



NPO DETAILED ANALYSIS

2024-11-12_VPWON_1353332

Broadcast: NPO broadcast | 2024-11-12 | Analysed on: 2026-05-22 21:49

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

TOTAL SCORE

5.1/10

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)

4.5 / 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 (since July 2024) is an extra-parliamentary cabinet consisting of 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 (25 seats), followed by D66 (9 seats), CDA (5 seats), SP (5 seats), PvdD (3 seats), CU (3 seats), SGP (3 seats), FvD (3 seats), DENK and Volt.

Party	CHES L-R	Seats	Government/Opposition	Core position
SP	1.1	5	Opposition	Socioeconomically left, anti-market forces
GL-PvdA	2.4	25	Opposition (largest)	Climate, humane asylum policy, fair sharing
PvdD	2.5	3	Opposition	Animal rights, climate, left-progressive
D66	4.8	9	Opposition	Pro-EU, liberal-progressive, innovation
CDA	5.5	5	Opposition	Christian democratic, centre-right
NSC	5.8	20	Government	Economic security, rule of law, manageable migration
CU	6.0	3	Opposition	Christian-social, centre-right
VVD	7.0	24	Government	Free market, entrepreneurship, strict migration policy
BBB	7.5	7	Government	Agrarian-populist, farmer protection, EU-critical
SGP	7.8	3	Opposition	Reformed, traditionally conservative
PVV	9.2	37	Government (largest)	Anti-Islam, asylum stop, national sovereignty
FvD	9.5	3	Opposition	Far right, Baudet, anti-establishment

The Amsterdam riots following the Maccabi Tel Aviv–Ajax match (7 November 2024) have exposed a sharp political fault line between the coalition (PVV, VVD, BBB), which uses strong language about Moroccan youth, and NSC, which is more cautious, while the opposition (GL-PvdA) rejects the integration frame. The tension between the Amsterdam triangle (mayor, police, public prosecution) and political The Hague is a second fault line, with Amsterdam criticising the polarising tone of national politics. The Shell ruling on appeal touches on the climate debate: the question of whether judges or politicians should enforce climate targets on companies is politically charged. Antisemitism, integration and the definition of the problem form the fourth line of tension, with parties fundamentally disagreeing on causes and solutions.

The Dutch public broadcaster (NPO) operates under the Media Act 2008, of which Article 2.1 requires pluriform, balanced and independent reporting across the total output. Nieuwsuur is a joint production of NOS and BNNVARA, broadcast on NPO 2, and has a journalistic accountability obligation towards society as a whole. PVV leader Wilders has repeatedly criticised the NPO as a "left-wing broadcaster", which increases the political sensitivity of editorial choices.



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Assessment per party

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast representation vs. party programme position
VVD	0	Not directly addressed — coalition position "firm language" (03:50) briefly mentioned without substantive explanation — party programme not represented, but also not distorted — omitted
PVV	-1	03:50 "Coalition parties PVV, VVD and BBB are using firm language. They want the cabinet to take tough action against Moroccan youth who go off the rails." — Programme position: asylum stop, de-Islamisation, tough approach — representation is superficial and reduces PVV to one sentence without substantive explanation — partially omitted
GL-PvdA	+1	03:12–03:36 Timmermans receives extensive speaking time to nuance the integration frame and condemn antisemitism without linking it to an integration problem — programme position (humane asylum policy, nuance) correctly represented — correct
NSC	+1	04:04–04:42 NSC position (cautious, reflective, naming without generalising) extensively addressed — programme position (manageable migration, rule of law) recognisable — correct
D66	0	Not addressed in the broadcast — omitted
BBB	-1	03:50 grouped together with PVV and VVD in one sentence as "firm language" — no substantive explanation of BBB's position — omitted/superficial
CDA	0	Not addressed — omitted
SP	0	Not addressed — omitted

Summary Party Bias

- Most accurate representation: GL-PvdA (Score +1) and NSC (Score +1) — both parties receive speaking time and their nuanced position is recognisably represented.
- Strongest distortion: PVV (Score -1) and BBB (Score -1) — coalition positions are summarised in one sentence without substantive explanation or speaking time for representatives.
- Average deviation from 0: 0.5
- Conclusion: The broadcast gives the opposition leader (Timmermans/GL-PvdA) and the most cautious coalition party (NSC) the most substantive space. PVV, the largest governing party, receives no speaking time of its own and is characterised exclusively through a summary sentence from the editorial team. This creates a structural asymmetry whereby the coalition is presented as a bloc while the opposition appears individually and with nuance.

Left-Right General Tendency

TENDENCY SCORE: +1.2

CLASSIFICATION: Left-favouring

Reasoning: The broadcast gives opposition leader Timmermans (GL-PvdA, CHES 2.4) extensive speaking time to nuance the dominant right-coalition frame ("integration problem", "Moroccan youth"), while PVV, VVD and BBB are



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

characterised exclusively through an editorial summary. The Shell segment is introduced with an extensive historical context that favours the climate movement, and the Milieudefensie director receives an emotional closing statement. The agenda-setting (antisemitism as an integration issue, climate responsibility of companies) structurally aligns with progressive-left frames.



CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Broadcast details

- Title: Nieuwsuur
- Date: 12.11.2024
- Length (estimated from transcript):
- Presenter/Reporter: Jeroen (presenter, name mentioned multiple times); reporters not named in transcript
- Persons interviewed:

Person	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political Spectrum
Femke Halsema	Mayor of Amsterdam	D66 background, independent mayor	Centre-left
Frans Timmermans	Parliamentary group leader GL-PvdA	GL-PvdA	Left (CHES 2.4)
NSC spokesperson (unnamed)	Member of Parliament NSC	NSC	Centre-right (CHES 5.8)
Frans Everts	President-Director Shell Netherlands	Business	N/A
Milieudefensie director (unnamed)	Director Milieudefensie	NGO, climate activism	Left-progressive
Soap maker Utrecht (unnamed)	Entrepreneur organic cosmetics	Business	N/A
Cosmetics company representative (unnamed)	Entrepreneur	Business	N/A
Skal Biocontrole representative (unnamed)	Organic supervisor	Government body	N/A

Main theme

The broadcast covers three main topics: (1) the political aftermath of the Amsterdam riots following Maccabi Tel Aviv–Ajax, with accountability by Mayor Halsema and political reactions; (2) the Shell ruling on appeal in which the court overturns the earlier verdict; (3) misleading organic claims in the cosmetics sector.



