness" for the main topic.



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	4	●●
4	OMISSION (Selective Omission)	6	●●●
5	USE OF FIGURES	3	●●
6	GUILT BY ASSOCIATION	2	●
7	TIMING	3	●●
8	SELECTIVE INDIGNATION	2	●
9	COMPLETENESS (Selective Omission — Overall Picture)	6	●●●
10	FRAMING (Setting the frame)	6	●●●
11	WORD CHOICE AND TERMINOLOGY	5	●●●
12	MODERATION BEHAVIOUR	3	●●
13	QUESTION ASYMMETRY	4	●●
14	FALSE BALANCE	2	●
15	AGENDA-SETTING	5	●●●

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

4.3/10

Considerable imbalance

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

4.2/10

Considerable imbalance

TOTAL SCORE

4.3/10

Considerable imbalance

Average of hard facts and soft facts



KEY — Meaning of the scores

Individual scores per criterion (0–10)

0	No finding	No relevant deviation established.
1–2	Weak finding	Slight deviation without material impairment of balance.
3–4	Slight to moderate finding	Recognisable tendency; minor to moderate impact.
5	Moderate finding with impact	Relevant imbalance that affects the opinion-forming potential of the audience.
6	Considerable finding (threshold)	Scores from 6 onwards are 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, persistent 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 ASSESSMENT (Media Act Art. 2.1)

Assessment on the basis of Media Act Art. 2.1

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

Violation 1:

Standard: Media Act Art. 2.1 — Pluriformity

Factual description: PVV Minister Faber is mentioned as an involved party (01:19) but is given no speaking time; not a single supporter of border controls is given substantive airtime

Evidence: Timestamp 01:19 — Quote: "PVV Minister Faber of Asylum is at any rate watching this German decision with great interest, while critics are questioning whether it is feasible."

Assessment: The construction suggests balance but does not achieve it; the pluriformity requirement demands that relevant perspectives are actually presented, not merely mentioned

Violation 2:

Standard: Media Act Art. 2.1 — Balance

Factual description: The migration segment contains exclusively critical voices on border controls; the framing ("far-reaching", "far-right AfD", "goes against all European laws") is consistently negative

Evidence: Timestamp 01:01 — Quote: "Germany surprised friend and foe yesterday with a far-reaching decision"; timestamp 13:43 — Quote: "under pressure from the rise of the far-right AfD"

Assessment: Balance requires that the arguments in favour of the measure are also presented; this is entirely absent

Violation 3:

Standard: Media Act Art. 2.1 — Independence

Factual description: Gerald Knaus is presented as a neutral authority ("architect of the EU-Turkey deal") without mention of his institutional interest in defending that approach

Evidence: Timestamp 10:00 — Quote: "He is seen as the architect of the so-called EU-Turkey deal... Knaus is deeply concerned about the plans of the German government."

Assessment: Independent reporting requires transparency about the interests of cited experts; the absence of this undermines the informational value for the viewer

Overall assessment Media Act Art. 2.1

The broadcast does not fully meet the requirements of Media Act Art. 2.1 for the migration segment. The pluriformity requirement is violated because the Dutch government's position is not substantively presented and all substantive voices are critical of the border control measure. The balance requirement is violated by the consistent negative framing and the selective omission of arguments in favour of the measure. The independence requirement is put under pressure by the presentation of an institutionally involved expert (Knaus) as a neutral authority. The other segments of the broadcast (Ukraine, reality TV, other news) are predominantly neutral and give no cause for a comparable assessment. The identified shortcomings are structural in nature and not incidental, which justifies a formal assessment by the Media Authority.



CHAPTER 6 — SOURCE DEPTH CHECK

1. Gerald Knaus / European Stability Initiative (ESI)

- FUNDING:** ESI is funded by the Open Society Foundations (George Soros), various European governments and private donors. Structural orientation towards pro-European, multilateral solutions.
- MANDATE:** Promotion of European integration and democratisation in the Western Balkans and adjacent regions — not neutral with regard to national border measures.
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Knaus co-designed the EU-Turkey deal; criticism of national border controls fits his institutional position and implicitly defends his own approach.
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** D1 Conflict of interest: -1 / D2 Personal risk: +1 / D3 Professional competence: +2 / D4 Consistency: +1 / D5 Emotion vs. data: +1 / D6 Source level: +1 → TOTAL: +5 → SOURCE LIGHT: GREEN (but with caveat on D1)
- COUNTER-VOICE:** An expert who assesses national border controls as effective (e.g. from Clingendael or WODC) is not cited.

Note: "Architect of the EU-Turkey deal" is a social qualification, not a neutral assessment of professional competence. The institutional interests of ESI should have been made transparent.

2. Advisory Council on Migration

- FUNDING:** State-funded independent advisory body of the Dutch central government.
- MANDATE:** Advisory role on migration policy — compatible with neutral assessment, but structurally focused on policy relevance.
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Advisory council has an interest in policy relevance and visibility; recommendations are aimed at government action, which can create a slight bias towards regulation.
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** D1 Conflict of interest: 0 / D2 Personal risk: +1 / D3 Professional competence: +2 / D4 Consistency: +1 / D5 Emotion vs. data: +2 / D6 Source level: +1 → TOTAL: +7 → SOURCE LIGHT: GREEN
- COUNTER-VOICE:** Employers' organisations (VNO-NCW, MKB-Nederland) that defend the economic necessity of labour migration are not cited.

Note: The Advisory Council on Migration is a reliable source for policy advice, but the absence of an employer perspective makes the labour migration report one-sided.

Analysis compiled in accordance with Methodological Principle K11+K8 (version 3.0-detail): triggering events documented for Criteria 8 and 12; asymmetry established only where comparable triggering events with other guests/positions did not produce an analogous reaction.

Legal and methodological notes

No factual determination

The results presented do not constitute factual determinations about individual persons, editorial teams or broadcasts. They are the product of a standardised operationalisation, not a determination of individual responsibility.

No legal ruling

The aggregated deviation index does not replace a legal assessment under 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).



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

No proof of causality

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

No judgement on intent

The analysis measures observable structural characteristics of broadcasts. A score of 7 means that a considerable imbalance has been established — not that the editorial team intended this. The methodology makes no statements about motives or strategic objectives.

Heuristic comparison instrument

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



APPENDIX 1: NATIONAL LEGISLATION

Legal basis Netherlands — NPO

Act

Media Act 2008

Relevant articles

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

Core obligations

1. **Independence:** Independent information provision
2. **Pluriformity:** 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, context removal 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 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 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.