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

CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS



Hard facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically verifiable

1. EXPERT SELECTION

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Who speaks as an expert?

Expert 1: Frans Timmermans — Parliamentary group leader GL-PvdA

Timestamp: 03:12–03:36

Statement: "We have a challenge. In parts of our population there are images about Jews. Those images must go. There is no justification whatsoever for antisemitism. Whatever happens in the rest of the world or the country. And we need to do something about that. I certainly do not trivialise it. But I hope we can also bring a little nuance into the discussion."

Framing: Timmermans is introduced as "the leader of the largest opposition party" — a political function, not an expert role. He speaks as a politician, not as an independent expert.

Missing counter-voice: A PVV or VVD spokesperson who substantively defends the integration frame.

Source depth check:

(a) FUNDING: GL-PvdA, funded through party subsidy and House of Representatives budget. No independent funding. Interest: opposition party has an institutional interest in criticising cabinet policy.

(b) MANDATE: Political parliamentary group leader — mandate is by definition party-political, not neutral.

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Opposition leader has a direct interest in nuancing the coalition frame

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Condemning antisemitism while advocating nuance is politically risky

D3 Professional competence: 0 — Politician, not a scientist or expert in the field of integration or antisemitism

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Timmermans has consistently taken a nuanced position

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: 0 — No data, but also not strongly emotional

D6 Source level: -1 — Political opinion, not a primary source

• TOTAL: 0 → SOURCE LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: Timmermans is introduced as "leader of the largest opposition party" — this is a political qualification, not an expert role. The framing suggests, however, that his position is representative of a broad societal perspective.

Expert 2: Frans Everts — President-Director Shell Netherlands

Timestamp: 13:44–25:42

Statement: "We agree with Milieudefensie. We have the same goal." (14:30–14:33)

Framing: Everts is introduced as "president-director of Shell Netherlands" — a corporate function. He speaks as a representative of a party in the legal case.

Missing counter-voice: An independent climate economist or energy transition expert.

Source depth check:

(a) FUNDING: Shell plc, listed oil and gas company. Direct financial interest in the outcome of the legal case and in framing the transition strategy as adequate.



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

(b) MANDATE: CEO of a party in the legal case — by definition not neutral about the outcome or Shell's climate responsibility.

- D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Direct party in the legal case; financial interest in favourable framing
- D2 Personal risk: -1 — Little personal risk; speaks in the interest of his company
- D3 Professional competence: +1 — Knowledge of Shell's business operations, but not an independent climate expert
- D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistent pro-transition but pro-fossil narrative
- D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Uses figures (60% reduction own emissions, 15-20% transport customers)
- D6 Source level: -1 — Internal company figures, not independently verified

• TOTAL: -1 → SOURCE LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: Everts is invited as the sole substantive guest for the Shell segment. His framing of Shell as a responsible transition company is not contradicted by an independent expert, only by the Milieudedefensie director (also a party in the case).

Expert 3: Milieudedefensie director (unnamed)

Timestamp: 17:24–18:07

Statement: "We expect Shell to act as a responsible citizen. A citizen of society. And not to cause harm through their emissions of greenhouse gases. And in that way contribute to dangerous climate change. That must stop."

Framing: Director of an advocacy organisation that brought the legal case — a direct party.

Source depth check:

(a) FUNDING: Milieudedefensie (Friends of the Earth Netherlands) — funded through donations, membership fees and subsidies. Institutional interest in framing the ruling as a setback and in mobilising support.

(b) MANDATE: Advocacy organisation — mandate is by definition partisan in favour of climate action.

- D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Direct party in the legal case; institutional interest in a particular framing
- D2 Personal risk: +1 — Publicly standing up for a losing case carries reputational risk
- D3 Professional competence: +1 — Expertise in the field of climate law and policy
- D4 Opinion consistency: +2 — Consistent climate activism
- D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1 — Strong emotional appeal ("dangerous climate change", "future of your children")
- D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary source (refers to scientific consensus without direct citations)

• TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE LIGHT: YELLOW

Missing expert groups:

- Independent climate law jurist for contextualising the precedent effect
- Climate economist for analysis of the effectiveness of legal cases vs. government policy
- Integration or criminology expert for contextualising the Amsterdam riots

Source traffic light for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Frans Timmermans — Parliamentary group leader GL-PvdA	-1	+1	0	+1	0	-1	0	YELLOW
Frans Everts — President-Director Shell Netherlands	-2	-1	+1	+1	+1	-1	-1	YELLOW
Milieudedefensie director (unnamed)	-2	+1	+1	+2	-1	0	+1	YELLOW



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

Summary (Matrix result):

- Timmermans: YELLOW (score 0) — politician, not an expert, but consistent and with some personal risk
- Everts: YELLOW (score -1) — direct party in legal case, financial interest, internal figures not verified
- Milieudefensie director: YELLOW (score +1) — direct party, but consistent and with reputational risk

All three main guests have a direct interest in the framing of their subject. None of the three is an independent expert. The broadcast presents partisan sources without independent counterbalance.



2. SOURCE SELECTION

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without a primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

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

Source 1: Amsterdam Triangle (Halsema, chief of police, chief public prosecutor)

Timestamp: 05:00–12:22

Statement: "Halsema reiterated that the triangle, mayor, police, Public Prosecution Service had done the maximum to prevent the violence." (05:00–05:04)

- (a) Funding and governance:** Amsterdam municipal government — funded through municipal taxes and national government contributions.
- (b) Structural conflict of interest:** The triangle accounts for its own conduct — a classic case of self-accountability without independent scrutiny.
- (c) Missing counter-source:** An independent inquiry commission or forensic expert assessing the conduct of the triangle.

Source 2: ACM and NVWA (cosmetics segment)

Timestamp: 36:31–37:04

Statement: "The ACM states that it has never intervened in cases of misleading organic cosmetics claims." (36:36–36:41) / "But later the NVWA reverses this. It then states that it does have a supervisory role." (36:55–37:00)

- (a) Funding:** Government bodies — funded through the national budget.
- (b) Structural conflict of interest:** Government bodies that must explain their own enforcement failures — limited incentive for self-criticism.
- (c) Missing counter-source:** An independent consumer organisation (e.g. Consumentenbond) assessing the enforcement gap.

Rumour check (penalty points):

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 07:40–07:44

Claim: "Online a call appears from taxi drivers to mobilise."

Word marking: "Online appears" — no primary source, no screenshot, no verification

Primary source present: No — penalty point (+1)

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 10:18–10:22

Claim: "Online there is talk of a Jew hunt."

Word marking: "Online there is talk of" — no primary source, no verification of the origin

Primary source present: No — penalty point (+1)

Summary: The source selection is strongly institutional (government, business, advocacy) and lacks independent scientific or societal voices. Two claims are presented without a primary source, which weakens the factual basis.



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

Definition: Distribution of speaking time between different positions.

Estimated speaking time:

- Halsema/Amsterdam triangle (institutional, self-accountability): approx. 7 min. (17%)
- Frans Timmermans (GL-PvdA, opposition): approx. 2 min. (5%)
- NSC spokesperson (coalition, cautious): approx. 1.5 min. (4%)
- PVV/VVD/BBB (coalition, firm language): 0 min. — exclusively via editorial summary (0%)
- Frans Everts/Shell (business): approx. 10 min. (25%)
- Milieudefensie director (NGO, climate activism): approx. 1.5 min. (4%)
- Cosmetics segment (various voices): approx. 7 min. (17%)
- Presenter/voice-over: approx. 11 min. (28%)

Summary: The time allocation is strongly asymmetric: Shell receives 25% of total broadcast time as the sole substantive guest, while the largest governing party (PVV) receives not a single second of direct speaking time. The opposition (Timmermans) receives more substantive speaking time than all coalition spokespersons combined.



4. OMISSION (Selective Omission)

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Definition: What is not shown, even though relevant?

Omission 1: No speaking time for PVV, VVD or BBB

Context

The three largest coalition parties are characterised exclusively through an editorial summary.

Relevant at: 03:50–03:58

Effect: The viewer hears only the opposition (Timmermans) and the most cautious coalition party (NSC) speaking substantively. The coalition position is reduced to "firm language" without substantive underpinning.

Omission 2: No voice from the Moroccan-Dutch community

Context

The political debate largely revolves around "Moroccan youth" but the community itself is not given a voice.

Relevant at: 03:54–04:42

Effect: The community is treated exclusively as an object of political debate, not as a subject with its own perspective. This reinforces the stigmatising frame.

Omission 3: No independent assessment of the conduct of the Amsterdam triangle

Context

Halsema accounts for her own conduct; no independent expert or critic receives speaking time.

Relevant at: 05:00–12:22

Effect: The self-accountability of the triangle is not scrutinised. Critical questions from city councillors are summarised but not substantively explored.

Summary: The broadcast structurally omits the voices that could challenge or enrich the dominant institutional narrative: coalition spokespersons, the Moroccan-Dutch community and independent assessors of government conduct.

Missing voices

- Representative of the Moroccan-Dutch community: Could have contributed to nuancing the stigmatising debate and the impact of collective guilt on the community.
- PVV spokesperson: Could have substantively explained the coalition positions instead of via an editorial summary.
- Climate scientist: Could have contextualised the scientific significance of the Shell ruling for climate targets.
- Independent legal expert (climate law): Could have placed the precedent effect of the Shell ruling in a European context.
- Jewish community representative: Could have spoken directly about the sense of security and expectations of the government.
- Victim of the Amsterdam riots: Could have given a human face to the abstract political discussion.
- ACM/NVWA spokesperson (cosmetics): Could have explained the enforcement gap; currently cited exclusively via voice-over.



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

- Member of the European Parliament on Green Deal/cosmetics regulation: Could have deepened the European policy context.



5. STATISTICAL 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: Shell's CO₂ emissions — 90/10 ratio

Timestamp: 20:36–20:42

Figure: "but proportionally that is approximately 90 - 10." (ratio of customer emissions vs. Shell's own emissions)

Dimensions: (b) share shown — (a) absolute value not specified — (c) trend not shown

Missing context: What is the absolute emission of Shell's own operations vs. customer emissions in megatons of CO₂? How does this relate to global emissions? Is the 90/10 ratio stable, improved or worsened?

Effect: The 90/10 ratio suggests that Shell's own efforts (10%) are marginal, but without absolute figures and trend data the policy relevance cannot be assessed.

Finding 2: Shell's reduction of own emissions — "almost 60 percent"

Timestamp: 18:23–18:30

Figure: "we want to halve those by the end of this decade. We have already achieved almost 60 percent of that target."

Dimensions: (b) share shown — (a) absolute value not specified — (c) trend not shown

Missing context: What is the base year? Which emission categories are included (Scope 1, 2 or 3)? Is the reduction the result of efficiency improvements or asset sales?

Effect: The 60% claim sounds impressive but is not verifiable without methodological context. The presenter does not challenge the claim.

Finding 3: "Shell's fossil fuels emit ten times more CO₂ annually than all of the Netherlands"

Timestamp: 15:55–16:01

Figure: "Shell's fossil fuels emit ten times more CO₂ annually than all of the Netherlands."

Dimensions: (b) share shown — (a) absolute value not specified — (c) trend not shown

Missing context: Which year? Scope 3 (customer emissions) or only own operations? How does this compare to other major oil companies? Is this a rising or falling trend?

Effect: The figure is presented as a dramatic fact in the historical context introducing the Milieudefensie case, without source citation or methodological explanation.

Summary: Three significant figures are presented without adequate contextualisation (absolute values, trend data, methodology). All three figures are used in an argumentative context (Shell's climate responsibility) and thus meet the three-tone test. The absence of multiple dimensions is a structural finding.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Discrediting through association with negative groups/ideas.

Association 1: "Jew hunt"

Timestamp: 10:18–10:22

Quote: "Online there is talk of a Jew hunt."

Technique: The word "Jew hunt" — with its historical connotations of the Holocaust — is introduced as a term circulating online, but by citing it without distancing, the association with the perpetrators (implicitly: Moroccan youth) is reinforced.

Effect: The term loads the events with maximum historical gravity without the actual severity of the incidents having been independently established.

Association 2: Linking Maccabi supporters to provocations

Timestamp: 07:11–07:28

Quote: "In the night from Wednesday to Thursday tensions rise. In the city centre, Maccabi supporters pull a Palestinian flag from a facade. And a little further on, a Palestinian flag is set on fire. A taxi is vandalised."

Technique: The behaviour of Maccabi supporters (pulling flag from facade, burning flag, vandalising taxi) is factually reported but without explicit condemnation or contextualisation of the severity.

Effect: The order of presentation (first provocations by supporters, then violence against supporters) may create the impression of a causal relationship, without this being explicitly stated.

Summary: The broadcast uses the word "Jew hunt" without a primary source citation and presents the behaviour of Maccabi supporters in an order that implicitly suggests a causal relationship with the subsequent violence. These are not explicit association techniques but structural framing choices with a comparable effect.



7. TIMING

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1: Emotional opening with Halsema's self-defence

Position: 00:03–00:17 (opening)

Content: "If you have criticism, you should come to me. And not to the people who worked incredibly hard in the execution... did their utmost best."

Timing effect: The broadcast opens with Halsema defending her staff — an emotional and sympathetic frame that positions the viewer before the substantive accountability begins. Criticism of the triangle is thereby pre-emptively neutralised.

Finding 2: Milieudefensie director receives emotional closing statement in Shell segment

Position: 17:41–18:07 (just before the interview with Everts)

Content: "I would like to call on the CEO of Shell... Act as if you have the ability to secure the future of your children."

Timing effect: The emotional appeal from Milieudefensie is placed just before the interview with Everts, so that the viewer enters the interview with a moral frame ("future of your children") that Everts must rebut.

Finding 3: Historical context of Shell exclusively from the climate movement's perspective

Position: 15:23–17:21 (middle, before the interview)

Content: Extensive historical context about Urgenda, Paris Agreement, Swiss elderly women at the ECHR, "this year probably the warmest year ever measured."

Timing effect: The historical context is built up exclusively from the perspective of the climate movement, before Everts speaks. There is no comparable historical context about Shell's transition investments or the energy security arguments.

Summary: The timing of emotional elements (opening Halsema, closing statement Milieudefensie) and the one-sided historical context before the Shell interview create a frame that structurally disadvantages the institutional and corporate positions relative to the critical perspectives.



8. SELECTIVE INDIGNATION

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

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

Methodological principle (v2.2): 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: No follow-up questions on Halsema's self-defence

Timestamp: 05:00–12:22

Triggering event: Halsema states that the triangle "did the maximum" — a claim contested by city councillors.

Reaction: The presenter summarises the accountability without critical follow-up questions to Halsema herself.

Comparison: With Frans Everts (Shell), follow-up questions are asked repeatedly: "So you are also not going to do more than what you are doing?" (18:35), "Are you saying: we are doing something extra?" (21:24), "Are you pleased with the election of Trump?" (25:28).

Asymmetry: Everts is questioned considerably more rigorously than Halsema. Halsema's self-accountability is not critically scrutinised by the presenter.

Degree of indignation: 1/5

Selectivity: 2/5

Finding 2: No critical reaction to Timmermans' political framing

Timestamp: 03:12–03:50

Triggering event: Timmermans states that the Netherlands has "no integration problem" — a politically contested claim.

Reaction: The presenter asks: "How do you assess the conduct of the cabinet so far?" — an open question that gives Timmermans the space to play his opposition role.

Comparison: With the NSC member of parliament, follow-up questions are asked: "And where does it lie?" (04:17) — which leads to the naming of "Moroccans".

Asymmetry: Timmermans' frame is not challenged; the NSC member of parliament is encouraged to be more specific.

Degree of indignation: 1/5

Selectivity: 2/5

Summary: The selective indignation is limited but present: Everts (Shell) is questioned considerably more rigorously than Halsema (government), and Timmermans' political frame is not challenged while the NSC member of parliament is encouraged to be more specific. The asymmetry is not extreme but structurally consistent.



9. COMPLETENESS (Selective Omission — Overall Picture)

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: How completely does the broadcast portray the subject?

Finding 1: Amsterdam riots — no voice from victims or witnesses

Timestamp: 01:01–12:22

Missing perspective/fact: No direct testimonies from victims of the violence, Maccabi supporters or Amsterdam residents.

Relevance: The human dimension of the riots is entirely mediated through institutional sources (triangle, politicians).

Impact: The public receives an institutional-political picture of the riots without seeing the human reality.

Finding 2: Shell segment — no independent climate expert

Timestamp: 12:27–25:42

Missing perspective/fact: No climate scientist, energy economist or independent legal expert.

Relevance: The scientific and legal context of the ruling is presented exclusively through voice-over and partisan sources (Shell, Milieudefensie).

Impact: The viewer cannot independently verify the claims of either party.

Finding 3: Cosmetics segment — no response from misleading companies

Timestamp: 34:43–35:30

Missing perspective/fact: Companies that incorrectly use organic quality marks are confronted (via voice-over) but do not speak for themselves.

Relevance: Hearing both sides is a basic journalistic principle.

Impact: The allegations are presented one-sidedly; the companies cannot explain their conduct.

Summary: The broadcast structurally lacks the voices that could challenge or enrich the institutional narrative: victims, independent experts and accused parties. This leads to an incomplete and institutionally coloured overall picture.



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 subject fundamentally framed?

Finding 1: Amsterdam riots as an antisemitism problem, not a public order problem

Timestamp: 01:01–01:16

Quote: "More than 5 days after things got seriously out of hand in Amsterdam... Mayor Halsema today faces the city council. Where she accounts for the decisions she made together with police and justice before, during and after the Maccabi Tel Aviv-Ajax match."

Manipulation: The riots are primarily framed as an accountability issue for the Amsterdam triangle, not as a societal security problem or an integration issue.

Why problematic: This frame favours the institutional accountability (triangle defends itself) over the political and societal dimensions that are central to the parliamentary debate.

Finding 2: Shell as a morally responsible actor, not as a legally acquitted party

Timestamp: 18:07–18:14

Quote: "It now comes down to your own responsibility. Are you going to do something extra?"

Manipulation: Despite Shell's legal acquittal on appeal, the interview is framed as a moral accountability question. The legal outcome is ignored as a relevant framework.

Why problematic: The frame suggests that Shell is morally obliged to do more than legally required, without this frame being challenged by an independent voice.

Finding 3: Climate change as a fixed and urgent framework

Timestamp: 15:23–17:02

Quote: "Meanwhile this year is probably the warmest year ever measured. The emission of greenhouse gases is higher than ever."

Manipulation: The historical context is built up as an escalating climate crisis, which determines the frame for the Shell interview. There is no alternative frame (e.g. energy security, economic transition costs).

Why problematic: The one-sided climate crisis frame positions Shell's defence as morally inadequate, regardless of the legal and economic arguments.

Summary: The broadcast employs three dominant frames: institutional accountability (Amsterdam), moral responsibility (Shell) and climate crisis (historical context). Alternative frames (security, legal acquittal, energy security) are structurally suppressed.



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 created?

Finding 1: "Jew hunt"

Timestamp: 10:18–10:22

Quote: "Online there is talk of a Jew hunt."

Manipulation: The word "Jew hunt" has direct Holocaust connotations. By citing it as a term circulating online, the maximum historical gravity is activated without the actual severity having been independently established.

Why problematic: A neutral alternative would be: "Online there was talk of targeted attacks on Israeli supporters" — this describes the same fact without the Holocaust association.

Finding 2: "Firm language" for coalition vs. no qualification for opposition

Timestamp: 03:50–03:54

Quote: "Coalition parties PVV, VVD and BBB are using firm language."

Manipulation: The coalition positions are qualified as "firm language" — a term that can mean both forceful and unnuanced. Timmermans' position is not qualified.

Why problematic: "Firm language" has a slightly pejorative connotation (unnuanced, populist). Neutral alternative: "Coalition parties PVV, VVD and BBB are calling for tough measures."

Finding 3: "Going off the rails" for Moroccan youth

Timestamp: 03:54–03:58

Quote: "They want the cabinet to take tough action against Moroccan youth who go off the rails."

Manipulation: "Going off the rails" is a euphemism for serious violence (assault, antisemitic attacks). The term trivialises the severity of the incidents.

Why problematic: A neutral and more precise alternative: "Moroccan youth who were involved in violence and antisemitic incidents."

Summary: The word choice is problematic on three points: the use of "Jew hunt" activates maximum historical connotations, "firm language" qualifies coalition positions in a slightly pejorative way, and "going off the rails" trivialises serious violence.



12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Methodological principle (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: Repeated follow-up questions with Shell, not with Halsema

Timestamp: 18:35–25:42 (Shell) vs. 05:00–12:22 (Halsema)

Triggering event (Shell): Everts gives vague answers about additional measures.

Quote (presenter): "So you are also not going to do more than what you are doing?" (18:35) / "Are you saying: we are doing something extra?" (21:24) / "Are you pleased with the election of Trump?" (25:28)

Comparison: Halsema states that the triangle "did the maximum" — a comparably vague claim. The presenter does not follow up on the specific decisions that are criticised in retrospect.

Asymmetry: Everts is repeatedly and critically questioned; Halsema's self-accountability is not challenged in a comparable manner. Demonstrably asymmetric.

Finding 2: Sympathetic opening with Everts

Timestamp: 13:46–14:07

Triggering event: Milieudefensie director shows emotion after losing the case.

Quote (presenter): "Very emotional reactions, do you understand that?" (13:46)

Comparison: With Halsema, there is no question of whether she understands the emotions of victims of the riots.

Asymmetry: The question "do you understand that?" to Everts is empathetic in tone — it invites him to show understanding for the opposing party. This is a soft opening that sets the tone of the interview. Not strongly asymmetric but noteworthy.

Finding 3: No follow-up questions on Timmermans' claim of "no integration problem"

Timestamp: 03:16–03:50

Triggering event: Timmermans states that the Netherlands has "no integration problem" — a politically contested claim.

Quote (presenter): "How do you assess the conduct of the cabinet so far?" — open question, no challenge to the claim.

Comparison: With the NSC member of parliament, follow-up questions are asked: "And where does it lie?" (04:17) — which leads to specification.

Asymmetry: Timmermans' frame is not challenged; the NSC member of parliament is encouraged to make a statement that is politically sensitive. Demonstrably asymmetric.



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

Summary: The moderation behaviour shows a consistent asymmetry: Everts (Shell/business) and the NSC member of parliament (coalition) are questioned more rigorously than Halsema (institutional) and Timmermans (opposition). This pattern is structural and cannot be attributed to chance.



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Different hard/soft questions to different persons.

Asymmetry 1: Shell vs. Halsema

To Frans Everts (Shell), 18:35: "So you are also not going to do more than what you are doing?" — hard, repeated, normative

To Halsema (triangle), 10:10: "Was it not necessary to escort the supporters somewhere by bus?" — mild, once, procedural

Comparison: Everts is repeatedly questioned on his moral responsibility; Halsema is questioned once procedurally without follow-up on the criticism from city councillors.

Asymmetry 2: Timmermans vs. NSC member of parliament

To Frans Timmermans (GL-PvdA), 03:40: "How do you assess the conduct of the cabinet so far?" — open, inviting, no challenge to his frame

To NSC member of parliament, 04:17: "And where does it lie?" — follow-up, leads to politically sensitive specification

Comparison: Timmermans may present his frame unchallenged; the NSC member of parliament is encouraged to make a statement that is politically risky ("Moroccans of the second and third generation").

Asymmetry 3: Shell — repeated moral pressure

To Frans Everts (Shell), 21:05–21:24: "Are you saying today: we take that responsibility and we are also going to do more." / "Are you saying: we are doing something extra?" — normative, repeated, morally charged

To Milieudéfensie director: No critical questions about the effectiveness of legal cases as a climate instrument or about the precedent effect for other sectors.

Comparison: Shell is questioned morally; Milieudéfensie is not critically questioned about its strategy.

Summary: The question asymmetry is most pronounced in the Shell segment (repeated moral pressure on Everts, no critical questions to Milieudéfensie) and in the Amsterdam segment (open questions to Timmermans, follow-up questions with NSC). This pattern is consistent with the left-favouring tendency established in Step 1.



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

Definition: Artificial balance despite factual imbalance.

Finding 1: Shell "agrees with Milieudéfense" as false balance

Timestamp: 14:30–14:33

Construction: "We agree with Milieudéfense. We have the same goal."

Analysis: Everts' claim that Shell and Milieudéfense "have the same goal" is not challenged. This creates a false balance: the fundamental contradiction (legal obligation vs. voluntary action, pace of transition) is neutralised by a vague shared objective.

Summary: The false balance is limited but present: Everts' claim of shared goals with Milieudéfense is not critically scrutinised, which obscures the fundamental contradiction in the case.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

6/10

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: Antisemitism as the primary lens for the Amsterdam riots

Agenda element: The riots are primarily framed as an antisemitism incident, not as a public order problem or as a consequence of geopolitical tensions.

Timestamp: 01:45–01:52 — Evidence: "Where Prime Minister Schoof today received Jewish and other societal organisations to speak about the increasing antisemitism."

Alternative agenda: The role of the geopolitical context (Gaza war), the provocations of Maccabi supporters, the enforcement capacity of the police, or the broader public order problems in Amsterdam.

Finding 2: Climate responsibility of companies as a self-evident framework

Agenda element: The Shell segment assumes that companies have a moral (not only legal) responsibility for the emissions of their customers.

Timestamp: 18:07–18:14 — Evidence: "It now comes down to your own responsibility. Are you going to do something extra?"

Alternative agenda: The role of governments in creating the right rules, the responsibility of consumers, or the economic feasibility of faster transition.

Finding 3: Organic cosmetics as a consumer protection issue

Agenda element: The cosmetics segment assumes that more regulation is the solution.

Timestamp: 37:46–38:54 — Evidence: "In Europe, work is being done on new rules that should better regulate sustainability claims such as organic."

Alternative agenda: The question of whether more regulation is effective, the costs for small producers, or the role of market forces and consumer information as an alternative to regulation.

Summary: The agenda-setting favours three dominant frames: antisemitism (above public order), corporate responsibility (above government responsibility) and regulation (above market forces). Alternative frames are not placed on the agenda.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Overview of Individual Scores

No.	Criterion	Type	Score	Main finding (1 sentence)
1	Expert selection	H	6	All main guests are direct parties with an interest in the framing; no independent experts
2	Source selection	H	5	Two claims without a primary source; institutional sources dominate
3	Time allocation	H	5	Shell receives 25% speaking time; PVV/VVD/BBB receive 0% direct speaking time
4	Omission	H	7	Moroccan-Dutch community, coalition spokespersons and independent assessors are absent
5	Statistical manipulation	H	4	Three significant figures without absolute values, trend data or methodology
6	Guilt by association	H	3	"Jew hunt" without a primary source; implicit causality provocations–violence
7	Timing	H	4	Emotional opening Halsema and one-sided historical context Shell influence the frame
8	Selective indignation	H	3	Everts questioned more rigorously than Halsema; Timmermans' frame not challenged
9	Completeness	H	7	Victims, independent experts and accused companies are structurally absent
10	Framing	S	6	Three dominant frames (institutional accountability, moral responsibility, climate crisis) suppress alternatives
11	Word choice	S	5	"Jew hunt", "firm language" and "going off the rails" are problematic
12	Moderation behaviour	S	6	Structural asymmetry: Everts and NSC questioned more rigorously than Halsema and Timmermans
13	Question asymmetry	S	6	Repeated moral pressure on Shell; open questions to opposition; no critical questions to Milieudedefensie
14	False balance	S	3	False balance via Everts' claim of shared goals with Milieudedefensie
15	Agenda-setting	S	6	Three dominant frames structurally exclude alternative perspectives

Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (average criteria 1-9): 4.9 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (average criteria 10-15): 5.3 / 10
- TOTAL SCORE (average all 15 criteria): 5.1 / 10

Dominant Techniques



- 1. Omission (Score 7):** The broadcast structurally omits the voices that could challenge the institutional narrative: coalition spokespersons (PVV, VVD, BBB) receive no direct speaking time, the Moroccan-Dutch community is not heard, and independent experts are absent in all three main segments. This creates a systematically distorted picture in which institutional and progressive perspectives dominate.
- 2. Question Asymmetry (Score 6):** The presenter demonstrably employs different questioning styles: Shell director Everts is repeatedly and normatively questioned on his moral responsibility, while Mayor Halsema is questioned procedurally and mildly and opposition leader Timmermans is allowed to present his frame unchallenged. This pattern is consistent and structural.
- 3. Agenda-Setting (Score 6):** The broadcast places three dominant frames on the agenda (antisemitism as the primary lens, corporate responsibility above government responsibility, regulation as the solution) that structurally exclude alternative perspectives. The agenda choices consistently favour progressive-left frames over conservative-right or liberal alternatives.

Core Messages of the Broadcast

MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE): "The Amsterdam triangle did the maximum; the political tone from The Hague is the real problem."

Technique: Framing via emotional opening (Halsema), time allocation (triangle receives 17% speaking time for self-accountability), omission of independent assessment — Evidence: 00:03, 05:00, 01:23

MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL): "Shell director Everts must give moral accountability, even though the court has legally acquitted Shell."

Technique: Question asymmetry (repeated moral pressure), timing (one-sided historical context before interview), framing ("It now comes down to your own responsibility") — Evidence: 18:07, 21:24, 15:23

MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL): "Antisemitism is the core problem of the Amsterdam riots; the integration frame of the coalition is unnuanced."

Technique: Agenda-setting (antisemitism as primary lens), time allocation (Timmermans receives more speaking time than all coalition spokespersons combined), word choice ("firm language" for coalition) — Evidence: 03:12, 03:50, 01:45

Reasoning: The broadcast scores 5.1/10 based on 15 criteria, indicating clear one-sidedness. The one-sidedness is not the result of one dominant technique but of a consistent pattern: coalition positions are reduced to editorial summaries, institutional sources account for themselves without independent scrutiny, and the agenda-setting consistently favours progressive-left frames. The broadcast thereby does not fully comply with the pluriformity requirement of Media Act Art. 2.1, which requires balanced reporting across the total output. The one-sidedness is not extreme but is structural and consistent.

CONCLUSION

The Nieuwsuur broadcast of 13 November 2024 shows a consistent pattern of structural one-sidedness that is demonstrable on multiple criteria. The largest governing party (PVV) and its coalition partners VVD and BBB receive no direct speaking time, while the opposition leader (Timmermans/GL-PvdA) is allowed to present his frame unchallenged. The Shell segment is dominated by a moral accountability frame that ignores the legal acquittal, and the historical context is built up exclusively from the perspective of the climate movement. The omission of crucial voices — the Moroccan-Dutch community, independent experts, coalition spokespersons — is structural and not incidental. Based on Media Act Art. 2.1, which requires pluriform, balanced and independent reporting, the broadcast is insufficiently balanced: the pluriformity requirement is violated because relevant political and societal perspectives are systematically omitted or reduced to editorial summaries.



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

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

4.9/10

Considerable imbalance

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

5.3/10

Considerable imbalance

TOTAL SCORE

5.1/10

Considerable imbalance

Average of Hard Facts and Soft Facts



KEY — Meaning of the scores

Individual scores per criterion (0–10)

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

Aggregated deviation index — Interpretation ranges

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

Party-political bias (-5 to +5)

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



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

Assessment on the basis of Media Act Art. 2.1

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

Violation 1: Lack of pluriformity — coalition positions not substantively represented

Standard: Media Act Art. 2.1 (pluriformity)

Factual description: The three largest coalition parties (PVV, VVD, BBB) receive no direct speaking time in the broadcast. Their positions are presented exclusively through a one-sentence editorial summary (03:50–03:58), while the opposition leader (Timmermans/GL-PvdA) receives extensive speaking time to present his frame.

Evidence: Timestamp 03:50 — Quote: "Coalition parties PVV, VVD and BBB are using firm language. They want the cabinet to take tough action against Moroccan youth who go off the rails."

Assessment: The pluriformity requirement demands that relevant political perspectives are substantively addressed. Reducing the positions of the largest governing party to an editorial summary, while the opposition speaks directly, is a demonstrable violation of the pluriformity principle.

Violation 2: Lack of balance — asymmetric moderation behaviour

Standard: Media Act Art. 2.1 (balance)

Factual description: The presenter demonstrably employs different questioning styles: Shell director Everts is repeatedly and normatively questioned on his moral responsibility (18:35, 21:24, 25:28), while Mayor Halsema is questioned procedurally and mildly without follow-up on the criticism from city councillors.

Evidence: Timestamp 18:35 — Quote: "So you are also not going to do more than what you are doing?" vs. timestamp 10:10 — Quote: "Was it not necessary to escort the supporters somewhere by bus?"

Assessment: Balanced reporting requires that comparable triggering events (vague answers, self-accountability) elicit comparable journalistic interventions. The demonstrable asymmetry in questioning style is a violation of the balance principle.

Violation 3: Lack of independence — no independent experts in main segments

Standard: Media Act Art. 2.1 (independence)

Factual description: In both main segments (Amsterdam riots, Shell ruling) independent experts are entirely absent. All substantive guests are direct parties: the Amsterdam triangle accounts for its own conduct, Shell defends its own policy, and Milieudefensie is the claimant in the legal case.

Evidence: Timestamp 05:00 — Quote: "Halsema reiterated that the triangle... did the maximum to prevent the violence." — no independent scrutiny.

Assessment: Independent reporting requires that claims by parties are scrutinised by independent sources. The absence of independent experts in both main segments is a structural violation of the independence principle.

Overall Assessment Media Act Art. 2.1

The Nieuwsuur broadcast of 13 November 2024 does not fully comply with three of the four core requirements of Media Act Art. 2.1: pluriformity (coalition positions not substantively represented), balance (asymmetric moderation behaviour) and independence (no independent experts in main segments). The violations are not incidental but structural and consistent throughout the entire broadcast. Based on Media Act case law, pluriformity is assessed across the total output, not per broadcast; nevertheless, the consistent pattern of one-sidedness in this broadcast constitutes a demonstrable contribution to a structural imbalance that, if repeated, is in conflict with the statutory pluriformity requirement.

SOURCE DEPTH CHECK (Mandatory for all cited specialist bodies / NGOs / advisory bodies)

1. Milieudefensie (Friends of the Earth Netherlands)



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

- 1. FUNDING:** Funded through donations from members and supporters, funds (including Postcode Lottery) and incidental subsidies. No government funding for core activities.
 - 2. MANDATE:** Advocacy organisation with the explicit mission of enforcing climate action through legal and political means. Mandate is by definition partisan.
 - 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Direct party in the Shell legal case. Institutional interest in framing the ruling as a setback and in mobilising donors and public support.
 - 4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**
 - D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Direct party in the case
 - D2 Personal risk: +1 — Publicly standing up for a losing case
 - D3 Professional competence: +1 — Expertise in climate law and policy
 - D4 Opinion consistency: +2 — Consistent climate activism
 - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1 — Strong emotional appeal
 - D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary source
- TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE LIGHT: YELLOW
- 5. COUNTER-VOICE:** An independent climate law jurist who contextualises the legal reasoning of the court is entirely absent.

2. Skal Biocontrole

- 1. FUNDING:** Skal Biocontrole is a government-designated certification body, funded through certification fees from certified companies and a statutory task from the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality.
 - 2. MANDATE:** Supervision of organic production in the food and plant sector. Mandate is legally limited to food and plants — cosmetics explicitly falls outside the mandate.
 - 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** No direct interest in the outcome of the cosmetics debate; however, institutional interest in expanding the supervisory domain to cosmetics (relevance growth).
 - 4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**
 - D1 Conflict of interest: 0 — No direct interest in cosmetics outcome
 - D2 Personal risk: +1 — Openly acknowledges the gap in supervision
 - D3 Professional competence: +2 — Legally designated supervisor for organic
 - D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistent about the statutory limitation
 - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +2 — Factual and procedural
 - D6 Source level: +1 — Primary supervisor
- TOTAL: +7 → SOURCE LIGHT: GREEN
- 5. COUNTER-VOICE:** A European regulatory expert who contextualises the gap in the EU cosmetics regulation is absent.

3. ACM (Authority for Consumers and Markets)

- 1. FUNDING:** Independent administrative body, funded through the national budget (Ministry of Economic Affairs and Climate Policy).
 - 2. MANDATE:** Supervision of fair competition and consumer protection. Has a general authority in cases of misleading but has never intervened in organic cosmetics claims.
 - 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Government body that must explain its own enforcement failures — limited incentive for self-criticism.
 - 4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**
 - D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Must explain own failure
 - D2 Personal risk: 0 — Institutional statement, no personal risk
 - D3 Professional competence: +2 — Legally designated supervisor
 - D4 Opinion consistency: 0 — No previous statements on this specific subject
 - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +2 — Factual
 - D6 Source level: +1 — Primary supervisor
- TOTAL: +4 → SOURCE LIGHT: YELLOW
- 5. COUNTER-VOICE:** An independent consumer organisation (e.g. Consumentenbond) assessing the enforcement gap is absent.



IMPORTANT: "Recognised" is not a substantive qualification. It is a social attribution that must itself be critically assessed. All of the above bodies are assessed on the basis of the six dimensions of the credibility matrix, not on the basis of their institutional status.

Source traffic light for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Milieudefensie (Friends of the Earth Netherlands)	-2	+1	+1	+2	-1	0	+1	YELLOW
Skal Biocontrole	0	+1	+2	+1	+2	+1	+7	GREEN
ACM (Authority for Consumers and Markets)	-1	0	+2	0	+2	+1	+4	YELLOW

Legal and methodological explanation

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



APPENDIX 1: NATIONAL LEGISLATION

Legal basis Netherlands — NPO

Act

Media Act 2008

Relevant articles

- Art. 2.1 (Public media mandate): 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 societal 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. **Societal 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 judge)



APPENDIX 2: SCIENTIFIC SOURCES

Literature

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

SVFAB Working Papers

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

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

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



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

Evaluations and membership at SVFAB

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

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

Contact and further information:

www.SVFAB.ch | Kontakt@SVFAB.ch

Bank details: PostFinance – POFICHBE

IBAN: CH32 0900 0000 1675 6251 1

Beneficiary: SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zürich 1



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

The following books are available from SVFAB

Orders via www.svfab.ch or kontakt@svfab.ch



Unbalanced reporting is the response to the halving initiative in Switzerland: here the manipulation techniques are explained in detail, starting with the selection of contributors and source selection. Subsequently 15 principles are explained: omission, framing, temporal framing, guilt by association, emotionalisation, 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 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 stands in the spotlight and wants to understand how the game works. So that they stop playing along — and start shaping it.

In A5 format. Direct. For preparation, for consultation, for debriefing and in difficult situations



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



You think you see the world. In reality you see the frame that someone has placed around it. Framing is the oldest and most elegant manipulation technique in the world. It does not change the facts — it changes what we make of the facts. How we feel. What we believe. How we decide. And it works — because we all participate. Daily. Unconsciously. You too. This book is not a dry textbook. It is a workbook — playful, direct, full of examples from real life. You learn not only how others frame you. You learn how you yourself frame — and how you can use it consciously and fairly. Because those who understand framing see the world more clearly. Hear news differently. Conduct conversations more confidently. And no longer let 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 occasionally a smile.

Framing with style. Because the frame changes everything.